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INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Statement for Nez Perce National Historical Park and Big Hole National Battlefield is an abbreviated document. It is important to understand that this Final Environmental Impact Statement must be read in conjunction with the previously published Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

A notice of availability of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register, Vol. 61, No. 199, p. 53373, on October 11, 1996. Approximately 1,700 copies of the draft were distributed to governmental agencies, public interest groups, businesses, media, local libraries, and individuals.

Written comments were accepted through December 11, 1996, which was the close of the 60-day public comment period for the draft document.

During the public review period, 512 people participated in workshops conducted in late October and early November in 16 communities in Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho. In addition, 641 letters were received. The National Park Service greatly appreciates the time and effort that people took to participate in the review of the draft document and to comment on the proposals.

This document is divided into three sections: a summary of the public meetings, responses to the comments, and corrections or revisions to the draft document. The responses are addressed via General Responses to Major Issues, a table of Site-Specific Comments, and Specific Responses and Copies of Comment Letters.

Concerns expressed in letters from individuals are summarized in the General Responses to Major Issues section. In the Specific Responses and Copies of Comment Letters section only letters from elected officials, federal agencies, tribes, state and local governments, and organizations are displayed. In some cases, when a comment was received from individuals as well as from agencies or organizations whose letters were displayed, the comment is addressed only in the Specific Responses and Copies of Comment Letters section.

The section of the document, Corrections and Revisions to the Draft Document, contains specific factual corrections and clarifying text changes to the Draft General Management Plan/Environ-
A 30-day waiting period will follow the publication of this Final Environmental Impact Statement, and a record of decision is expected to be signed in August of this year. The record of decision will indicate the alternative selected as the general management plan for Nez Perce National Historical Park and Big Hole National Battlefield. This procedure is in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, title 40, parts 1505.2 and 1506.10. When the record of decision is signed, the General Management Plan will be issued and will include the details of the record of decision and all elements of the plan. It will not contain the rejected alternatives or other components of the environmental impact statement.

For further information about this plan, please contact:

Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
Route 1, Box 100
Spalding, Idaho 83540
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Workshops were held in 16 communities near park sites. Press releases announced these meetings. They were also announced in a transmittal letter enclosed in each mailed copy of the draft document. An additional meeting in Weippe was scheduled at the request of landowners and the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission, Oregon</td>
<td>October 28, 1996</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa, Oregon</td>
<td>October 29, 1996</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph, Oregon</td>
<td>October 30, 1996</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise, Oregon</td>
<td>October 30, 1996</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, Montana</td>
<td>November 4, 1996</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook, Montana</td>
<td>November 6, 1996</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel, Montana</td>
<td>November 7, 1996</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapwai, Idaho</td>
<td>November 12, 1996</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding, Idaho</td>
<td>November 12, 1996</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bird, Idaho</td>
<td>November 13, 1996</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grangeville, Idaho</td>
<td>November 14, 1996</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weippe, Idaho</td>
<td>November 15, 1996</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nezperem, WA</td>
<td>November 18, 1996</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston, Idaho</td>
<td>November 19, 1996</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooskia, Idaho</td>
<td>November 20, 1996</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiah, Idaho</td>
<td>November 21, 1996</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop Format

The workshops were informal, and geared to help people better understand the draft plan so they could provide appropriate comments that would articulate their concerns with, or support for, the proposals. Comment forms and a Guide to Comments were available to assist the public in preparing and submitting comments.

The legislative history of the park was reviewed and the planning process to date was summarized. The cooperative nature of park management was stressed. Copies of newsletters, enabling legislation, the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, and other informational materials were available. After the introduction, the floor was opened to questions. Most of the questions requested clarification of statements within the draft document.

Concerns

There was a supportive atmosphere at many of the meetings, in which concerns were expressed within the context of appreciation for the efforts being made by the park through the planning process.

At Mission, Oregon, there were questions about the amount of inventory and resource protection that could be provided for such a large, dispersed park.

At two meetings (White Bird and Chinook), the opinions expressed appeared to be directly opposite of what was expressed at the scoping meetings in 1994. At the White Bird meeting, those attending were opposed to a visitor facility at the White Bird Battlefield, whereas those attending the scoping meeting had requested one due to its potential for helping community economic development.

At Chinook, those attending stressed that some sort of visitor/staff facility is needed at the battlefield because of its exposure to the elements and the distance from town. During the scoping meeting, the need for maintaining the integrity of such an important and sensitive resource was stressed. The response at both White Bird and Chinook was that during implementation, we will carefully reevaluate the need, scale, and siting for any development at both sites, and will include the public in project planning.

