

PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL
PARK DRAFT WILDERNESS PROPOSAL AND
MASTER PLAN--SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

by

The Recreation Research Project^{1/}
U.S.D.A. Forest Service
Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station
4507 University Way N.E.
Seattle, Washington 98105

Under Contract to:
National Park Service, U.S.D.I.
Pacific Northwest Region
4th and Pike Building
Seattle, Washington 98101

^{1/} John C. Hendee, Recreation Research Project Leader; Dr. Roger N. Clark, Research Social Scientist; Randel F. Washburne and Robert M. Muth, Research Technicians.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Procedure for Public Input Analysis and Summary	2
III. The Kinds of Public Inputs Received: Their Nature and Extent	7
A. How many inputs were received?	7
B. In what form were the inputs received?	8
C. Who responded?	9
D. How did inputs vary by where respondents live?	9
E. To whom were inputs addressed?	10
IV. Opinions and Supporting Reasons Concerning Wilderness Plan	11
A. The wilderness plan and EIS documents	12
B. Size of proposed wilderness	15
C. The concept of wilderness in general	20
D. Wilderness additions proposed by the public	24
E. Wilderness deletions proposed by the public	30
F. Proposed hostels and enclaves	32
G. Proposed wilderness buffers	39
V. Opinions and Supporting Reasons Concerning the Master Plan	40
A. Master plan and EIS documents	41
B. General statement toward additions to the park	44
C. Specific additions to the park	47
D. Hydrographic boundary adjustments	50
E. Backcountry management	51
F. Trails	52
G. Backcountry shelters	54
H. Removal of Enchanted Valley Chalet	55
I. Other backcountry facilities	56
J. Sol Duc Hot Springs facilities	57
K. Road development	59
L. Highway relocation	62
M. Shuttle buses in Park	65
N. Beach and backcountry access	66
O. Bike routes	67
P. Intensive recreation facility development	68
Q. Proposed Mt. Angeles tramway	70
R. Park concessions	72
S. Interpretation and visitor information	72
T. Special Park uses	73
U. Park flora	74

Table of Contents (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
V. Wildlife	75
W. Private inholdings	76
X. Use restrictions	79
Y. Management goals for Park	80
Z. Other issues	84
AA. Public involvement process	86
VI. Opinions on Alternative Plans Proposed by Citizen Groups . . .	87
A. Olympic Peninsula Heritage Council Plan	88
B. Olympic Park Associates Plan	89
VII. Appendix - Organizations Submitting Input	91

I. INTRODUCTION

In August, 1973, the National Park Service made public a draft master plan and wilderness proposal for Olympic National Park, accompanied by draft environmental impact statements. Hearings on the master plan were held in Aberdeen on October 31 and in Port Angeles on November 2; wilderness hearings took place on November 1 in Aberdeen and November 3 in Port Angeles. The public was asked to respond to these plans by December 3, 1973.

The wilderness proposal suggested Wilderness for 93% of the park, excluding from wilderness 26,000 acres near Mt Angeles. Two hostels and surrounding 23-acre enclaves were proposed within the wilderness area.

The Park master plan dealt with several issues, including: plans for incorporating private inholdings, adjustment of certain park boundaries to fit hydrographic divides, removal of facilities at Sol Duc Hot Springs, relocation of arterial highways within the park, and a proposed addition to the Park of a strip of ocean coastline at Point of Arches/Shi Shi Beach.

Several organized groups responded to the National Park Service proposals with their own plans. The Olympic Peninsula Heritage Council recommended only 56% of the park as wilderness, a policy of development for intensive recreation for the remainder, and no further expansions in total park size. A conservationist coalition group, the Olympic Park Associates, proposed more wilderness than the National Park Service recommendation and further additions to the park.

These issues and many others were discussed in 1,734 inputs sent to the National Park Service. This report summarizes the public response by indicating what opinions were expressed, what reasons were given to support these opinions, and how the opinions varied on major issues by where respondents live, who responded and the form in which the input was provided.

II. PROCEDURE USED FOR PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The method used in this analysis is the Codinvolve System for analyzing public input. This system was developed in 1972 by the U.S. Forest Service researchers Roger N. Clark and John C. Hendee, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Seattle, Washington, and George H. Stankey, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Missoula, Montana.

The Codinvolve System is a method of coding, summarizing and displaying diverse public inputs with provisions for subsequent storage and retrieval. Intensive effort, involving the recreation research project of the Pacific Northwest Region and the Experiment Station, was needed to adopt the Codinvolve system to handle public response concerning Olympic National Park. A staff of nearly 20 persons was involved in the Codinvolve analysis procedures, including 12 who were trained as coders.

The basic concept underlying systematic content analysis of public input is as follows: The common denominators of virtually all public input are the opinions offered for, against, or about the issues in question, along with the reasons that may be given to support the views. The number and kinds of support reasons can vary considerably, even those given to support the same opinion.

It is this combination of opinions and their supporting reasons which define the values the public holds with regard to the issue in question. Opinions offered with incorrect or inaccurate reasoning might sometimes be subject to change with new information--but they still tell something about the value orientations of the public in response to the issues in question.*

* Some of the assumptions and procedures underlying analysis of public input to resource decisions are contained in "A Framework for Using Public Input in Resource Decisionmaking" by J.C. Hendee, R.N. Clark and G.H. Stankey, 1973, unpublished manuscript, 26pp.; and "CODINVOLVE: A System for Analyzing, Storing and Retrieving Public Input to Resource Decisions," by R.N. Clark, G.H. Stankey, and J.C. Hendee, 1974 unpublished manuscript, 23 pp.

The basic goal of systematic analysis of public input is to identify and display the opinions and supporting reasons contained in the public input and how they varied according to other variables that may be important, e.g., form of input, residence of respondent and who responded.

The Codinvolve System involves several steps to this completed analysis:

1. Identify basic questions about the public inputs for which decision-makers need answers. These questions include: How did the public feel about the amount of wilderness proposal and what specific changes were desired? What was the balance of opinion on issues such as hostels, enclaves, additions to the park, inholdings and other issues included in the wilderness and draft master plans? What reasons did the public choose to discuss?
2. Survey the inputs to determine the breadth of issues it discusses.
3. Develop codebook and coding form to guide the coding of subsequent inputs. The coding categories are defined by the content of the input itself and not by what someone might think is in it.
4. Read and code each input as to the opinions and supporting reasons they contain entering them on a coding form. Reliability checks of the accuracy and completeness of coding are made continuously.
5. Assemble the opinions and supporting reasons into a set of organized tables which display the content of the public input.
6. When necessary to avoid confusion, provide a technical interpretation of the data avoiding any evaluation of what the data might mean for the decision. Evaluating the importance or implications of the data is the responsibility of the decision-maker.

The major emphasis in this process is in the coding of individual inputs. This necessitated, of course, careful training of coders through group discussion, joint coding, and coder reliability checks to ensure uniform application of the system.

Intermittent reliability checks consisted of each coder coding the same input and then comparing results. Any differences between coders were immediately corrected through more training and developed more explicit coding instructions. Utilization of this approach allowed an average coder reliability of 85% to 95% to be maintained. Most coding "errors" involved only differences in where data was entered on the Keysort cards. The Codin-volve system has the flexibility to negate these errors, and in the case of the Olympic National Park analysis, such inconsistencies were insignificant.

Every opinion and supporting reason contained in the public input was entered on the Keysort summary form. When many people gave supporting reasons which meant the same thing, but were worded differently, these reasons were grouped together under one heading with a common meaning. The reader should recognize that the lists of supporting reasons for opinions shown in the report represent all reasons given and are not merely a sample.

The following report consists mainly of a set of organized tables to display opinions, supporting reasons, and supporting comments. In this way, the data speak for themselves.

Organization and Presentation of the Results

Part III summarizes the extent and nature of public input received. Part IV describes opinions on the salient issues in the wilderness plan and Part V summarizes opinions on issues concerning the draft master plan. Following each table describing opinions (below it or on following pages)

are lists of reasons supporting the opinions, shown in number of times each reason was mentioned.

Following the main tables, more detailed breakdowns of the opinions by form of input, who responded or residence are provided on selected issues having sufficient variation in opinion to make further analysis worthwhile. Note that the totals shown in these supplementary tables may be lower than those in the main table on that issue because some inputs could not be classified by the "breakdown variable" (who responded, residence, etc.) and therefore don't appear in the table.

No interpretation of the data is provided in the report since the balance of opinion on the issues speak for themselves. The reader is cautioned, however, that apparent inconsistencies in opinions and supporting reasons offered by the public may appear; that is, opinions may be supported for erroneous or irrelevant reasons. Quite often, public input contains opinions and reasoning that managers recognize as unsound, based on misinformation or is wrong for some other reason. This analysis does not correct for such problems, however, since the function of analysis is to accurately describe what is contained in the input and to provide it in a form for review by decision-makers.

The format used to display data is as follows: tables show numbers of inputs (I) and number of signatures (S) responding with opinions. Percents are also provided for significant figures in some tables.

Multiple Input

Some individuals responded more than once or through different means. For example, they may have written one or more letters and also have testified at the hearing. In order to determine the extent of such multiple inputs, a list of names for all written and transcript inputs was assembled and the

names matched. These inputs from the same people were then coded together.

In these cases, the number of inputs (I) exceeded signatures (S), since they were from the same person. Hence some tables may indicate more inputs than signatures. The extent of such multiple inputs is summarized in Table 1 under form of input.

III. THE KINDS OF PUBLIC INPUTS RECEIVED: Their Nature and Extent

Number of Public Inputs Received

Inputs	1734
Signatures	6540

Table 1.--In what form were inputs received?

Form of input	Inputs	Signatures
Personal letters	1,259(76%)	1,539(24%)
Form letters	12	12
Petitions	14	3,656(56%)
Hearing transcripts	179(11%)	162(2%)
Reports	2	1
Position statements	105(6%)	104(2%)
Telegrams and mailgrams	9	12
Telephone calls	2	3
Peninsula College Class Response	43	42
Hearing notes	1	1
Survey of Wilderness Core <u>2/</u>	1	969(15%)
Maps	2	1
TOTAL <u>3/</u>	1,629(100%)	6,502(100%)
Multiple inputs <u>1/</u>	384	218

1/ These represent more than one input submitted by a person or persons, such as a person submitting a letter and also testifying at a hearing. (About 19% of the inputs were accounted for by multiple inputs. The maximum detected was 6 inputs per person, several submitted 4 or 5 inputs.) Does not include petition signatures. Many multiple inputs were by people who responded to the invitation to testify and subsequently wrote letters (See introduction).

2/ Testimony by David Veltkamp reports a survey of 969 Port Angeles High School students on the question "What is your feeling concerning the Wilderness plan as proposed for Olympic National Park?"

3/ These totals are lower than the total of inputs and signatures received because Multiple Inputs from the same person were not always identified by specific type, i.e., letters, reports, petitions, but rather coded together as Multiple Input.

Table 2.--How did inputs vary by who responded?

Who responded	Inputs	Signatures
Individuals	1,208 (70%)	1,112 (17%)
Family groups	218 (13%)	408 (6%)
Formal groups or organizations	255 (14%)	365 (6%)
Informal groups (friends or petition signers)	53 (3%)	4,655 (71%)
TOTAL	1,734 (100%)	6,540 (100%)

Lists of organizations are provided in Appendix.

Table 3.--How did inputs vary by where the respondent lives?

Respondents' residence	Inputs	Signatures
Olympic Peninsula ^{1/}	543 (33%)	3,376 (66%) ^{3/}
Regional (Washington other than Olympic Peninsula, Oregon and British Columbia)	572 (35%)	942 (18%)
National and international	524 (32%)	772 (15%)
TOTAL	1,639	5,090^{2/}

^{1/} Towns and cities classified as "Olympic Peninsula":
Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Port Angeles, Port Townsend,
Joyce, Shelton, Amanda Park, Quinalt, Humptulips,
Montesano, Elma, McCleary, Matlock, Agnew, LaPush.

^{2/} This total does not reflect the total signatures submitting inputs to this project due to some letters not containing residence information.

^{3/} One petition (input # 694A) with 1790 signatures included 1539 local residents, 234 regional residents and 17 national residents. Hence these numbers of signatures are included under the appropriate residence categories. It was also considered as one local input.

Table 4 .--To whom were inputs addressed?

Letters addressed to	:	Inputs
Superintendent or Hearing Officer, Olympic National Park	:	1,636(94%)
Pacific Northwest Regional Office, National Park Service	:	45
Washington Office, National Park Service	:	46
Others (mostly Forest Service offices)	:	7
TOTAL	:	1,734

IV. PUBLIC OPINION AND SUPPORTING REASONS CONCERNING
THE WILDERNESS PLAN

Table 5 | --What opinions and comments were
expressed about the Wilderness Plan?

Nature of comments on the Wilderness Plan	Inputs	Signatures
Endorsed whole Wilderness Plan	53	991
Discussion of Wilderness Plan or points in it	753	2,582
TOTAL	806	3,634

OPINIONS ABOUT THE WILDERNESS PLAN

COMMENTS RELATED TO BLANKET ENDORSEMENTS OF THE WILDERNESS PLAN

- Supports Plan because they favor wilderness status for the Park (13)
- Very good and well thought out plan (3)
- Plan provides core around which other uses can function (3)
- Plan keeps Park from being overrun with highways and commercial structures (1)
- Compliment Park Service for preserving wilderness character (1)
- Plan should be accepted as it stands (1)
- Plan will save the Park (1)
- Backs 93% wilderness (1)
- Plan will protect and preserve the Park (1)
- All Americans will be grateful for preserving Park (1)
- Endorses plan even though it is a little conservative and skimpy (1)
- Supports plan for selves and future generations (1)
- Read pamphlet and agreed (1)
- Supports plan because more wilderness is needed (1)
- Plan is good and essential (1)
- Wilderness core survey of students: 96% supported Plan, 2% opposed Plan, 1% no opinion (1)

Favorable Discussion of Wilderness Plan:

- General support but recommends small changes (188)
- Commends Park Service for good plan (53)
- Plan shows high sensitivity toward wilderness (24)
- Plan assures protection that Park deserves (5)
- Grateful for Park efforts on plan (4)
- Hopes final plan resembles this one (2)
- Supports plan with Olympic Park Associates amendments (2)
- Long range plans needed to preserve wilderness (2)
- Plan shows good balance - recognizes more than just the wilderness user (2)
- Supports plan as Park is one of the last and least spoiled wilderness areas (1)
- Supports plan because more wilderness is needed (1)
- Supports plan but objects to developing areas within the wilderness (1)
- Plan is a great preservation step (1)
- Plan is one way to begin protection of Park (1)
- Plan restrictions needed to protect Park (1)
- Supports plan with modifications on Sol Duc (1)

Criticism of Wilderness Plan:

- Opposes wilderness plan (37)
- Plan is OK but wilderness is too large (8)
- Plan is too restrictive (6)
- Plan would destroy local community by taking land (2)
- Oppose plan - not in favor of making Park all a wilderness (2)
- Opposes plan - because it limits number of horses (2)
- Plan is not in best interest of majority of people (2)
- Plan doesn't provide for fire protection (2)
- Develop what you now have for everyone to use (1)
- Plan would make Park useless to all but a few tourists (1)
- Oppose plan - how does Park expect people to enjoy beauty of Quinault area if they can't see it (1)
- Oppose plan - Quinault Valley property owners (1)
- We don't need a wilderness plan (1)
- Majority of local people don't want plan - let common sense prevail - table this absurd plan (1)
- Against any plan restricting public use in Park (1)
- Plan is crazy (1)
- Plan is unfair (1)
- Plan is unrealistic (1)
- Has reservations about plan (1)
- Room for substantial improvement on the plan (1)
- Plan is dull and unimaginative (1)
- Plan too vague on purchasing inholdings (1)
- Many statements need to be more explicit (1)
- Plan should discuss wilderness designation effect on present hydrolic conditions and future stream and snow pack conditions (1)
- Plan would: a) provide poor timber management b) provide no access to recreation areas (1)

General Discussion of Wilderness Plan:

- Olympic National Park should be part of Wilderness system (7)
- Park conceived as wilderness Park, most should be wilderness (4)
- Proposals can't go far enough (2)
- Plan has no impact on Coast Guard Missions (1)
- Further define minimum use of tools in plan (1)
- Plan should be modified and improved (1)
- Plan should have something for everyone (1)
- Concerned about future plans (1)
- Change plan with regard to testimony at hearings (1)

Table 6 --What opinions and comments were expressed about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Wilderness Plan?