In Laurel, Montana, representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the Friends of Canyon Creek attended, and expressed their support for the project. They are actively working toward developing an interpretive center in Laurel, and a wayside shelter at Canyon Creek.

In Nezperem, Montana, the meeting focused on establishing priorities for work to be done at the sites in the vicinity. The opinion was expressed that the National Park Service should spend a larger sum of money for
the sites related to the Chief Joseph Band, particularly for a Nez Perce cultural center.

The primary concern voiced at most of the other meetings, particularly in communities along the upper Clearwater River valley, was that boundaries were being proposed on private land. After hearing explanations of the boundaries, the upcoming Land Protection Plan, and various management strategies that could be used to protect the resources, the opinion was clearly expressed that these boundaries should not be established without the consent of the landowner. Our response was that those who wanted their private land to be a part of the park sites would be contacted prior to issuing the final document, to be sure they were in agreement with the boundaries. Except for previously legislated boundaries, the proposed boundaries were redrawn to exclude those properties where the landowner objected.

GENERAL RESPONSES TO MAJOR ISSUES

Six hundred forty-one written comments were received. Of these, 430 were form letters from individuals, examples of the four types of form letters are displayed in Appendix A. Comment letters from elected officials, federal agencies, tribes, state and local governments, and organizations are reproduced in the section titled Specific Responses and Copies of Comment Letters. Appendix B lists the names of individuals who submitted letters.

Responses are required only for comments that are substantive. Comments are considered to be substantive when they:

(a) question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EIS;
(b) question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of environmental analysis;
(c) present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EIS; or
(d) cause changes or revisions in the proposal.

In some cases, we have responded to comments that might not be substantive, but a response will help the public better understand how or why we arrived at a decision.

Six major issues were raised in the written comments from individuals received during the public review period. These can be better addressed in longer, more general explanations than can be accommodated in the side-by-side format of letters and responses. In this section we respond to issues raised in individual letters. An additional section concerning the General Management Plan and the Park in General is included in Appendix A.

There is also a table displaying site-specific comments and our responses. Some of the same topics and sites are also discussed in responses presented in the Specific Responses and Copies of Comment Letters section.

The page numbers where specific issues are addressed in the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement are indicated in brackets.

THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND THE PARK IN GENERAL

A number of letters commended the National Park Service for its efforts in developing the plan, and praised the proposals to improve the visitor experience. Support was expressed for the work done to date, and for telling a worthwhile story. Some comments were in favor of expanding the park in general, and others encouraged expanding boundaries of specific sites or designating new sites.

Others requested that the plan be halted or scrapped, since they disagreed with it as stated, or were against the proposed changes in park management and operation. A few comments indicated they were opposed to the park as a whole for unspecified reasons.

The National Park Service appreciates the positive comments and acknowledges the negative ones. We hope our responses will help everyone better understand why we made our decisions we did, and will illustrate how we adjusted the plan to accommodate the comments.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Several comments expressed the opinion that the environmental impact statement is incomplete, due to inadequacy of the scope of process, a lack of addressing socioeconomic concerns, the title "No Action" for Alternative 1, and the impacts of additional traffic on local roads.

Scoping

A Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register, Vol. 59, No. 222, p. 59790 on November 18, 1994. The National Park Service determined that a single meeting in a central location would not be appropriate for a park that includes 38 sites in four states; we set up meetings in 21 communities where we could elicit the views of people near the affected sites. People who could not attend the meetings had the opportunity to express their views by mail or telephone [p.161]. As the planning and analysis process continued, we provided newsletters describing what we had done, and we adjusted the focus of our efforts based on the responses we received from the public and our partners.

The National Park Service believes that we have complied with Council on Environmental Quality Regulations on scoping, through an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action (40 CFR 1501.7).

Socioeconomic Concerns

There were concerns that private property would lose value if it was included within the proposed National Park Service boundaries, and that its inclusion would negatively affect the tax base of local entities. Since fee interest to most of the private property included within the proposed boundaries would not have been acquired, there would have been no reduction in the local tax base. For those few areas where acquisition of interest in the property will take place, arrangements will be made for payment in lieu of taxes to local governments. Acquisitions of partial interests (e.g., easements) would have little if any impact on county tax bases, as property taxes would continue to be paid.

Response. In response to the concerns regarding loss of value or rights to private property, when a landowner objected to having his or her property included in the proposed boundary for any reason, unless the boundaries were established by legislation, we excluded that property from the boundary. Please see Appendix C for maps indicating the revised proposed boundaries for specific sites.