Nature of comments on the Wilderness Plan EIS	Inputs	Signatures
Endorsed whole Wilderness Plan EIS	1	1
Discussion of Wilderness Plan EIS or points in it	64	40
TOTAL	65	41

COMMENTS ON THE WILDERNESS PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- No explanation of sewage disposal for hostels - no discussion of maintenance of underground cable (1)
- Rudolph W. Bekus - Forest Research Consultant at Humboldt interested in reviewing the EIS's (1)
- Department of Commerce defers to the Department of Interior in this matter (1)
- Should discuss impact of land acquisition along Lake Crescent on private home, cabin, and property owners; their commercial and leisure time activities (1)
- Discuss impact on non-wilderness lands (especially Mt. Angeles - Hurricane Ridge and enclaves) of concentrating intensive recreation use due to remainder being wilderness (1)
- Adjacent Washington Island proposal referred to on pg 26 has been included in the Wilderness System (1970). If an impact would result either to or from this refuge, it could be discussed under paragraph 2 on pg. 40 "Impacts on Wilderness from Adjacent Lands" (1)
- Question inference of (see VII paragraph 1) "National Park status precludes grazing, logging, mining or other consumptive use." Does this include fishing? If not change to most other consumptive uses - also refer to letter #1572 (1)
- Wilderness plan environmental impact statement appears better prepared than the Master Plan, proposed 92% wilderness won't change anything significantly (1)
- Compliments Park Service for comprehensive and sensitively prepared study and analysis (1)
- Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has little criticism of impact of wilderness proposal in EIS but too few alternatives proposed. Alternatives should provide a choice of different arrangements of wilderness and non-wilderness land. (1)
- On page 5 #17 substitute the following paragraph for the sentence beginning : "According to the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-480) all buildings and facilities constructed, altered, financed or leased by the United States (with certain exceptions on military installations) that are either accessible to the public or within which handicapped persons may work or reside must be designed to insure that physically handicapped persons will have ready access to and use of such buildings" (1)
- The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation offers specific comments on increasing intensive recreation, the need for it and the plan's impact on this need. See letters for details (#1551, 1571, 1585, & 1589) (1)

INTRODUCTION TO TABLES CONCERNING WILDERNESS

Most inputs discussing wilderness were specific about the amount of wilderness in the park. Others only expressed favor or opposition to the wilderness concept, whether in relation to the park (including comments such as "I would like wilderness in the park") or in general. In order to obtain a clear distribution of opinions on the amount of wilderness desired (and also to avoid "forcing" these general comments to fit a quantitative scale on the amount of wilderness), the general comments are summarized separately as "opinions on the general concept of wilderness." The opinions clearly pointing to an amount of wilderness desired are summarized in the table concerning "opinions on the size of the proposed wilderness."

Table 7. --What was the balance of opinion on the size of wilderness as proposed in the Wilderness Plan?

Desired amount of wilderness	Inputs	Signatures
want larger wilderness than proposed	938(82%)	1,479(25%)
amount proposed is OK	28(3%)	951(17%)
want smaller wilderness than proposed (including no wilderness)	173(15%)	3,243(58%)
TOTAL	1,139(100%)	5,621(100%) ^{1/}

^{1/} This includes petition signatures

REASONS UNDERLYING OPINION ON THE SIZE OF THE PROPOSED WILDERNESS

Desire Larger Wilderness than Proposed

- Preserve for posterity (50)
- To keep area unspoiled (33)
- Needs statutory protection (26)
- The largest possible wilderness area (26)
- To protect against economic interests (25)
- Has valuable wilderness qualities, unique beauty and variety (20)
- Once wilderness is gone it's gone forever (12)
- Not much wilderness left (11)
- To protect against overuse (10)
- To provide opportunity for rejuvenation and solitude (8)
- Need for wilderness is growing (7)
- Deserves protection (5)
- The exclusions detract from wilderness concepts (5)
- Wilderness preserves for all people of the world (2)
- The original purpose of the park was wilderness (2)
- To protect from logging (2)
- It's good for scientific study (1)
- Even if 93 percent of the park becomes wilderness, wilderness will still be a small percentage of National Park System (1)
- Majority of users would support largest possible wilderness (1)
- Decreasing wilderness size would compound over use problems (1)
- Keep park roadless (1)
- Citizens near wilderness don't understand that it belongs to everyone (1)
- Whole roadless area should be wilderness as well as additional areas returning to roadless state (1)
- National Park Service is not required to provide land area proportionate to the number of visitors in each use group (1)
- Is the largest wilderness left in the forty-eight states (1)
- Size provides best possible wilderness experience (1)

Desire Less Wilderness than Proposed

- 93 per cent of park is too much (32)
- Wilderness restricts or excludes (28)
- Want no wilderness (19)
- Wilderness hurts economy (7)
- Wilderness is contrary to National Park concept (4)
- Present plan lacks good management and flexibility (4)
- Wilderness presents fire hazards (2)
- Wilderness classification unnecessary (2)
- Like park as is (2)
- Wilderness doesn't serve future generations (1)
- Smaller wilderness would provide larger buffer area (1)
- How much is needed for isolation? (1)
- Afraid of "adjacent to" clause that would effect Lake Crescent, even though not wilderness (1)

Amount of Wilderness OK as Proposed

- Good plan, logical (3)
- Areas excluded are enough for non-wilderness uses (1)
- Size is small compared to rest of U.S. (1)
- Plan should have something for everyone (1)
- Smaller wilderness would effect ecology and care of area (1)

Other Comments About Wilderness in the Park

- Keep Olympic National Park as it is today (5)
- Parks should have wilderness status with no exclusions that allow development (1)
- Popular undeveloped portions should be classified wilderness (1)
- Set aside as much wilderness as possible for recreation by public (1)
- Commence any action leading to wilderness (1)
- Parks should be wilderness and reserved for healthy common man on foot (1)
- Classify as wilderness as is good for long term administration and plans (1)
- Park has sufficient wilderness now (1)
- Ambiguity of 97 per cent; does it include roadless areas or compromise? (1)
- Different people have different needs for size of wilderness (1)
- Size or access to wilderness should not discourage visitation to the area (1)
- Do not include Hurricane Ridge or narrow corridor in Bogachiel in wilderness (1)
- All unroaded parts of parks should be wilderness (1)

Table 8 .--How did the balance of opinion on the size of the proposed wilderness vary by who responded?

Who responded	Size of wilderness			Total
	Larger than proposed	Smaller than proposed	OK as proposed	
Individuals	(I): 718(90%) (S): 669	66(8%) 53	20(2%) 15	(100%)
Families	(I): 104(81%) (S): 197	23(18%) 34	2(1%) 4	(100%)
Formal groups	(I): 95(55%) (S): 252	72(42%) 63	5(3%) 2	(100%)
Informal groups	(I): 21(62%) (S): 361	12(35%) 3,093	1 930	(100%)
TOTAL	(I): 938 (S): 1,479	173 3,243	28 951	

(I) = Inputs
(S) = SignaturesTable 9 .--How did opinions on the proposed size of wilderness vary by the respondents' residence?

Residence of respondent	Larger than proposed	Smaller than proposed	Amount proposed OK	Total
Olympic Peninsula	(I): 111(43%) (S): 117	135(53%) 2,966	12(4%) 938	(100%)
Regional	(I): 372(91%) (S): 408	32(7%) 254	8(2%) 7	(100%)
National	(I): 410(98%) (S): 648	4(1%) 21	2(1%) 2	(100%)
TOTAL	(I): 893 (S): 1,173	171 3,241	22 947	

1/ One petition (input # 694A) with 1970 signatures included 1,539 local residents, 234 regional residents and 17 national residents. Hence these numbers of signatures are included under the respective residence categories rather than under "Olympic Peninsula", although it is counted as one "Olympic Peninsula" input.

Table 10.--How did opinions on the size of proposed wilderness vary by form of input?

Form of input		Size of wilderness			
		Larger than proposed	Smaller than proposed	Proposed amount OK	Total Percents
Personal letters	(I):	784 (90%)	67 (3%)	15 (2%)	[100%]
	(S):	886	112	13	
Form letters	(I):	4	14	0	
	(S):	4	19	0	
Petitions	(I):	2	5	0	
	(S):	229	3,067	0	
Survey by wilderness core	(I):	0	0	1	
	(S):	0	0	934	
Hearing transcripts	(I):	66 (71%)	21 (23%)	6 (6%)	[100%]
	(S):	66	20	6	
Reports	(I):	2	0	0	
	(S):	1	0	0	
Position statements	(I):	62 (68%)	27 (29%)	3 (3%)	[100%]
	(S):	56	16	1	
Telegrams and mailgrams	(I):	4	3	0	
	(S):	4	2	0	
Hearing notes	(I):	1	0	0	
	(S):	1	0	0	
Phone calls	(I):	3	0	0	
	(S):	4	0	0	
Penninsula Community College class assignment	(I):	3	1	1	
	(S):	3	1	1	
TOTAL	(I):	931	138	26	
	(S):	1,254	3,237	955	
Multiple inputs	(I):	178 (64%)	89 (32%)	10 (4%)	[100%]
	(S):	88	53	6	

Table 11.--What was the balance of opinion on the general wilderness concept (without reference to the amount of wilderness proposed for the Park)?

Opinion on general wilderness concept	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Favor concept	:	341	:	406
Against concept	:	72	:	1,863 ^{1/}
TOTAL	:	397	:	2,269 ^{1/}

^{1/} Includes 1790 signatures in response to petition from Clallam County Chronicle.

(I) = Inputs
(S) = Signatures

Table 12/.--How did opinions on the general concept of wilderness (without reference to park proposal) vary by the respondents' residence? ^{1/}

Respondents' residence		Wilderness in general		Total
		Favor	Against ^{1/}	
Olympic Peninsula	(I):	77 (59%)	54 (41%)	(100%)
	(S):	73	1,597	
Regional	(I):	118 (87%)	17 (13%)	(100%)
	(S):	131	247	
National	(I):	124 (99%)	1 (1%)	(100%)
	(S):	149	18	
TOTAL	(I):	319	72	
	(S):	353	1,862	

^{1/}One petition with 1790 signatures talked about wilderness in general. Each signature in this petition was located under its appropriate residence in this table.

(I) = Inputs.
(S) = Signatures

Table 3. --How did opinions on the general concept of wilderness (without reference to the Park proposal) vary by form of input. ^{1/}

Respondents	Form of input	Wilderness in General		Total
		Favor	Against	
Personal letters	(I):	293 (87%)	44 (13%)	(100%)
	(S):	348	62	
Form letters	(I):	0	0	
	(S):	0	0	
Petitions	(I):	1	4	
	(S):	17 (1%)	1801 (99%)	(100%)
Hearing transcripts	(I):	48	11	
	(S):	37	5	
Reports	(I):	0	0	
	(S):	0	0	
Position statements	(I):	6	21	
	(S):	6	23	
Telegrams and mailgrams	(I):	3	0	
	(S):	4	0	
Peninsula Community College class assignment	(I):	4	0	
	(S):	4	0	
Hearing notes	(I):	1	0	
	(S):	1	0	
TOTAL	(I):	356	72	
	(S):	417	1,863	
Multiple inputs	(I):	83	27	
	(S):	53	25	

^{1/} This table does not include persons included in tables 7 and 8 who were referring to the Park proposal.

REASONS AND COMMENTS ON THE GENERAL CONCEPT OF WILDERNESS

Favor Concept of Wilderness

- Preserve for posterity (125)
- Keep unspoiled (85)
- Need statutory protection (49)
- To prevent over-use (29)
- To prevent development (20)
- Provide spiritual or therapeutic values (18)
- To meet increased demands for wilderness (16)
- Once lost wilderness can't be replaced (15)
- Little wilderness left (7)
- Area is unique (4)
- To protect beauty (4)
- "Restricts handicapped" is not a valid objection (3)
- To preserve for wildlife (3)
- To preserve ecosystem diversity (3)
- Benefits people in many ways not just elite (2)
- Provides a historic monument (2)
- Maintain U.S.'s large and varied wilderness resource (1)
- Provide quality wilderness experience (1)
- Has scientific values (1)
- Wilderness a small percent of land available for logging and mining (1)
- Although many people want easy access it lowers their appreciation (1)
- Wilderness is the spectacular feature of the park (1)
- Doesn't restrict older people (1)
- Wilderness has a right to its own destiny (1)
- Good to know its there (1)
- Our wastefulness of natural resources is best argument for wilderness (1)
- To prevent sediment pollution from roads (1)
- Prevent scarcity of wilderness getting like it is in the East (1)
- To have wilderness in all fifty states (1)

Oppose Concepts of Wilderness in General

- Restricts use (25)
- Hurts economy (11)
- Prevents development (9)
- Presents fire-hazards (3)
- Waste of natural resources (3)
- Results in lack of protection (2)
- Prefer multiple-use (2)
- Park doesn't need wilderness designation as it is already wild (2)
- Should be for the majority (2)
- Why need more? (1)
- Doesn't serve future (1)
- Need more areas for increasing population (1)
- Wilderness and parks would be committing mayhem (1)
- High cost of finding lost hikers (1)
- Limits maintenance options (1)
- Secretary of Interior could increase wilderness at own discretion (1)
- Excludes handicapped and elderly (1)
- Users must be experienced in survival (1)

Other Comments Related to the Concept of Wilderness

- Endorse National Park Service efforts to designate Olympic National Park as wilderness (2)
- Don't be swayed against wilderness by economic interests (2)
- Wilderness in park would reduce pressure for wilderness on other lands that can serve timber needs (1)
- Wilderness must be on a planned basis (1)

Table 14.--What areas were desired as wilderness in addition to those proposed in the Wilderness Plan?

Area desired as wilderness	Inputs	Signatures
<u>Specific Areas</u>		
Mt. Angeles Exclusion	696	947
Hoh Head mineral exclusion	519	751
Non Park lands in Bogachiel	445	670
Point of Arches	245	375
Queets River Corridor	123	120
Lake Quinault Backdrop	79	68
Upper Staircase Road	59	49
Kloochman Rock	58	62
Lake Ozette	18	13
Lake Willoughby	13	17
Quinault Valley	14	18
Petroleum Creek	7	12
Coastal Strip	9	7
Seafield Lake	8	4
Quinault River	6	7
Quinault Park Land	6	6
121 acres above Whiskey Bend	6	2
Klahhane Ridge	5	5
Land east of coastal strip	6	5
Manny's Prairie	3	1
Portage Head	1	10
Wonder Mountains and Moonlight Dome	1	15
Point of Arches Uplands, Cape Alava to Waatch River, north to Lake Crescent		
Hurricane Ridge, Cape Alava to Waatch Point, Rugged Ridge	2	2
Royal Basin, Unit #3	2	1
Solduc River, Dosewallips, Boulder Creek west of Dosewallips, South of Hoh Reservation, Blue Glacier, Old Baldy, area from Hoh Indian Reservation to Ozette Indian Reservation, Old Baldy Ridge, Second Beach Back-up, Little River Basin, Unicorn Griff Ridge, Heather Park, First and Second Peak, Websters Cliff, Ozette River	1	1

(Continued...)

(Table 14 continued)

Area desired as wilderness	Inputs	Signatures
<u>General or ill-defined areas</u>		
Maximum amount of wilderness possible	9	9
All of Olympic National Park	6	6
Inholdings, small tracts of private land:	5	2
Parts of Hoh River Valley	6	2
All four units of roadless areas	6	2
Quinault Area, all of Olympic National		
Park and suitable adjacent areas, all		
of Olympic Peninsula, all of Olympic		
National Park except roadways and		
developments, any new land acquired by:		
the Park, any areas that could endanger		
wilderness characteristics, Forest		
Service land, roadless area near		
skyline, Beach along Straits of Juan		
de Fuca	1	1

OPINIONS FAVORING ADDITION OF SPECIFIC AREAS TO WILDERNESS

NON PARK LAND IN BOGACHIEL

Reason Favoring Addition of Bogachiel to Wilderness:

- The Bogachiel land deserves wilderness classification (47)
- It is most beautiful river on peninsula (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Bogachiel to Wilderness:

- Add to wilderness upon acquisition of inholdings (196)
- Add the inholdings to wilderness through special legislative provisions (36)
- Exchange for private inholdings (1)
- Follow Olympic Park Association plan (1)
- Build access trail to area (1)

MOUNT ANGELES EXCLUSION

Reasons Favoring Addition of Mt. Angeles Exclusion to Wilderness:

- Wilderness designation necessary to prevent development in area (38)
- Area meets requirements for wilderness designation (20)
- Reasons given for exclusion are mass transit/ski development - which are insufficient (18)
- Area should be saved for posterity (11)
- No need for additional ski areas (6)
- Area should be protected from overuse (5)
- Once wilderness gone - lost forever (4)
- Enough trails and roads already - protect as wilderness (4)
- Wilderness designation necessary to protect Hurricane Ridge from auto traffic (2)
- Wildlife needs protection (2)
- Wilderness recreation should take precedence over other uses (1)
- Only a few wilderness areas left (1)
- Area contains unique flora (1)
- Popularity of Hurricane Ridge should not prevent rest of area from being wilderness (1)
- Important backdrop to Port Angeles (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Mt. Angeles Exclusion to Wilderness:

- Include as much area as possible in wilderness (8)
- Include as wilderness, boundary modifications can be made in future if necessary (4)
- Exclude only Hurricane Ridge lodge and ski area (3)
- Exclude only park roads (1)
- Exclude only existing ski area and proposed tramway (1)
- Limit mass recreation on Hurricane Ridge and hiking and skiing (1)
- Area was excluded for political and economic reasons (1)

POINT OF ARCHES/SHI SHI BEACH

Reasons Favoring Addition of Point of Arches to Wilderness:

- Protect area from development (7)
- Contains fragile/unique ecology (6)
- Wilderness is fast disappearing resource (6)
- It is a beautiful area (6)
- Contains old unique cedars (4)
- Protect from overuse (3)
- Protect area from logging (2)
- Deserving of inclusion as wilderness (2)

Other Comments on Addition of Point of Arches to Wilderness:

- Extend to Makah Reservation (17)
- Preserve roadless ocean strip by limiting access (4)
- Widen wilderness coastal strip 3 to 5 miles (5)
- Suggest land exchange, if necessary to acquire this area (1)
- Obtain virgin timber lands (1)
- Wilderness classification insufficient to protect area (1)

HOH HEAD

Reasons Favoring Addition of Hoh Head to Wilderness:

- Wilderness designation necessary for protection (4)
- Wilderness designation would allow National Park Service to control access (4)
- Meets requirements for wilderness (2)
- It is an area of great beauty and solitude (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Hoh Head to Wilderness:

- Mineral rights do not preclude immediate wilderness classification (4)
- Include Hoh Head as wilderness upon termination of mineral rights (2)
- Add Hoh Head to wilderness (1)

QUEETS RIVER CORRIDOR

Reasons Favoring Addition of Queet River Corridor to Wilderness:

- Area is worthy of wilderness designation (1)
- One of the last natural rivers (1)
- Should be protected because of native summer steelhead runs (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Queets River Corridor to Wilderness:

- Add land from boundary adjustment (5)
- Add both sides of river to present road right of way (4)

QUINULT LAKE BACKDROPReasons Favoring Addition of Quinault Lake Backdrop to Wilderness:

- Area is worthy of wilderness designation (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Quinault Lake Backdrop to Wilderness:

- Add the north shore Lake Quinault Backdrop (10)

LAKE OZETTEReasons Favoring Addition of Lake Ozette to Wilderness:

- Large freshwater lake of beauty and solitude (1)
- Part of rapidly disappearing wilderness (1)
- Deserves protection (1)
- Protect from logging (1)
- Protect from development (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Lake Ozette to Wilderness:

- Designate the east shore of Lake Ozette as wilderness (4)

QUINULT PARKLANDComments on Addition of Quinault Parkland to Wilderness:

- Add lower Quinault Parkland to wilderness (4)

UPPER STAIRCASE ROAD AREAReasons Favoring Addition of Upper Staircase Road Area to Wilderness:

- Worthy of classification (1)

Other Comments on Addition of Upper Staircase Road Area to Wilderness:

- Close road and add area to wilderness (3)

KLOOCHMAN ROCKReasons Favoring Addition of Kloochooman Rock to Wilderness:

- The whole upthrust (including land outside Park) deserves wilderness classification (2)
- Area should be protected from logging (1)

HIGLEY PEAKReasons Favoring Addition of Higley Peak to Wilderness:

- Wilderness designation necessary to protect virgin forests (1)

QUINULT RIVERReasons Favoring Addition of Quinault River to Wilderness:

- Wilderness designation of some areas necessary to protect native summer steelhead runs (1)

QUINULT VALLEYComments on Addition of Quinault Valley to Wilderness:

- Relocate road north and extend wilderness to relocated road (2)

LAKE WILLOUGHBYReasons Favoring Addition of Lake Willoughby to Wilderness:

- Protect Cedars (1)

Table 15.--What areas did respondents wish deleted from the wilderness proposal?

Delete from Wilderness Proposal	Inputs	Signatures
North Shore Lake-- Quinault	4	5
All except 500,000 acre core proposal by Olympic Heritage Council	4	4
Little River and Hurricane Ridge	1	216
"Outer Areas"	1	2
Morse Creek Watershed	11	4
Unit No. 1	3	1
T27N T28N and Ranges 10, 11, 12 W	1	1
TOTAL	25	233

INTRODUCTION TO TABLES ON HOSTELS AND ENCLAVES

Some citizen input showed confusion between "hostels" and "enclaves"; the discussion of enclaves seemed to actually mean the hostel concept (from the nature of their comments). Their opinions were classified in the terms they used to avoid misinterpretation. Hence, the evaluator should be aware that the two concepts are seen as closely related and are used interchangeably.

Table 16. --What was the balance of opinion on hostels in general (those not mentioning specific hostel proposals)?

Opinion	Inputs	Signatures
Favor hostels	23	26
Oppose hostels	227	276
TOTAL	250	302

SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS ON HOSTELS IN GENERAL

Reasons Favoring Hostels in General:

- Allows persons normally unable to get into wilderness to see it (8)
- Useful in bad weather or for safety purposes (3)
- Concentrates use, limits input (2)
- Appropriate in Park wilderness (2)
- OK, if run in European model (2)
- Group camping is good (1)

Reasons Opposing Hostels in General:

- Incompatible with wilderness/intent of Wilderness Act (65)
- Will lead to overuse/too many people (23)
- Will lead to litter, pollution (8)
- Will lead to destruction of wilderness values/experience (11)
- Should be confined outside Park/do not belong in Park (10)
- Will lead to alteration of natural environment (10)
- Will lead to inexperienced, unprepared hikers in wilderness (9)
- Opposed to airlift of supplies (6)
- Difficulties in waste disposal (1)
- Too expensive/money better spent elsewhere (8)
- Problems in servicing hostels (2)
- Costs for providing service will necessitate prohibitive rates (2)
- Inappropriate in areas proposed (2)
- New facilities should not be permitted (1)

Other Comments on Hostels in General:

- Concept has some merit, have reservations about proposal (9)
- Should be limited to periphery of wilderness (7)
- Favor traveling in Park using sherpas (guide) system (5)
- Favor hostels only if it provides simple inexpensive lodging for all travelers (1)
- OK, only if blended into wilderness properly/kept primitive (3)
- Dislike proposed hostels, but favor hostels in other area: Lake Crescent (1), Hurricane Hills (1), "Waterhole Camp" near Obstruction Point (1) (for cross-country skiers)
- Prefer mobile structure/tents over permanent building (2)
- Put hostels on bike trail system, not in wilderness (1)
- Recommend trial hostel with further study on its desirability (1)
- Remove existing hostels (1)

OPPOSE HOSTELS AND ENCLAVES

Agencies

U.S. Forest Service, Washington Office
Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle

Organizations

Northwest National Seashore Alliance
Saguaro Ecology Club
Arizonans For Quality Environment
Kitsap Audubon Society
Arizona Habitat Association
Seattle Audubon Society
Cache Valley (Logan, UT) Sierra Club
Friends of the Earth, Arizona Branch
Florida Defenders of the Environment, Inc.
Dakota Environmental Council, Inc.
Florida Audubon Society
Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs (2)^{1/}
Wilderness Corps
Olympic Conservation Council
Wilderness Society (3)^{1/}
Southwest River Study Committee
Bogachiel Garden Club
Sierra Club, Columbia Group
National Parks and Conservation Association
Izaak Walton League
Appalachian Mountain Club
Sierra Club, Ashland, OR
Earth Care Organization
Mazamas
Southwest Environmental Action Team
Hood Canal Environmental Council
Pilchuck Audubon Society
Friends of the Earth, Seattle
Chemeketans
Tahoma Audubon Society
Northern Michigan Wilderness Coalition
Save Cypress Island Committee
Sierra Club, Northwest Chapter
Black Hills Chapter, Audubon Society
The Mountaineers
Olympic Park Associates (2)^{1/}
Crescent Grange
Chamber of Commerce of Port Angeles
Clallam County Economic Development Council
North Cascades Conservation Council
Audubon Society, Olympic Peninsula

^{1/} Indicates more than one respondent affiliated with this organization.

Table 17. --What was the balance of opinion on the proposed Diamond Meadows hostel?

Opinion	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Favor	:	14	:	15
Opposed	:	216	:	217
TOTAL	:	230	:	232

SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED
DIAMOND MEADOWS HOSTEL

Reasons Supporting Hostel:

- Approve of hostel without enclave (1)
- Needed to provide backcountry enjoyment for large numbers of people (1)
- Can use to introduce new people to conservation (1)
- Concept worth trying (1)
- Build as proposed (1)

Reasons Opposing Hostel:

- Not compatible with wilderness (34)
- Would increase overuse (15)
- Permanent facilities not needed with light weight equipment (11)
- Would worsen problem (10)
- Masses of people detracts from wilderness (8)
- Use sherpas with guide service (4)
- Classify as Wilderness (4)
- Would mean less land for wilderness (3)
- Should be no construction in this area (3)
- Dangerous to bring inexperienced hikers into wilderness (3)
- Locate around the edges of designated wilderness (3)
- Overnight accommodations could be provided at primitive campsites under the Wilderness Act (1)
- Elaborate structures not allowed under Wilderness Act (1)
- Helicopter use would defeat wilderness experience for visitors (1)
- Should investigate other means of accomodating people that has less impact (1)
- Plenty of other areas (1)

Other Comments about the Hostel:

- Approve of hostel, but only if reservation system is used to limit number of visitors per day (1)
- Should be more in other areas (1)
- No more than two (1)

Table 18.-- What was the balance of opinion on the proposed Enchanted Valley Hostel?

Opinion on Enchanted Valley Hostel	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
	:		:	
Favor	:	16	:	17
Oppose	:	226	:	245
TOTAL	:	242	:	262

SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED ENCHANTED VALLEY HOSTEL

Reasons Supporting Hostel:

- Approve of hostel only if reservation system to limit number of visitors per day is used (1)

Reasons Opposing Hostel:

- Detracts from wilderness character (42)
- Hostel would increase use pressure in area (22)
- Permanent facilities not needed with today's light weight equipment (9)
- Wilderness experience should include carrying supplies and no conveniences camping out (7)
- Dangerous to bring inexperienced hikers into the wilderness (4)
- Could use human sherpas and guide service instead (4)
- Should be no construction in the area (3)
- Headache for Park Service (3)
- This hostel along with the one at Diamond Meadows would cause a non-wilderness strip to form between them (2)
- Any non-wilderness structure should be at roadhead (2)
- It would be a mistake (1)
- Elaborate structures are not allowed under the Wilderness Act (1)
- Should investigate less damaging ways of accomodating Park visitors (1)
- Hostels should be outside the Park (1)
- Trail from Graves Creek to Enchanted Valley already over used
- Plenty of other areas (1)
- Would bring bad element to Park (1)

Other Comments on Hostel:

- Approve of hostel without enclave (1)
- Should take steps to reduce visitor and management impacts (1)
- Hostels should be outside of Park (1)

Table 19.---What was the balance of opinion on non-wilderness enclaves for the proposed hostels and research station at Blue Galacier?

Opinion on non-wilderness enclaves	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Favor enclaves	:	29	:	19
Oppose enclaves	:	638	:	867
TOTAL	:	667	:	886

OPINIONS, SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS ON ENCLAVES 1/

Reasons Favoring Enclaves in General:

- Use for sanitary facilities (3)
- Will serve many types of people who would otherwise be denied experience (1)
- Can be changed later if necessary (1)
- If strictly regulated (1)

Reasons Opposing Enclaves in General:

- Out of place, detracts from wilderness (41)
- Against intent of Wilderness Act (8)
- Detracts from wilderness experience (1)
- Careful planning and operation will make unnecessary (1)
- Erode integrity of wilderness core (1)
- Are costly and risky venture (1)

Opinions on Appropriate Use of Enclaves: Opinions on Enclaves at Hostels

- Favor enclaves at hostels (2)
- Oppose enclaves at hostels (330)

Reasons Opposing Enclaves at Hostels:

- Would cause overuse, degradation (15)
- "Enclaves" attract the unprepared (5)
- Detracts from wilderness integrity, experience (5)
- No rationale for 20 acre "hostel" (2)
- Attract aircraft and construction (2)
- To prevent development (1)
- Produce waste and pollution (1)
- Not needed if facilities are rustic (1)

Opinions on Enclaves for Blue Glacier Research Station and the Station Itself

- Favor enclave for research station (3)
- Oppose enclave for research station (61)
- Oppose research station itself (1)
- Keep research station (24), if temporary (14), as long as it doesn't intrude on wilderness experience (1)
- Mountain safety reasons for Snow Dome are invalid (1)

Reasons for Opposing Enclave for Research Station

- Enclave not necessary for pre-existing research which is allowable in wilderness (35)
- Confers permanent status on temporary activity (1)
- Temporary easement better (3)

1/ A general tendency was noticed to confuse the concepts of enclaves with hostels and the research station per se. Consequently some comments are unclear as to which they refer,

Other Comments Regarding Enclaves

- Put enclave around Hurricane Ridge if Mt. Angeles included in wilderness (1)
- Reduce two 20 acre enclaves to 10 acre (1)
- Change to out of Park (1)
- Enclaves too large (1)

Table 20. --What was the balance of opinion on buffer zones between roads and wilderness.

Opinion	Inputs	Signatures
Favor buffers	32	28
Oppose buffers	529	728
TOTAL	561	756

SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS ON PROPOSED WILDERNESS BUFFERS

Reasons Favoring Buffers as Proposed in the Plan:

- Permits timber salvage (2)
- Needed facilities can be built in buffers without damaging wilderness (2)
- Favor as staging areas (1)
- Protects adjacent landowners (1)
- Permits roadside management (1)
- Appropriate to exclude from wilderness (1)
- Roads are poor boundaries because of need for relocation due to floods (1)
- Outside Park boundaries to protect low lying parts of Park, especially the coastal strip (1)
- Needed to protect the wilderness from adjacent lands (1)
- Keep buffers within Park boundaries (1)
- Denies timber employment and support for schools (1) ,

Reasons Opposing Buffers as Proposed in the Plan:

- Wilderness boundaries should meet road right-of-way (81)
- Encourage undesirable development (34)
- Include in wilderness (10)
- Buffer zones dodge issues (6)
- Buffers detract from scenery on roads for those who can't travel by foot into wilderness (6)
- Zones will provide for economic interest groups rather than general population (3)
- The roadway is a more definable boundary (2)
- Allow Queets corridor to be included in wilderness (2)
- A 50' - 100' buffer would be better (1)
- 1/4 - 1/2 mile excessive, 1/8 OK (1)
- There is no reason for roadside exclusions except tourist developments or salvage logging, neither of which is accessible (1)
- Delicate ecosystem along Obstruction Point Road deserves wilderness (1)
- Why waste acreage (1)
- Give foresters the right to protect these strips (1)
- Save cedar forests (1)
- Bring buffers to roadside so motorized vehicles will not be permitted in wilderness (1)

V. PUBLIC OPINION AND SUPPORTING REASONS CONCERNING
THE MASTER PLAN

Table 21. --What opinions and comments were expressed about the Master Plan?

Nature of comments on the Master Plan	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
	:		:	
Endorsed whole Master Plan	:	20	:	16
	:		:	
Discussion of Master Plan or points in it	:	433	:	791
TOTAL	:	453	:	807

OPINIONS ABOUT THE MASTER PLAN

Comments related to Blanket Endorsement of the Master Plan:

- Expresses full support (5)
- Should be accepted as it stands (2)
- Park Service purpose is to oppose development and destruction (1)
- Must do what we can to preserve Parks for ourselves and future generations (1)

Favorable Discussion of Master Plan:

- Basically a good plan (34)
- Careful comprehensive plan (7)
- We need long range plans to preserve wilderness (4)
- Plan supports legislative purpose behind the Park (2)
- Plan saves Park for future generations while being used by the people (1)
- Effective and desirable way of preserving Wilderness (1)
- Plan is an important tool for assuring protection of Peninsula (1)
- Plan best serves the American people (1)
- Agrees with principle of setting direction for administration (1)
- Concur with cooperative interagency agreement for inter-tidal zone management (1)
- Endorses management of inter tidal zone (1)
- Plans sensitive to wilderness and natural resource values (1)

Criticism of the Master Plan:

- Oppose plan (25)
- Plan is restrictive (8)
- Vague language (3)
- Proposed too much wilderness (2)
- Plan far exceeds bounds of reasonableness (1)
- Revise plan with reasonable regard for testimony offered at hearings (1)
- Plan lacks alternate proposals for management (1)
- Plan seems to have been prepared by persons unfamiliar with Olympic Peninsula (1)
- Would wreck economy of local residents (1)
- Nightmare to people of area and state since economy of western Washington is based on timber (1)
- Information on Master Plan not disseminated in a fair and impartial manner (1)
- Park Service wanted to keep plan a secret (1)
- Plan favors fauna and flora more than people - unfair (1)
- Plan unreasonable and ridiculous (1)
- Largest farce since Mein Kampf (1)
- Plan incomplete (1)
- Plan excludes horsemen (1)
- Biased proposal (1)
- Doesn't address problems of protection. Regulatory enforcement measures needed instead of education/orientation lectures (1)
- Plans have no input on Coast Guard missions (1)

General Discussion of Master Plan:

- Add more wilderness to Plan (19)
- Exclude Quinault River Valley from Plan (3)
- Modify Plan to that of Olympic Park Associates (2)
- Plan should encourage more people to the park - not restrict (1)
- Don't add more land (1)
- Exclude Lake Quinault and all other private land (1)
- Does not want any changes in the Park (1)
- Supports cooperative agreement with adjoining land owners for coastal strip and Lake Ozette (1)
- Object to plans for Sol Duc and Hurricane Ridge shelter removal (1)
- Park needs more access (1)
- Olympic National Park is already a wilderness - it does not need official wilderness classification (1)
- Against Park Service joining with other agencies (1)
- Statement on amount of land involved should be clearer in final report (1)
- Initiate comprehensive land and water use plans for entire Olympic Peninsula (1)
- Support plan with exceptions (1)
- Shouldn't limit ski facilities (1)
- If plan excludes one person it is contrary to God's creation (1)
- Add forest protection plan to Master Plan, include control of insects, disease, and fire etc. (1)
- Plan need additions (1)
- Manage the Brothers, Quilcene, Mildred Lakes as wilderness through interagency cooperation (1)
- In addition to Plan, recommend mineral inventory in Park (1)
- Plan should discuss what effect wilderness designation would have on present hydraulic conditions on streams, snowpacks in Olympic National Park (1)

Table 22.--What opinions and comments were expressed about the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Master Plan?

Nature of comments on the Master Plan EIS	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Endorsed whole Master Plan EIS	:	0	:	0
Discussion of Master Plan:	:		:	
EIS or points in it	:	76	:	37
TOTAL	:	76	:	37

COMMENTS RELATED TO THE MASTER PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- Don't feel EIS sufficiently studied economic impact, since timber and tourism are so important (2)
- Excellent comprehensive land-use general plan (1)
- Periodically updated comprehensive land-use plan should be added to this one or totally developed (1)
- Refers to Pgs. 2-8 of Master Plan EIS favors pages 1-21, except 11, 15, 16 and 19 (1)
- Suggests sentence amendments and additions - see letter 1555 - Sidney Gauer, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce. (1)
- See letter for various suggestions as to word or sentence changes - #1554 (1)
- Suggested word changes - see letter #1559 in regard to minerals (1)
- Want clarification of impact of continued operation of Glines Canyon electric service project; proposals of plans could affect future operation of hydraulic project. Plans should discuss hydroelectric matters, there are a number of potential power projects within the Park and proposed wilderness areas (1)
- No objections to draft statements (1)
- Sensitive planning (1)

Table 23. --What was the overall balance of opinion on additions to the Park (including general opinions and opinions on adding specific areas)?

Opinion	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
	:		:	
Favor additions	:	801	:	1,075
	:		:	
Oppose additions	:	38	:	98
TOTAL	:	839	:	1,173

Comments about specific areas to be added are found on page 47.

SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS FOR ADDITION TO THE PARK

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK

Reasons Supporting Additions:

- Annex more land around all the Park (7)
- Classify as wilderness (4)
- I hope as much land as possible can be added to Olympic National Park and that this land be automatically classified as wilderness (3)
- Supports National Park Service proposed additions (2)
- Add more for buffers (2)
- Use land exchange for beach land (2)
- Add all unspoiled areas (2)
- Ocean strip is desirable (2)
- Eastward expansion of Olympic National Park into National Forest lands (1)
- Protect from logging (1)
- Manage as roadless areas (1)
- Support further study and acquisitions of coastal area together with some upland including Willoughby and Seafield lakes (1)
- Should be enlarged to include scenic and wilderness features of its surroundings such as Olympic National Forest (1)
- If upper slopes are clearcut, no wilderness value can be maintained (1)
- I would be delighted to see the Park expanded to include the roadless coast area north of the Park ocean area (1)

Reasons Opposing Additions:

- Purchase no new land until current land is managed properly (2)
- Money better spent on other facilities than land (1)
- Park expansion is out of the question, seems to forget taxpayers come up with the money (1)
- Park is larger than it should be (1)
- Object to National Park Service indiscriminately acquiring land which includes homesteads and improved lands (1)
- As a property owner in Quinault Valley-oppose Master Plan and Wilderness Plan (1)
- Park not adequately maintained now - can't prevent vandalism by locking everybody out (1)
- Original Congressional mandate limited size to 1,400 square miles for good reason-not enough money to effectively protect and preserve Park (1)
- Private road on North Shore Lake Quinault removed from Olympic National Park (1)
- Against locking up more land in Parks and wilderness (1)
- Will take more land away from mining and logging and other forms of labor (1)
- Will result in less logging, thus less housing for people (1)

Other Comments on Additions:

- Any new land acquired by Park will automatically be designated wilderness (1)
- Trade for land only at Shi Shi Beach/add no other areas (1)

ADDITIONS TO THE PARKOther Comments on Additions: (cont.)

- Don't want to see unlimited lands into the Park (1)
- National Park Service should pay for lost timber revenues where additions are (1)
- Allow people to retain inholdings (1)
- Increase width of beach strip to protect against encroachment (1)
- Include the Red Cedar forests east of the coast strip (1)

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK: PT. OF ARCHESReasons Supporting Additions:

- To classify as wilderness (113)
- Deserves National Park protection status (11)
- To protect cedars (7)
- To protect against development (5) logging (5) , roads (9)
- Preserve immediately (5)
- Preserve primitive coastline in natural state (4)
- Aggressively pursue all measures for protection of coastal beach (2)
- Preserve valuable and unique ecosystems (2)
- Great idea (2)
- Point of Arches should be wider than 1/2 mile to avoid problems of access and intrusion occurring in narrower existing strip (2)
- National Park Service and local citizens should take an active role in protecting timber from logging companies, engine noise and pollution (1)
- The eastern buffer zone should be extended five miles inland at least (1)
- Add it to keep it free of noise (1)
- Add it to keep it to leave for hikers (1)
- Will provide needed refuge for vanishing wildlife (1)
- Acquire by exchange (1)

Reasons Opposing Addition

- Against Park acquiring any more beach (1)
- Would eliminate private enterprise north of Ocean Shores (1)
- See no advantage to Park acquisition - would in effect have a Park within a Park (1)
- Would make the total acreage of the Park more than the legal limit (1)

Other Comments on Additions

- Area is rare heritage, awe inspiring (5)
- No where in country are beaches as beautiful as ours (3)
- Have County Parks manage it (2)
- Indian tribes are interested in development (1)
- County is trying to acquire for the public, so that the public can enjoy it without a rugged beach hike (1)
- Need separate Environmental Impact Statements on proposed Pt. of Arches inclusion (1)

Table 24. --What specific areas were recommended for addition to the Park?

Area recommended for addition to Park	Inputs	Signatures
Bogachiel Inholdings	484	728
(Opposed to addition of Bogachiel)	3	2
Point of Arches—Shi Shi Beach	399	578
(Opposed to addition of Point of Arches)	16	9
Lake Ozette area	69	39
Kloochman Rock	85	76
(Opposed to addition of Kloochman Rock)	2	2
Lake Willoughby	23	39
Beach lands 3-5 miles wide	23	12
Seafield Lake	16	24
Land east of Olympic seacoast	14	28
The Brothers	25	11
Mildred Lakes	12	7
Quilcene	10	6
Land east of Point of Arches	9	6
Petroleum Creek	8	13
Uplands near Point of Arches	3	5
Beach area in general, more seacoast	5	4
Lower Duckabush lands	3	3
Old (Mt.) Baldy	3	2
Manny's Prairie	3	1
Portage Head	1	10
Higley Peak, Royal Basin, Colonel Bob area between Quinault R. and W. Fork		
Humptulips, Quinault Ridge (T23N, R9W; T22N, R9W)	2	1
More land along peripheral areas	1	2
Cape Alava to Waatch Pt.	1	1
Mt. Constance, Rugged Ridge, area along Straits of Juan de Fuca, Portage Head, area around Straits of Hood Head, Happy: Lake area, Dungeness R. Valley and bordering Hood Canal, Forest Service lands in Bogachiel, Hoh outlet, east and NE boundaries	1	1

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK: BOGACHIEL

Reasons Supporting Additions:

- Add to Park (440) include in Wilderness (434)
- Purchase private land (121 acres) to add to Park (5)
- Add National Forest land (1)
- Part of Bogachiel River runs through private land where cattle are grazing - an inappropriate intrusion - land should be purchased (1)
- Acquire Bogachiel land by land exchange only (1)

Reasons Opposing Additions:

- Private land would automatically be classed as wilderness as acquired by the National Park Service (1)

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK: LAKE OZETTE

Reasons Supporting Additions:

- Protect east side of Lake Ozette (13)
- Should be wilderness (6)
- Buffer zone around lake to prevent development (2)
- To protect quality of shorelands (2)
- Chance of more acres being added around Lake Ozette (1)
- Protect east shore 2 - 3 miles, revegetate clearcuts north of Lake Ozette by setting up experimental forest with special growing techniques (1)
- To retain solitude and beauty of area (1)
- Unusually large freshwater lake of great beauty that deserves protection and management (1)

ADDITION TO THE PARK: KLOOCHMAN ROCK

Reasons Supporting Additions:

- Add to Park and include in wilderness (13)
- To protect flanks from logging and timber sales (3)
- Wants all of the Rock in the Park (1)
- Add when money is available (1)

Reasons Opposing Additions:

- This is public land needed for revenue (1)

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK: MILDRED LAKESReasons Supporting Additions:

- Transfer area from Olympic National Forest to the Olympic National Park for a more complete ecological unit (2)
- Area should be included in the Park (1)
- Adjust the boundary to include this area (1)

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK: THE BROTHERSReasons Supporting Additions:

- Transfer area from Olympic National Forest to Olympic National Park for a more complete ecological unit (2)
- Area should be in Park (1)
- Adjust boundary to include this area (1)
- Provide buffer strip to reduce possibility of access (1)

ADDITIONS TO THE PARK: QUILCENEReasons Supporting Additions:

- Transfer area from Olympic National Forest to Olympic National Park for a more complete ecological unit (2)
- Area should be in the Park (1)

Table 25. --What was the balance of opinion on hydrographic boundary adjustments proposed in the Master Plan?

Opinion	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
	:		:	
<u>Boundary adjustments:</u>	:		:	
	:		:	
Favor	:	107	:	54
	:		:	
Oppose	:	0	:	0
TOTAL	:	107	:	54

REASONS SUPPORTING HYDROGRAPHIC BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

- Improve management effectiveness (2)
- Would define boundaries better (2)
- Would provide more flexible utilization (1)
- Boundaries should conform to hydrographic features (1)

OTHER COMMENTS ON HYDROGRAPHIC BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

- Favor adjustments for wilderness (3), for whole Park (7)
- An exception: all of Kloochman Rock should be in Park (2)
- Study more adjustments besides those proposed (2)
- Solicit public input before making adjustment (2)
- Make minor adjustments only (1)
- Adjust other areas where would improve management (1)
- Adjust to include: Sam's Ridge (3), Queets (2) and Royal Basin (2) by exchange of timbered for non-timbered lands (1), Mildred Lakes (1), Sawtooth Range (1), Mountains: Cruiser, Alpa, Shokomish, the Brothers (1), Friaba in Dungeness (1), ridge between Dungeness and Ray Creek (1), upper Royal Creek (1), Rugged Ridge and Pine Mt. as boundary (1), Mueller and Slide Creek out of Park (1), Rogachiel and Calawah boundary on ridge one mile east (1), trade off and acquire around Clearwater and Solduc to make boundary at head of drainage (1), ridge between Bunch and Fletcher canyon as boundary (1), put boundary on Higley Ridge or even get rid of all lands west of Quinault River (1), Mt. Henderson-Stowe ridge as boundary. (1)

COMMENTS AND OPINIONS RELATED TO BACKCOUNTRY MANAGEMENT

- It may be possible to limit backcountry users (7)
- Increased future protection should include more personnel to patrol backcountry, educate hikers, direct camping use (5)
- Should restrict wood fires (5)
- Should restrict wood gathering in alpine areas (3)
- Need sanitary facilities in high use areas (3)
- Natural fires and insects should be allowed to run their course (3)
- Use portable stoves in wild (3)
- Ban horses from trails (3)
- Teach visitors that campfires are a thing of the past except on a beach (2)
- Management needed to prevent overcrowding (2)
- Ban snowmobiles (2)
- Management and study of backcountry should be intensified to erase effects of past use and provide for continued use without degradation (2)
- Prohibit packhorse trains (2)
- A crew of a few men and chainsaw could open trails in record time in the spring (2)
- When time comes where hikers are too much of a menace to wilderness, then a limited use should be enforced (2)
- Require stoves at high elevations (2)
- Don't agree with not controlling forest fires—not in best interest of nation's resource supply (1)
- NPS should support a sound wilderness management plan that will help preserve park for posterity (1)
- If NPS considers hostels desirable, should be in peripheral areas—less over use problems and easier maintenance (1)
- Put enclaves in periphery where rescue and refuse disposal aren't such serious problems (1)
- Officials at ONP have done best job of keeping out development than any other park (1)
- Random campsites were developed for good reasons (1)
- Want better dispersal of small trail camps (1)
- No new roads (1)
- Want more shelters (1)
- Was no discussion of maintenance of underground cable or sewage disposal for hostels in wilderness plan (1)
- Fees for users in backcountry (1)
- Approve of park's management (1)
- Want food concession or availability of food at hostels (1)
- Control stock to prevent against overuse (1)
- Feels limiting users won't work (1)
- Elimination of roads penetrating wilderness core should be feature of any management plan for Park (1)
- Favor local people in backcountry management (1)
- Pro stub/circle roads for fire protection and closer access to high country (1)
- Keep main trails open to horses, since older people use them (1)
- Use helicopters to supply ranger stations and other motor equipment for emergencies—only momentary impact (1)
- Restrict group size to 6 (1)
- Prohibit camping in meadows and lake shores (1)
- Increase protection of alpine camping areas (in Royal Basin) (1)
- Enclosed shelters with fires should be checked frequently (1)
- Take people into wilderness, don't change it to fit our needs (1)
- Recommend movable tent camp instead of permanent hostels (1)
- Need 1-day trips (1)
- Reopen trails earlier (1)
- Keep horses out of campsites (1)
- YCC could build trails or maintain or build shelters—volunteer crews don't last long. YCC improved with experienced woodsmen (1)
- Study all frequently used areas (1)
- Construct group camps in non-wilderness areas (1)
- Natural lakes should be left in present condition (1)
- Utilize fallen trees (1)
- No helicopters for hostels (1)
- Prohibit campers, motorbikes (1)
- Patrol backcountry and educate hikers, direct camping use (1)
- Persons unable or unwilling to backpack should be provided for in other ways, as per Olympic Park Associates (1)
- Use minimum maintenance tools (1)

COMMENTS AND OPINIONS RELATED TO TRAILS

- Upgrade trails, more maintenance (18)
- Create more trails (14)
- Favor loop trails (signed) (6)
- Need more varied trails (5)
- Separate trails for horses (4)
- Keep trail-less area trail-less (i.e. central core) (4)
- Want more and better access to backcountry (3)
- More trails for horses (3)
- Maintain present trail system (3)
- Use trails for more effective management (overuse) (3)
- Too many trails now (3)
- Better upkeep of Kloochman Rock Trail - too many blowdowns (2)
- Black top and soil cement surfaces should be discontinued (2)
- Day loops good idea for beginning hikers (2)
- Build new trails in forest, not high country (2)
- Want trails, not roads (1)
- Amount of trail-less area out of proportion with use (1)
- Clear trails (1)
- Maintain trails for horses (1)
- Against limited trails (1)
- Students prefer hiking trails to paved roads and parking lots (1)
- Park should provide and maintain trails (1)
- Have plenty of trails for those of us who like to backpack (1)
- Planning shows sensitivity (1)
- Foottrails & bridges should remain unimproved (1)
- Trails overcrowded (1)
- Limiting users may be necessary (1)
- Need better trail heads (1)
- Need trails with better drainage or reroute away from lakes (1)
- Close trails to horses during wet season (1)
- Wilderness core should be trail-less (1)
- No trails on ocean strip (1)
- Favor day use trails (1)
- Good to have few more trails if done without adding roads (1)
- Eliminate interpretive signs on trails (1)
- For trail administration program (1)
- No new trails (1)
- More trail miles needed to eliminate congestion rather than restrictive measures (1)
- Loop trails should be developed after adequate funding has gone to protect the resource (1)
- More trails can be built without harming wilderness values (1)
- Need some trails for hiking only (1)
- Limit trail construction to needed maintenance and relocation (1)
- Need trail to Point of Arches (1)
- Olympia National Forest trail system is great (1)
- Re-open and maintain old trails built by U.S. Forest Service (1)
- Soils in Park won't stand up to heavy use without damage (1)

- Open up existing trails instead of building more (1)
- Present trail system in Mt. Angeles area is challenging but not impossible for experienced hiker. (1)
- Trails in Mt. Angeles area are some of the most beautiful and wild (1)
- Trails for horses limited, upkeep leaves a lot to be desired. (1)
- Keeping trails rugged will allow one to see area as early explorers saw it. (1)
- Non-hiking public can be encouraged to hike if we designed short and scenic trails. (1)
- More information centers around periphery of Parks could provide better utilization of present trail system (1)
- Maintain trails into Lake Willoughby for foot traffic (1)
- Fill mountain trail ruts with gravel or wood chips and line with bags (1)
- See letters (1571, 1585, 1557 and 1589) regarding trails: Maurice Lundy NW Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (1)
- Favor loop trails that can be used by handicapped (1)
- Nature trails at Obstruction. (1)
- Build parallel trails to reduce over use. Can't believe Forest Service must seal off big area because of limited budget and doesn't have money for trails. (1)
- Parks can tolerate greater number of people on well-built, organized trail systems (1)
- Trails should be maintained at a minimum. Keep hikers from bushwhacking on their own provides easier access in emergency (sec. 4, Wilderness Act) (1)
- Concurs with Olympic Park Associates trail building policies. (1)

Table 26 | --What was the balance of opinion on backcountry shelters?

Opinion on backcountry shelters	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Favor shelters	:	60	:	115
Oppose shelters	:	20	:	17
TOTAL	:	80	:	132

OPINIONS ON BACKCOUNTRY SHELTERS

Opinions Favoring Shelters:

- Keep them in good repair (10)
- Are necessary because of storms (1), especially along beach (4), for safety (8)
- Save for historic value (2)
- Favor overnight shelters (2), maximum open shelters (1), a few scattered around Park (1)
- Provide more shelters (2)
- Discourage removal unless degrading environment (2)
- Better than many hotels (1), than many camps (1)
- Eliminating will not disperse use (1)
- Youth Conservation Corp could build shelters (1)
- Are compatible with wilderness (1)

Opinions Opposing Shelters

- No new shelters (3)
- Remove all shelters (3), to reduce concentration (1), remove one sided shelters (2), many shelters (2), all those needed to protect wilderness resource (2), those in meadows (1), those that are eyesores (3), all but those in river valleys (1), those contributing to deterioration of wilderness (1), all but those in areas needing over use protection (1)
- Limit building of shelters (1)
- Shelters leave impact on land (1)

Table 27. ---What was the balance of opinion on removing the Enchanted Valley chalet?

Opinion	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Favor removal	:	271	:	291
Oppose removal	:	26	:	19
TOTAL	:	297	:	310

SUPPORTING REASONS REGARDING REMOVAL OF THE ENCHANTED VALLEY CHALET

Reasons Favoring Removal of the Chalet:

- Maximize wilderness area (1)
- If deemed unsafe (1)
- No longer needed (1)
- Area would be improved by returning it to wilderness (1)
- The area around Enchanted Valley Chalet is already overused (1)
- Replace with modest cabin for summer ranger (1)
- Chalet is not kept up; has rats; is an eyesore (1)

Reasons Favoring Retention of the Chalet:

- Historic value (4)
- Need in a wet climate (1)
- Would spread out campers (1)
- Area should be enjoyed by old (1)
- Urge immediate repair of last remaining display of pioneer craftsmanship (1)

Other Comments on the Chalet:

- Phase it out (1)
- Upgrade to hostel (1)

OPINIONS ON BACKCOUNTRY FACILITIES

- Provide sanitary facilities in high use areas (2)
- Develop good 1 day trips to backcountry (1)
- Have corrals at each road terminus (1)
- Need signs on high country trails (1)
- Enough "civilized" improvements (1)
- Continue research station (1), can be easily dismantled (1)
- Favor group camps (1)
- Allow campfires (1)
- Camping facilities in areas of heavy use (1)
- Shelters OK, but no further building (1)
- Build footbridge across streets (1)
- Take down present facilities on Mount Olympus (1)
- No permanent installations should be permitted on Blue Glacier (1)
- Non-wilderness enclaves seriously dilute wilderness experience (1) Mountain safety reasons for this structure are invalid, as would promote marginal and ill-prepared climbers to go there (1)
- Avoid features which encourage use (1)
- Deplore commercialization of Enchanted Valley to accomodate private packing parties - would deteriorate the whole area (1)

Table 28.--What was the balance of opinion on retaining the Sol Duc Hot Springs facilities?^{1/}

Opinion	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
	:		:	
<u>Sol Duc Facilities:</u>	:		:	
Retain	:	97	:	80
Do not retain	:	28	:	17
TOTAL	:	125	:	97

^{1/} The discrepancy of totals between tables on Sol Duc Hot Springs facilities is explained by not all inputs containing residence information.

(I) = Inputs
(S) = Signatures

Table 29.--How did opinion on retaining Sol Duc Hot Springs facilities vary by respondents' residence? ^{1/}

Respondents' residence		Sol Duc facilities	
		Retain	Do not retain
Olympic Peninsula	(I):	78	12
	(S):	63	8
Regional	(I):	11	9
	(S):	9	5
National	(I):	6	3
	(S):	5	2
TOTAL	(I):	95	24
	(S):	77	15

^{1/} The discrepancy of totals between tables on Sol Duc Hot Springs facilities is explained by not all inputs containing residence information.

OPINIONS ON KEEPING SOLDUC HOT SPRINGS FACILITIES AND OTHER COMMENTS
ON SOLDUC HOT SPRINGS

Opinions Favoring Facilities:

- Add more facilities (14)
- Keep all facilities (6)
- Keep swimming (1) charge fees (1), keep campground (3), keep overnight facilities (4)
- Retain use of Hot Springs (4)
- Many use it (4)
- Maintain efficiency (3)
- Keep open for day use only (3)
- Fully utilize Hot Springs for swimming (2)
- Provide facilities for children (1)
- Modernize (1)
- Good for families (1)
- Tear down and rebuild (1)
- Retain concessions (1)
- Turn it over to private ownership (1)
- Upgrade by renovation or construction of new units on the Hotel concept (1)
- Provide unlimited access (1)

Opinions Opposing Facilities:

- No overnight accommodations (5), or camping (5), or lodge (2)
- Phase out cabin (2)
- Phase it out (1)
- This isn't why the Park was established (1)

Other Comments on Facilities:

- Hope what happened to Olympic Hot Springs won't happen here (2)
- If phased out, a bigger store and campground is needed (1)
- No further development (1)
- Environmental Impact Statement should discuss impact of increased use on other lake areas as a consequence of removing overnight accommodations at Sol Duc (1)
- If lodgings close, will there be day use - swimming (1)
- Area offers enjoyment of unusual beauty (1)
- Restore historic Solduc, don't need fancy facilities (1)
- Adequate overnight lodging is provided outside of the Park (1)
- Will hurt economy (1)

OPINIONS AND COMMENTS ON PARK ROADS

Opinions and Comments on Roads in General

Opinions Favoring Roads:

- Want more loop roads (8)
- Favor better access and protection (7)
- Need better maintenance (7)
- Want more roads (4) but not too many (1)
- Keep existing roads open (3)
- Want more trail heads (1)
- Keep access roads open after reforestation (1)

Opinions Against Roads:

- No new roads (62)
- No roads in Park (3)
- Close more roads (3)
- Close more roads to cut off auto access (3)
- Roads cause lasting damage (1)
- Against road through Park (2), through interior of Park (2)
- Convert to bike trails (1)
- Let it return to wilderness (1)
- Impossible to control use on roads (1)
- Roads not needed for fire protection (1)
- Against loop roads (1)
- Limit vehicle access to present level (1)
- Agrees with opposition against (1)

Other Comments on Roads:

- Only minor improvements of existing roads needed (3)
- Paving roads ends mud and dust but increases use (1)
- Any new roads should be for pedestrians and horses (1)
- Values toward cars change (e.g., energy crisis) from desire to build roads everywhere to being glad that we didn't (1)
- Include in plan why Whiskey Bend to Hurricane Road was closed in 1958 (1)
- Don't pave access roads (1)

Opinions and Comments on Specific Roads

Whiskey Bend Road

Favor:

- Favor a loop drive (5)
- Favor use for uphill traffic only (3)
- Opening would take care of present access problems (2)
- Favor use of downhill traffic (1), except for safety features (1)
- Needs improvement (1)
- Favor keeping it dirt (1)
- Favor opening it up to two-way traffic (1)

Against:

- Keep it closed (11)
- Make it wilderness (5)
- It would degrade the wildlife quality (3), and too costly and destructive of the environment (1)
- Won't relieve congestion (2), is too hazardous (1), and would cause overuse (1)
- Useless if tram is built (1)
- Would divert use of shuttle buses (1)
- "Motor nature drive" contradiction (1)
- Keep it as a trail (1)
- No longer needed (1)
- Inappropriate (1)

Obstruction Point Road

Favor:

- Favor loop road via Deer Park (4)
- Favor use by buses only (2)
- Keep the road operational until minibuses are in operation (1)
- Keep open to provide vehicles and/or minibuses (1)
- Favor keeping it as a narrow dirt road with turnouts (1)

Against:

- Close it (4)
- Allow no cars (2)
- Road is overused and has a negative impact (2)
- Too costly (1)

Other Roads

Favor Roads:

- Favor one-way road between Sol Duc and Olympic Hot Springs (4)
- Hurricane Ridge Road offers an adequate access to this part of the Park (3)
- Save the road on the north and south shore of the Quinault River (1), repair the north shore Quinault road (1)
- Favor the Deer Park loop (1)
- Favor the east-west road through the Park, it wouldn't hurt the ecology (1)
- Need to improve the road between Heart of the Hills and Elwash (1)
- Favor relocating Quinault Village Road to the north (1)
- Favor a scenic loop along the Quinault (1)

Against Roads:

- Close the Upper Staircase Road (25)
- Close the road at the North Fork of the Skokomish (3) /
- Against roads along the Beach (6)
- Against roads in the wilderness (3)
- Close roads and add the Hoh Reservation to the Wilderness area (1)
- Against road construction to Hurricane Ridge (1)
- Against a road across the lower Klootchman (1)
- Against a road up the Little River Trail (1)
- Against a road at Olympic Hot Springs and Happy Lake Ridge (1)

Table 30.--What was the balance of opinion on the general question of highway relocation (without reference to specific areas)?

Opinion	Inputs	Signatures
Favor relocation	28	19
Oppose relocation	6	3
TOTAL	34	22

Opinions on relocation of specific highways are found on the following pages.

Table 31.--What was the balance of opinion on relocating the highway at Lake Crescent?

Opinion	Inputs	Signatures
Favor relocation	91	51
Oppose relocation	5	5
TOTAL	96	56

Table 32.--What was the balance of opinion on relocating the highway at Kalaloch?

Opinion	Inputs	Signatures
Favor relocation	46	18
Oppose relocation	1	1
TOTAL	47	19

SUPPORTING REASONS AND OTHER COMMENTS ON HIGHWAY RELOCATION

GENERAL COMMENTS ON HIGHWAY RELOCATION

- Doesn't want log trucks to come through Park (3)
- Remove competition between log trucks and public (2)
- Oppose closing main highway (2)
- Present highways paid for by residents - if Park Service wants others they should pay (1)
- Need separate Environmental Impact Statement on each highway relocation proposal (1)
- Future roads should be on periphery of Park (1)
- Get traffic away from sensitive areas. (1)
- Oppose closure of road to Quinault (1)
- Alternative to realignment; use ITT railroad to haul freight between Forks and Seku (1)
- No need for relocation if present laws are enforced (1)

HIGHWAY RELOCATION AT KALALOECH

Reasons Favoring Relocation

- Relocation would remove competition between logging trucks and vacation vehicles (4)
- Relocation would be a positive contribution to tourists and loggers (2)
- Enjoyment at Ruby Beach is diminished by noise from log trucks (1)

Reasons Opposing Relocation

- New road would pen wildlife between the two roads (1)

Other Comments on Kalaloech:

- Build by-pass as soon as possible (1)
- Should have further study as to feasibility and need (4)
- Favor by-pass (1)
- Support by-pass but need separate Environmental Impact Statement (1)
- Minimize impact on fish and wildlife resources (1)
- "Being abused, re-establish tolls" (1)

HIGHWAY RELOCATION AT LAKE CRESCENT

Reasons Favoring Relocation:

- Will eliminate logging and other commercial trucks (13)
- Would be safer to relocate (3)

Reasons Opposing Relocation:

- Would be a hardship to taxpayer (1)
- Unnecessary (1)

Other Comments on Relocation:

- Make old highway a scenic route (8)
- Favor by-pass of Lake Crescent (6)
- Relocate but don't widen (3)
- Don't relocate at expense of commercial traffic (2)
- Relocate traffic away from camping areas (1)
- More study needed (1)
- Improve old highway instead of relocation (1)
- Establish tolls (1)
- Bear Creek Road doesn't lend itself to timber transportation (1)
- Relocation good for faster thru traffic but power squeeze may void this (1)
- Minimize impact on fish and wildlife (1)
- Don't ruin more semi-wild land for highways (1)
- Need separate Environmental Impact Statements on Lake Crescent (1)
- Timber shouldn't be forced into a back-haul situation (1)
- Remove commercial traffic from Park (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO BUSES IN THE PARK

Opinions Favoring Buses:

- Favor buses to Hurricane Ridge area (18)
- Buses will cause less environmental impact (congestion) than cars (14)
- Favor buses during peak season only (5)
- Favor mini-buses to Obstruction Point (4)
- No cars should be allowed at Hurricane Ridge (3)
- Will allow banning of cars in Park (3)
- Provide better access for the elderly and handicapped (2)
- Buses should have interpretive talks (3)
- Buses are alternative to trams (3)
- Existing roads with shuttle buses will be sufficient (2)
- Bus system should be implemented before the parking lot at Hurricane Ridge reaches capacity (1)
- Good idea - works well at Mount McKinley (1)
- Transit system should benefit all users (1)
- Buses shouldn't be mandatory (2)
- Buses will contribute to visitor safety (1)
- Plans aren't clear when mass transit will be implemented (1)
- The National Park Service should subsidize a minibus system (1)
- Users of the transit system should bear the cost (1)
- The routes should be connected with highways to increase Park availability (1)
- Sufficient bus service is needed (1)
- Favor free bus service (1)
- National Park Service should promote transportation to the trailheads (1)
- Transit system needs careful planning (1)

Opinions Opposing Buses:

- Against mandatory buses and regimentation (7)
- Against shuttle buses to Hurricane Ridge (2)
- People don't want to be loaded into buses (1)
- Against buses but it may become necessary (1)
- Prefer personal car pools for camping gear (1)
- Buses are inconvenient to catch (1)
- Buses separate users from personal property (1)
- A ride to well trodden trails or to hostels with 100 people can't be a future generation idea of communing with nature (1)
- Upgrade the roads instead of having buses (1)
- Public not ready for shuttle buses between Big Meadow and Obstruction Point (1)

Comments on Buses in the Park:

- Should be studied further regarding the impact of buses (1)
- Hurricane ridge is far too crowded - limit access to bikes, horses and foot (1)
- Plans to leave cars at boundaries should be deleted (1)

OPINIONS ON PROVIDING ACCESS TO BEACH AND BACKCOUNTRY

Opinions Favoring Eased Access:

- Isolated local residents should be assured access to beaches and Lake Crescent (1)
- Favor Lake Ozette - Makah Reservation Road (3)
- Against too many road restrictions (1)
- Favor beach access to Ruby Beach (1)
- Federal Government has no right to stop access to state-owned beach by local people (1)

Opinions Favoring Restricted Access:

- Close roads to beach (4)
- Cooperate with landowners and state to control road access to beach (3)
- Limit easy access (2)
- If Hoh Head is wilderness, Park will be able to control access to it (1)
- Widen Point of Arches strip to control access (1)
- Keep people from crossing Park lands to reach beach (1)
- Beach access by trail only, parking lots several miles from beach (1)
- Control access to protect wilderness values (1)

OPINIONS ON THE PROPOSED BIKE ROUTES

Opinions Favoring Bike Routes

- Favor bike paths around Lake Crescent (6)
- Favor bike paths around Park (1), around fringes of wilderness (2) around Olympic Peninsula (2)
- Four foot paths around Lake Crescent too narrow, substandard-should be eight feet (2)
- Provide bike racks (1)
- Majority should be outside of Park (1)
- Feel it is a good idea (1)

Opposing Bike Routes

- Too costly (2)
- Unnecessary (1)
- Dangerous (1)

OPINIONS AND COMMENTS ON INTENSIVE RECREATION FACILITIES

General Development

Opinions Favoring:

- Needs campgrounds and parking areas (9)
- Provide camping and trailer facilities on the perimeter (4), build group camps adjacent to and outside the Park maybe on State land (1)
- Favor using private capital to, and/or encourage development of ski facilities (4)
- Include more variety of facilities and more public facilities (4)
- Select campgrounds in areas of easy maintenance and low environmental impact (2)
- Future needs include trailhead camping (2)
- Add packing servicing (1)
- Need to maintain foot bridges, especially those used in winter (1)
- Need sewage treatment facilities (1)
- Park should provide facilities for handicapped and elderly (1)
- Need more trash cans to prevent litter (1)
- Develop more campgrounds, but not too many (1)

Opinions Against:

- No new campgrounds (11)
- All undeveloped areas should remain so (7)
- Against chairlifts tram etc. (5)
- Intensive recreation facilities should be outside the Park (3)
- Short term benefits derived from intensive recreation are outweighed by the value of preserving the integrity of the area (1)
- Ski conditions don't justify expanding facilities (1)
- Against visitor centers - cause overuse (1)
- Intact wilderness has greater recreation opportunities than do ski and other developments (1)
- Roads and developments impair beauty (1)
- Ski facilities would be better outside the Park (1)
- Resorts on the U.S. side of the straits threaten defacto wilderness (1)

Other General Comments:

- Restrict camping facilities in Park (3)
- Utilize fallen trees for campground firewood to protect other trees (2)
- Protect from traffic, commercial use and development (2)
- Camping is desirable as long as users follow Park regulations (1)
- Designation as wilderness puts heavy demand on private and Forest Service lands (1)
- Charge fees (1)
- Encourage cross country skiing, snowshoeing, and winter camping (1)
- Don't unite camping sites (1)

Specific Areas

Opinions favoring:

- Need additional facilities to relieve overcrowding at Kalaloch and Upper Hoh Head (2)

Opinions Favoring: (cont.)

- Locate all intensive recreation at Hurricane Ridge (1)
- Add three access and viewpoints in the east, south and west areas of the Park (1)
- Open the Kalaloch area more frequently (1)
- Remodel Hurricane Ridge Lodge (1)
- Need a float dock at Lake Crescent (1)

Opinions Against Development in Specific Areas:

- Remove ski and other recreation facilities from Hurricane Ridge (2), remove ski facilities - too costly there (1)
- Discourage campgrounds at Kalaloch (1)
- Unit 4 is too large an area for recreation development (1)
- Visitor-use facilities shouldn't be located in the rain forest (1)

Other Specific Comments:

- Keep downhill skiing at Hurricane Ridge (2), peninsula skiers should use the Olympics, others the Cascades (1)
- Temporary winter use of poma lift at Hurricane Ridge is alright if the lift is removed at the end of the season (1)

Table 33.---What was the balance of opinion on the proposed Mt. Angeles tramway?

Opinion	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Favor tramway	:	37	:	29
Oppose tramway	:	137	:	108
TOTAL	:	174	:	137

(I) = Inputs

(S) = Signatures

Table 34.---How did opinions on the proposed Mt. Angeles tramway vary by respondents' residence?

Respondents' residence		Proposed Mt. Angeles tramway		Total
		Favor	Opposed	
Olympic Peninsula	(I):	12 (25%)	36 (75%)	(100%)
	(S):	13	31	
Regional	(I):	6 (9%)	63 (91%)	(100%)
	(S):	3	45	
National	(I):	3 (10%)	28 (90%)	(100%)
	(S):	3	22	
TOTAL	(I):	21	127	
	(S):	19	98	

REASONS AND COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED MT. ANGELES TRAMWAY

Reasons Favoring the Tramway:

- Will allow invalid people to enjoy the Park (3)
- Will help eliminate cars (1)
- Will increase visitor enjoyment (1)
- Will cut snow removal expenses (1)
- Could be used by both skiers and tourists (1)

Reasons Opposing the Tramway:

- Would spoil the wild area (22)
- Is not needed (8)
- Is ineffecient (2)
- Would lead to overuse (2)
- Is financially prohibitive (1)
- Violates main function of the Park (1)
- Will add one more machine to a wild area (1)
- Will impair scenery (1)
- Not practicable (1)
- Would favor downhill skiers (1)
- Is dangerous due to high winds (1)
- Disneyland already has one (1)

Other Comments on the Tramway:

- Oppose tramway (10)
- Prefer shuttle bus system (3)
- Tram is merely a substitute for roads (2)
- Would require an act of Congress (1)
- Further study needed (5)
- Favor only if inexpensive to ride (1)
- May be OK for handicapped (2)
- Let private industry operate tram instead of Park Service (1)
- Possible sight of lower terminal not indicated (1)
- Any development in this area should be out of sight of Mt. Angeles trail (1)
- Fully utilize existing roads before building a tramway (1)
- Mass transit should follow existing right-of-way (1)
- Tram OK only if feasible (1)
- "Refer to" letter on placement of tramway (1)
- Use the money to hire more Park employees
- Visual impact of tram is worse than that of alternative methods of mass transportation (1)
- Favors present winter facilities (1)
- Possible future need of tramway is poor reason to spend money on study (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO PARK CONCESSIONS

Opinions Favoring Concessions

- Keep concessions at Hurricane Ridge, (1) upgrade and expand (2), limit but upgrade (3)
- Concessions at Lake Crescent should meet economic and visitor needs - locate convenient to visitors away from high winds (1)
- Facilities should be provided by private industries (1) - non risk revenue little outlay of public funds
- Enlarge Lake Crescent and Kalaloch concession - keep private (1)

Opinions Opposing Concessions

- No more concessions in Park (5)
- Against concessions - preserve from exploitation (4)
- No more expansion except possibly at Kalaloch (2)
- Limit expansion (1)
- No more expansion at Lake Crescent (1)
- Discourage linear expansion at Kalaloch (1)
- Restrict development to periphery (1) restrict to outside Park only (3)

OPINIONS AND COMMENTS ON INTERPRETATION AND VISITOR INFORMATION

Opinions Concerning Interpretation:

- Favor information centers (13), around periphery of the Park (2)
- More needed (2)
- Need good educational program (1), on animals and nature (2), on history (1), on Park regulations (2), on environmental impact (1)
- Needed to regulate use (2), and what is available to user (2)
- Needed on west side of peninsula (1), needed at Port Angeles, Discovery Bay, Hoodsport and Heilton (1)
- Need marine interpretive centers (1)
- Indian center along coast good idea (1)
- Needed so that beach combers don't take live creatures (1)
- Need to list sanitary disposal stations - put on maps and post (1)
- Need more "interpretation" but limit signs in wilderness (1)
- Interpretive education meetings needed between National Park Service and riding groups (1)
- Eliminate interpretive signs from wildlife trails (1)
- No new centers - also use ferries for information disposal (1)
- If have shuttle buses, no additional visitor facilities needed (1)
- How will they be established and who will maintain (1)
- Possible for interpretive education on trams (1)
- Outdoor education needed away from visitor centers (1)

OPINIONS ON SPECIAL PARK USES

Opinions about Use of Horses

Opinions Favoring Horses:

- Allow horses in Park (21)
- Promote horse back riding - they clean up more than backpackers (2)
- Establish separate trails for horses (3)
- Limit number of horses in an area on basis of available food (1), or pack own food (1)
- Establish rules for horse use (1)
- Charge fees for horse use facilities (1)
- Have pole gates at meadows (1)
- Contact saddle clubs to patrol gates and clear gates (1)
- Horses OK but not in meadows (1)
- Should have hitching posts in campgrounds and along horse trails (1)
- Should have special campgrounds for horses (1)
- Post out of bound areas for horses (1)
- Keep riding stock at low use/maybe phase out (1)
- Slash F Ranch offers day use of horses (1)

Opinions Opposing Horses:

- No horses in Park (6), on trails (1), in alpine areas (1)
- Horses create real mess for foot traveller (1)
- No horse pack trains (2)

Other Comments on Horses

- Need more definite information on horse use (1)
- Need more availability for users of mules and burros (1)

Stock

- Establish trails for stock (2) and only at favorable times of year (1)
- Pack animals OK, but not riding animals. (1)
- Don't limit pack animal - many people dependent on them (1)

Motor Vehicles

- Open Park up more to motorcycles (1)
- Would like area for planes (1)
- Snowmobiles should use snow-bound roads (1)
- Favor motor boats on Lake Crescent (1)
- Against snowmobile in Park (8), in wilderness (1), on snow bound roads, especially at Hurricane Ridge. This activity could become a problem (1)
- Snowmobile use can be annoying up to dangerous to those snowshoeing and ski touring (1)
- No motor drives and trails - degraded wilderness (3)
- Close roads to motor vehicles during snow season - "winter wild" concept should be thoroughly studied and included in Olympic National Park (1)
- No motor boats on Lake Crescent (1)
- No planes on beaches (1)
- Control motor bikes and off road vehicles (1)

Skiing

- Poma Lift should be removed after each ski season (2)
- More ski areas (1)
- Skiing could be made attractive (1)
- Skiing facilities should be kept to a minimum (1)
- Don't expand Hurricane Ridge ski area (1)

Other Comments on Special Uses

- Fence in campgrounds (1)
- Oppose beachcombing (1)
- Have view points for elderly (1)
- Have facilities for handicapped (1)
- To deny vast number of acres to horsemen and trail riders is unjust, unnecessary and un-American. All that's needed is proper supervision, then area open to all (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO PARK FLORA

- Shi Shi Beach Forest in wild to protect from logging (3)
- Protect Old Growth Cedar at Point of Arches (3)
- Olympic National Park wilderness to protect flora (2)
- Preserve all present and unique biota (2)
- Fascinated by the variety of ecosystems (2)
- Those who lack skill to rough it are dangerous to flora (1)
- Protect virgin timber at Lake Willoughby (1)
- Preserve valley bottom old growth forests (1)
- Highey Peak virgin forests deserve protection (1)
- Olympic National Park is last sanctuary for plants and animals (1)
- Contrast of biological zones make Mount Angeles worth saving (1)
- Impressed by unique flora on Mount Angeles (1)
- Oppose elimination of non-native plants (1)
- "Sharps book on wild flowers states 20 species are endemic." (1)
- Replace communities of rare endemic plants (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO WILDLIFE

- Stock fish (11)
- Keep goats (9)
- Re-introduce wolves to help stabilize animal population of the Park (7)
- Lakes without fish should remain so (4)
- Wildlife needs protection (4)
- Allow sufficient habitat that doesn't co-exist well with man (3)
- Pro feeding station for visitor attraction and to preserve elk (2)
- Protect sea creatures (2)
- Likes listening to whistling Marmots and seeing deer and bear (1)
- 54 species of mammals in Park - save them (1)
- People need to learn respect for wildlife and habitat (1)
- Have to consider animals and trees (1)
- Don't log and remove shelter for animals (1)
- Manage whole mountain area as free environment for dwindling species - depressing that so little area is left for this (1)
- "Seen deer with no fear of man" (1)
- Olympic National Park should be wilderness to protect wildlife (1)
- Bob Pyle says butterfly, Valarta Artic, endemic to Olympic Peninsula, also 140 species of birds and mammals (1)
- Protect Roosevelt Elk (1)
- Saw 27 goats at Mount Angeles (1)
- Many benefit from hunting and fishing (1)
- Mountain goats make Mount Angeles worth saving (1)
- The mountain goats and marmots within one day hike of lodge at Mount Angeles need protection (1)
- Allow fishing (1)
- Increase sports fishing at Lake Crescent (1)
- Equal protection for fish as for bear, elk, etc. (1)
- Statements on phase-out of exotic fish planting and restocking should be related to their impact on fish resources and management policies. (1)
- Logging won't ruin stream for salmon and steady production (1)
- Study goats (1)
- Don't eliminate any animals from Park (1)
- Propose birth control pills to control goat population (1)
- Control goat population with predators (1)
- Add Point of Arches for game refuge (1)
- Collection of live specimens on beaches is a problem (1)
- Study birds off the coast (1)
- Need cooperation with other agencies to control wildlife (1)
- Problems of game management is same with or without wilderness but methods used could vary - see section III Wilderness Plan (1)
- Study wildlife migration patterns in Park (1)
- Glad insects recognized as part of nature - hopes controls are biological (1)

Table 35.--What was the balance of opinion expressed on the question of private inholdings in the Park (including general comments and recommendations on specific inholdings)?

Opinions on inholdings in Olympic National Park	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Should be retained in private ownership	:	40	:	29
Park should acquire	:	491	:	787
TOTAL	:	531	:	816

GENERAL ISSUES OF INHOLDINGS

Reasons favoring retention of inholdings:

- Owners should be able to retain (5), preserve freedom to use land (3)
- Against condemnation (4)
- Would violate Homestead Act (3)
- Owners have done no damage in area (2)
- Would cause losses of tax revenue, hurt economy, affect communities (2)
- Owners care about their land (2)
- Cites Sec. 5 of 1938 Act on property rights (1)
- Land already acquired hasn't been opened to public use (1)
- Unfair that Park Service can outbid individuals (1)
- Landowners predate Park formation (1)
- Park can't govern land or take it away (1)
- Acquisition is cruel and inhuman (1)

Reasons Favoring Acquisition of Inholdings

- To add to wilderness (10)
- To prevent mining (4)
- Prevent development or inconsistent activities (2)

Other Comments on Inholdings

- Favor Olympic Heritage Council's plan on inholdings (1)
- Property owners in Quinault Valley oppose Master Plan and Wilderness Plan (1)
- Term "inholder" a slur on owners rights (1)
- Object to Secretary of Interior's power to include Lake Crescent in wilderness (1)
- Although an owner, wants to add inholdings in public domain (1)
- Park Service should encourage owners to sell (1)
- Give priority to those with virgin timber (1)
- Park Service has bad reputation as "cheap" (1)
- Acquire (9), Trade for (1), or Buy (6) inholdings as soon as possible
- Exclude private land from boundaries of Park (10)

Table 36.---What was the balance of opinion expressed about private land inholding acquisition in the Park?

Opinions on specific inholdings:	Inputs	Signatures
<u>A. Inholdings in Lake Quinault- Quinault Valley Area (specific lands not specified)</u>		
Retain in private ownership	11	11
Park should acquire	25	16
<u>B. Private lands in Park on north shore of Lake Quinault</u>		
Park boundary should be moved to: exclude private land from the Park	70	81
<u>C. Private land in Bogachiel Valley</u>		
Should be retained in private ownership	0	0
Park should acquire	39	630
<u>D. Private inholdings in the Elwah Area</u>		
Retain in private ownership	0	0
Park should acquire	9	4
<u>E. Private inholdings in Higley Peak Area</u>		
Retain in private ownership	0	0
Park should acquire	1	1
<u>F. Private inholdings in Lake Ozette Area</u>		
Retain in private ownership	0	0
Park should acquire	4	2
<u>G. Private inholdings in Lake Crescent Area</u>		
Retain in private ownership	4	1
Park should acquire	4	2

SPECIFIC ISSUES OF INHOLDINGS

Opinions on Quinault Inholdings:

- Retain private lands in Quinault owned by Peterson Brothers (1)
- Park not living up to agreement (1)
- Residents have worked land to establish fine community (1)
- Can't take land away (1)
- People on south shore will fight for those on north shore (1)
- Would affect logging industry, shake industry, and other industry (1)
- Land prices are too high to buy elsewhere if forced to move (1)
- Homesteaders shouldn't sacrifice home and lifestyles for the pleasure of a few wilderness users (1)
- Quinault Area should be wilderness (5)
- Quinault Area should be purchased when land available - deal generously with private individual (1)
- Opposed to deletion of Quinault Area from Olympic National Park (1)
- Park can't control wildlife management on private land (1)

Opinions on Hoh Head Mineral Exclusion:

- Should be wilderness (284)
- Study possible reimbursement (1)
- Is administrative problem (1)
- Offer fair market value (1)
- Can be added if addressed by enabling legislation (1)

Opinions on Bogachiel Inholdings:

- Should be wilderness (264)
- All should be acquired (7)
- Offer fair market value (1)

Opinions on Higley Peak Inholdings

- Acquire for wilderness (1)

OPINIONS ON RESTRICTING USE IN THE PARK

Opinions Favoring Restrictions

- Limit number of people in area at one time (20)
- Favor permit system (8)
- If problems get worse, should restrict use (4)
- Use restrictions needed to protect resources (4)
- Favor limiting group size (3)
- Use restrictions needed to protect especially in high country (2)
- Favor quota system (1)
- Favor user fees (1)
- Favor computerized reservation system (1)

Opinions Opposing Use Restrictions

- Is unfair (2)
- Won't work anyway (1)
- Use better management instead (1)
- Instead of use restriction, have rangers stationed at strategic points to aid in dispersing large groups (1)

Other Comments on Use Restrictions

- Only as a last resort (2)
- Adequate road access will make reservation system unnecessary (1)
- Preserve area by restricting use, but don't lock it up (1)
- Before limiting entry, screen out bad campers (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO MANAGEMENT GOALS FOR THE PARK

COMMENTS ON INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

- Those favoring cooperation with: all agencies (13), State agencies (6), U.S. Forest Service (9), the public (3), all agencies on zoning (1)
- Work with public land owners for management of entire coastal strip (3)
- Cooperate with State on inter-tidal zone management (2)
- Favors cooperative management of buffer zones (1)
- Make cooperative management agreement with timber industry (1)
- Work with Forest Service in managing trails and trail heads (1)

COMMENTS ON CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

- No development in Park (20)
- Only develop area on perimeter/periphery of the Park (6)
- Resist pressures of economic interests (4)
- No mining in Park (3)
- Develop some part of Park but leave the rest alone (2)
- Protect Park from future development (1)
- Day use development only in Park (1)
- Remove non-conforming structures (1)
- No development on sea coast (1)
- Favors use of dams (1)
- No oil pumps in Park (1)
- Develop Mount Angeles first (1)
- Develop Park as is (1)
- Park Service should stay out of motor biking and swimming business (1)

COMMENTS ON FACILITIES

- Private enterprise can meet resort and recreation facility needs (1)
- Youth camps are OK if they don't displace campgrounds (1)
- Indian culture center idea is fantastic (1)
- Standardize all campgrounds with landscaping (1)
- Develop overnight facilities in Park (1)
- Favors group camp construction in non-wilderness area (1)
- Restoration of Olympic Hot Springs and Wanilla camp facility would provide many the experience with minimum road travel (1)
- Designate campsites (1)
- Continue facilities like Hurricane Ridge (1)
- Spread recreation facilities to all parts of Peninsula (1)
- Development of tourist facilities doesn't serve purpose of Park (1)
- Tourist accommodations should be along Park border (1)
- Consider renovating existing facilities (1)
- Use existing buildings in inholdings when acquired (1)
- Government has no business performing any service that can be provided by private enterprise (1)

COMMENTS ON LOGGING

- Protect Park from logging interests and pressures (5)
- Favor alternate roads for log trucks (4)
- Need more control of logging operations in Park (3)
- No logging near proposed Wilderness (3)
- Prevent clearcutting in areas that haven't been protected in Park (1)
- Park should give lumber companies dead and diseased timber existing next to access roads (1)
- Against salvage logging (1)
- Control logging around Lake Ozette (1)
- Clear cuts are ugly (1)
- Against coastal area logging (1)

COMMENTS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

- Need more law enforcement (3)
- Favor stricter law enforcement and penalties (2)

COMMENTS ON FIRE

- Favors "no camp fire" policy in sub-alpine and heavy use areas (1)
- Favors "no camp fire" policy in Park (1)
- Control man-caused fires (1)
- Control fires which threaten areas outside the Park (1)
- Don't control natural caused fires (1)

COMMENTS ON INSECTS

- Only control insects which threaten areas outside the Park (1)
- Don't control insects in Park (1)

COMMENTS ON MOTOR VEHICLES

- Favor no cars in Park (4)
- Favor plans to avoid auto congestion (1)
- Discourage Recreational Vehicles (1)
- Exclude machinery from Park--instead use man, horse and a good trail system (1)

COMMENTS ON ROADS

- Keep Point Greenville to Cape Flattery unscarred by roads (1)
- Pave and maintain existing roads only (1)
- Keep all coast areas roadless (1)
- Opposed to removing any existing roads (1)

COMMENTS ON EQUIPMENT

- Use chain saws on trails (1)
- Special equipment for research should be packed in rather than flown in (1)
- Power tools OK for maintenance on beaches and in Wilderness areas (1)

COMMENTS ON BEACH AREA

- Protect and preserve natural coast areas (6)
- Not feasible to protect beach area (1)

COMMENTS ON INTER-TIDAL MANAGEMENT

- Endorses inter-tidal zone management plan (1)
- Against too much collecting in inter-tidal zones (1)

OTHER COMMENTS

- Keep Olympic National Park as it is today (5)
- Commends past management (3)
- Need careful planning and management to insure wilderness quality (3)
- Areas presently selected for wilderness shouldn't be classified as anything else (3)
- Control over-use (2)
- Have something for everyone (2)
- Be concerned about local people (2)
- Need more manpower during heavy-use months and weekends (2)
- No wood gathering in campgrounds--sell wood instead (1)
- Grazing by homesteaders should be permitted (1)
- Fight marine pollution (1)
- Have guided ranger hikes to aid and teach inexperienced hikers wilderness skills (1)
- Continue glacier studies (1)
- Adopt radio tapedeck like DNR (1)
- Park needs more maintenance forces (1)
- Reduce hazardous fuel concentrations in Park (1)
- Stop persecution of private land owners (1)
- Establish buffers (1)
- Take more active interest in boundary areas that affect Park (1)
- Recognize fragility of Obstruction Point - Deer Park Ridge area (1)
- Control access to Hoh Head to protect wilderness values (1)
- Manage Dosewallips and Duckebush as wild and scenic rivers (1)
- Would like to see Quinault area protected as per 1962 proposal (1)
- Do study on carrying capacity of Olympic Wilderness area to minimize future visitor impact (1)
- Plan for future impact of tourism (1)
- Encourage every citizen to visit, see and enjoy Park (1)
- Make wilderness areas less accessible (1)
- Don't cater to people seeing Park by car (1)
- Large gathering places in Park should be taboo except for Hurricane Ridge (1)
- Encourage overnight use (1)
- Strongly in favor of Olympic National Park as wilderness (1)
- Good that National Park Service set aside further areas for wilderness (1)
- Recreational uses of Park should center around wilderness (1)
- Designate as wilderness all areas added (1)
- Park goals should be "virgin conditions" (1)
- Keep as much wilderness as possible (1)
- Winter wilderness good idea (1)
- The four roadless areas should remain roadless, plus core and coastal areas (1)
- Leave some areas without trails (1)
- Favor multiple-use concept (1)

OTHER COMMENTS (continued)

- Maintain Park unimpaired for recreation and public enjoyment (1)
- Need plan to handle visitors--most never leave parking lot or visitor center (1)
- Build access (1)
- Favor smaller wilderness area--keep fringe areas open for public use under current management practices (1)
- Don't close Park (1)
- Olympic National Park could be managed sufficiently to make it a great recreation area without destroying it (1)
- Place no limitation on amount spent to keep Park open for all people (1)
- Keep Park accessible (1)
- Pleased with scope and foresight of Park Service (1)
- Keep flexible (1)
- Proper control by good management not Congressional Act (1)
- Administer to preserve area (1)
- Don't try to provide something for everyone (1)
- National Park Service should turn attention to states with no parks (1)
- Park has too proprietary attitude--"You (National Park Service) don't own it" (1)
- Do all we can to guide, guard and protect and deeply appreciate National Parks (1)
- Park to be commended on Land-Use Plan for peninsula (1)
- Approve long-range planning (1)
- Periodically updated comprehensive land-use plan should be added to this one (1)
- See letter (Maurice Lundy - Bureau of Outdoor Recreation) 1571, 551, 1585, 1589 re: facis for fresh and salt water shorelands and winter sports needed in Jefferson and Clallam Counties (1)
- Could use better public relations because of growing numbers of backpackers (1)
- Money spent on Master Plan would have been better spent on improving existing trails and roads (1)
- Favor research programs on water quality (1)
- You (State Parks) are allowed to do as you please, the only place we will have to go will be our backyards--this appears to be what government wants (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO OTHER ISSUES

- Get more money for parks and bring up the standards (4)
- Review Indian treaties and return land (4)
- Only part of Mt. Rainier Park should be wilderness (3)
- By destroying nature man destroys himself (3)
- See more people backpacking every summer (2)
- Nature needs our help (2)
- Supports Alpine Lakes proposal with NRA (2)
- Health of land is of primary importance (2)
- Age no barrier to backpacking (2)
- Research will become the most important use (2)
- The Park Service has done a good job (2)
- Park has unique primitive beach and mountain area (2)
- Against preservation because it removes element of man (1)
- Emphasize regulations at Ranger Stations (1)
- Because there are no interior roads, Olympic Park is already wilderness (1)
- Rocky Mountain Park has problems with ranchers and business leasing land in the park (1)
- No reputable mining company would leave scars such as those at Miner's Ridge, North Cascades (1)
- We are yesterday's future generations, our recreation needs are as important as those to follow (1)
- Industrial Forestry Association states that National Park Service doesn't recognize its ability to handle the increased recreation needs and at the same time maintain timber production (1)
- Washington has more timber lands denied to "forestry" than any other state (1)
- Adjust the Park boundary to exclude the south half section 16, T27N R11W (1)
- Olympic Peninsula Chambers of Commerce can make a better decision on wilderness than Congress (1)
- Government is frivolous with money (1)
- Favors multiple use; the rest of public will have to be content with wilderness movies (1)
- Olympic National Park enriched understanding of ecological concepts (1)
- Grew up in Chicago--Olympic National Park changed his life (1)
- Value of Park is that it is a contrast to city life (1)
- Energy crisis is no excuse to extract minerals in Park (1)
- Fascinated with Park (1)
- Government should emulate Weyerhaeuser, pro tree planting and DDT use for Tussock Moth (1)
- Energy crisis may relieve pressure on overused areas (1)
- Impressed with North Cascades Park and people working for wilderness (1)
- Environmentalists are pleased that wilderness boundary usually same as Park boundary (1)
- Have met out-of-staters excited by road ending and getting out of their car in Park (1)
- B.C. residents also concerned over what happens on Olympic Peninsula (1)
- Park Service to be commended on excellent custodial services (1)
- NRA gives good wilderness core protection (1)
- Growing forests for recreation--mature forests for timber (1)
- The park is becoming a boyscout camp (1)
- Make future studies before final decisions (1)
- No more commercial development in Clallam County (1)

OPINIONS RELATED TO OTHER ISSUES (continued)

- Oppose beach combing and snowmobiles (1)
- Need a buffer along the beach (1)
- Use rail roads as an alternative form of transportation (1)
- Start another C.C.C. organization (1)
- Set up Olympic National Park Advisory Council (1)
- Opposed to advisory council made of local people (1)
- Against air traffic intrusion (1)
- Favor land-use planning on a statewide basis (1)
- No forests left in New Jersey (1)

OPINIONS EXPRESSED ABOUT THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

Favorable Opinions on Public Involvement

- Thanks Park for allowing him to express views (22)
- Thanks for allowing people to study Master Plan and review draft Environmental Impact Statement (5)
- On behalf of students thanks Superintendent Allin for speaking at CSC (3)
- Favors analysis of public input (2)
- Compliment National Park Service on presenting wilderness study (1)
- Commends having hearings at Port Angeles (1)
- Pleased that so many people spoke at Port Angeles hearing (1)

Unfavorable Opinions on Public Involvement

- Not able to attend hearing because of location (2)
- National Park Service trying to keep secrets (1)
- Not enough Master Plan copies circulated (3)
- National Park Service opinions will determine how Park will be run (1)
- Hearings shouldn't be biased by a few citizens when the majority of Americans would support Wilderness Plan (1)
- Individuals aren't informed about public hearings as quickly as local private interests (1)
- Letter late because of no prior knowledge of hearing (1)
- Just learned of hearing on 12/7/73 (1)
- Could not attend hearings (1)
- Very little public involvement in wilderness study (2)

Other Opinions on Public Involvement

- Need public input on boundary relocations (1)
- Hopes letter will show Park this issue is of National concern (1)
- Oppose any committee composed of local, state representatives as an advisory board setting policies on boundary for people of U.S.A. (1)
- Should get as much public input as possible before finalizing a decision (1)
- Please send outcome of plan and public input (7)
- Public involvement should be sought on location of road realignments (1)
- Don't let economic interest prevail (1)
- All agencies and owners on Peninsula should be consulted (1)
- National Park Service should plan for all publics not a few (2)
- Quilente Tribe wished to be represented at the hearing, they request information about how to testify (1)
- How does one write for hearing records so that the letter won't be discarded? (1)

VI. OPINIONS ON ALTERNATIVE PLANS PROPOSED
BY CITIZEN GROUPS

Table 37/---How many people gave blanket endorsement to or completely rejected the alternate plan proposed by the Olympic Peninsula Heritage Council? 1/

Opinions on Olympic Peninsula Heritage Council Plan	:	:	:	:
	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
	:	:	:	:
Endorse whole "Heritage" plan	:	75	:	1,863
Reject whole "Heritage" plan:	:	32	:	24
TOTAL	:	107	:	1,887

1/ Opinions about specific parts of the plan are not included. For these opinions see tables describing opinions on each issue.

OPINIONS ON THE OLYMPIC HERITAGE COUNCIL'S PLAN

Reasons Favoring the "Heritage" Plan

- Other facilities should be offered (4)
- More varied potential (2)
- Favor multiple use (2)
- Plan with greatest benefit for this and future generations (1)
- Considers older citizens (1)
- Plan more workable, feasible, sensible and conceivable (1)
- Provides wilderness and utilization (1)
- Favors plan's number of acres (1)
- Fully supports the Olympic Heritage Council to the point of leaving what we have and not opening any more area (1)
- 93% as wilderness seriously affects surrounding forest land (1)

Reasons Criticizing "Heritage" Plan

- Feel their objections are not valid (1)
- Don't bow to pressure of Chamber of Commerce groups (1)
- Campaign to "save the Park from the Wilderness Act" is by short-sighted, vocal, self-interested exploiters (1)

Other Comments on the "Heritage Plan"

- Suggests compromise between Park Service and Heritage Plans (1)

ORGANIZATIONS FAVORING "HERITAGE" PLAN ^{1/}

Western Forest Industries Association
 Industrial Forestry Association
 Olympic Peninsula Travel Association
 Grays Harbor Jaycees
 Crown Zellerbach Lumber Company
 Clallam Co, Economic Development Council
 Washington State Horsemen, Inc. and Outriders Saddle Club
 Grays Harbor Planning Commission
 Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce
 City Council of Port Angeles
 Machinist local 1028
 Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce
 Olympic Peninsula Heritage Council
 Association of Western Businessas
 Shelton-Mason County Chamber of Commerce
 Olympic Regional Planning Council
 Olympic Area Chamber of Commerce
 City Council of Hoquiam
 Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce

^{1/} Many of these organizations are members of the Olympic Heritage Council

Table 38. --How many people gave blanket endorsement to or completely rejected the alternative plan proposed by the Olympic Park Associates.

Opinions on Olympic Park Associates Plan	:	Inputs	:	Signatures
Endorse whole "Associates" plan	:	247	:	270
Reject whole "Associates" plan	:	2	:	3
TOTAL	:	249	:	273

^{1/} Endorsement or rejection of specific parts of the plan dealing with particular issues appear as supporting comments with the table describing opinions on that issue.

OPINIONS ON THE PLAN PROPOSED BY OLYMPIC PARK ASSOCIATES

Reasons Favoring Park Associates' Plan:

- Support conservationist recommendations (36)
- Support conservationist additions (4)
- Wilderness Society is supported by many people (1)
- Endorse five proposals of Wilderness Society (1)
- Support Olympic Park Associate with the exception of opening Whiskey Bend Road (1)
- Unless people have seen and enjoyed areas in the proposal they have no concept of the immediate need for their protection and acquisition (1)
- Save Wilderness from department and commercial pressures (1)
- These additions would provide nation with an outstanding Wilderness area (1)
- Once wilderness is gone - gone forever (1)
- Olympic Park Associates proposal consider many aspects of the Park (1)
- Majority of users would support (1)
- Favors their feeling that the National Park Service should administer the Park for the enjoyment of future generations (1)

Reasons Criticizing Park Associates' Plan:

none listed

Other Comments on Park Associates' Plan:

- Object to conservationist recommendations (1)

ORGANIZATIONS FAVORING "PARK ASSOCIATES" PLAN

Conservation Committee of British Columbia Mountaineering Club
 Tahoma Audubon Society
 Olympic Park Associates
 North Cascades Conservation Council
 Wilderness Society
 South West River Study Committee
 Sierra Club - Columbia Group
 Saguaro Ecology Club
 Black Hill Chapter of National Audubon Society
 Chehalis Jaycees
 Alpine Garden Club
 Northern Michigan Wilderness Coalition
 Friends of the Earth
 Pilchuck Audubon Society
 Northwest National Seashore Alliance
 Sierra Club
 Western Federation of Outdoor Clubs

APPENDIX

ORGANIZATIONS SUBMITTING INPUT

Alpine Garden Club of British Columbia
 Auto Machinists Lodge 1028
 Appalachian Mountain Club
 Audubon Society - Florida
 Audubon Society - Dakota
 Audubon Society - Pilchuck
 Audubon Society - Seattle
 Audubon Society - Olympic Peninsula
 Arizona Conservation Club
 Association of Washington Businesses
 Arizona Flora Quality Environment
 Audubon Club - Kellogg
 Audubon Society - Kitsap

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
 Bureau of Land Management (Acting State Director for Oregon)
 British Columbia Mountaineering Club
 Bogachiel Garden Club

Chehalis Jaycees
 Chemeketoms Outdoor and Conservation Club
 Citizens for Outdoor Recreation
 Central Washington State College Mountain Club
 Conservation League
 Crescent Grange
 Crown Zellerbach Lumbar Company

Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
 Division of Geological and Planetary Services

Earth Core Organization
 Elma Chamber of Commerce
 Elwah Indian Tribe
 Environmental Planning Commission of Grays Harbor

Federal Power Commission
 Friends of the Earth - Northwest Chapter
 Florida Defenders of Environment, Inc.
 Friends of the Earth, Arizona Chapter
 Friends of the Earth, Chicagoland Chapter
 Friends of Lake Crescent

Governor's Task Force on Wilderness
 Gray's Harbor Jaycees
 Gray's Harbor Pomamo Grange
 Gray's Harbor Saddle Club
 Gray's Harbor Chamber of Commerce

Hoquiam City Council
 Hood Canal Environmental Council
 Horseman's Group (Name not picked up by recorder)

Industrial Forestry Association
 Izaak Walton League

Jefferson County Planning Commission

Kitsap County Board of Commissioners
 Klahhane's

Lake Dawn Association

Mountaineers
 Mazama's
 Makah Tribal Council
 M & R Timber, Inc.

National Audubon Society - Black Hills Chapter, Tacoma
 National Park Concessions, Inc.
 National Parks and Recreation Association
 North Cascades Conservation Council
 Northern Washington Wilderness Coalition
 Northshore Quinault Owners Association
 Northwest National Seashore Alliance

Office of Assistant Secretary of Commerce
 Obsidians Club
 Olympic Area Chamber of Commerce
 Olympic Conservation Council
 Olympic Mountains Search and Rescue
 Olympic National Forest US Forest Service
 Olympic North Beach Chamber of Commerce
 Olympic Park Heritage Council
 Olympic Peninsula Travel Association
 Olympic Regional Planning Council
 Outdoors Unlimited; Wyoming, Utah, Nevada Chapters

Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce
 Port of Port Angeles
 Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce
 Ptarmigans

Quileute Indian Tribe
 Quinault Grange # 729
 Quinault Lake School District #97
 Quinault Property Owners Association

Safeguard Ecology Club
 Saquans Ecology Club
 Save Cypress Island Committee
 Shelton-Mason Chamber of Commerce
 Sierra Club - Ashland
 Sierra Club - Cache Valley
 Sierra Club - Columbia Group
 Sierra Club - Logan, Utah
 Sierra Club - Northwest Chapter
 Southwest River Study Commission
 Stable Hounds 4-H Club
 State of Washington Department of Agriculture
 State of Washington Department of Game
 Student Conservation Association

Tahoma Audubon Society

US Bureau of Mines (Director)
 US Coast Guard - 13th District
 US Forest Service (Philip Thornton)
 University of Washington; Office for Research

Washington State Department of Natural Resources
 Washington State Horsemen/ Outriders Club
 Washington State Parks
 Western Environmental Trade Association
 Western Federation of Outdoors Club
 Western Forest Industries Association
 Wilderness Corps
 Wilderness Society - Northern Michigan
 Wilderness Society - San Diego