"No Action"

The definition of a "No Action" alternative is presented on page 12 of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. "No Action" does not imply that the park will cease operations, but rather that it will continue to operate under the same level of authority and support that currently exists.

Impacts of Additional Traffic on Local Roads

There was concern about increased traffic on local roads, and the associated increased expense to local governments for maintenance.

Response. Under 16 USC 8a and 8b, the National Park Service has the authority to enter into agreements with county governments for maintenance of approach roads to park sites.
INTERPRETATION AND VISITOR USE

Of the comments received that specifically addressed interpretation and visitor use, most were site specific, suggesting more or less visitor use facilities at a particular site. Another group of comments offered suggestions for developing a particular interpretive media product (videos, relief maps, murals, etc.) which the reviewer felt should be produced to interpret specific stories or story elements. These suggestions are too prescriptive for the level of detail appropriate in a General Management Plan, but they will be considered as the park develops strategies to implement the GMP.

One letter recommended constructing a comfort station at each site. Beyond the prohibitive cost of this recommendation, many sites do not have the land base to make this feasible. Also, the resources at most sites do not support visitor activities which would require a long enough stay at the site to make the facilities appropriate.

Two letters suggested designating, and interpreting additional Nez Perce legend sites. There are many legend sites in the Nez Perce homeland and to designate and interpret each of these would be an enormous undertaking. Rather, the plan proposes to expand the interpretation at legend sites already designated to include a discussion of the role of legend sites in Nez Perce culture and to provide the visitor with a sense of the number and variety of legend sites.

Suggestions were made to expand the interpretation at certain sites to include historic figures that have no connection to the Nez Perce people and their culture. These suggestions are outside the legislated purpose of Nez Perce National Historical Park.

Finally, some people felt that the current level of interpretation at park sites was adequate. Site analysis by the GMP team found that the interpretation at many sites was not up to National Park Service standards in that it failed to give visitors an understanding of the site's significance, and/or the interpretive message did not reflect current scholarship on the site and was inaccurate.

BOUNDARIES AND LAND PROTECTION

Establishing Boundaries [pp. 8, 17-18]

One of the requirements for a National Park Service General Management Plan is that boundaries be established or modified as needed (Management Policies 2.8, 1988). The National Park Service may recommend boundary revisions:

- to include significant resources or opportunities for public enjoyment related to purposes of the park;
- to address operational and management issues such as access and boundary identification by topographic or other natural features or roads;
- to protect park resources critical to fulfilling the park's purpose.

We are also required to determine that:

- the added lands will be feasible to administer;
- other alternatives for management and resource protection are not adequate.

When Nez Perce National Historical Park was established in 1965, boundaries were established only for lands owned in fee simple or easement by the National Park Service. For the remainder of the sites, and for some of the additional that were authorized in 1992, no boundaries were defined. All 38 sites are considered to be nationally significant, since they contribute to the story of Nez Perce National Historical Park. All sites are also considered to be critical to fulfilling the park's purposes since each site represents a distinct portion of the story.

In many cases, the "site" was considered to be the pulloff and roadside exhibit where a historical marker was located; sometimes the location of the actual event or resource was unknown or unidentified. This made it difficult for the visitors to learn about the Nez Perce story, since they often could not identify the location or feature they were looking for. Little protection of resources was afforded by this method.

Since the 38 sites are spread across four states, and since Nez Perce National Historical Park is a "partnership park", with authority to develop cooperative agreements and contracts and to expend funds for sites in non-Federal ownership, it was difficult to focus workplans and develop agreements when, in most cases, there was no clear definition of the resource area. Defining boundaries will help the park staff establish priorities, and justify why energy should be exerted in one location but not on nearby property. This is especially important since limited personnel and budget are available for park management and operation.

The planning team evaluated various ways to define the boundaries at all 38 sites. Because the landscape surrounding most of the pertinent resources was so vast and expansive, it was not feasible to include a "viewshed" (what can be seen from a single point when looking toward, or standing in the middle of, the primary resource) in the boundaries. In many cases, the planning team decided that the boundaries established in recent historic studies or for nominations to the National Register of Historic Places would be the best basis for defining the locations of the resources. The team evaluated whether protection afforded by eligibility for or listing in the National Register would be adequate, without including the resources within park boundaries. Because eligibility or listing provides protection relative to Federal actions, and since most of the properties are privately owned, National Register listing alone does not afford the needed protection.

There were few operational and management issues relative to boundary establishment. Regarding it to feasibility of administration, it is anticipated that cooperative agreements and other partnership measures will continue to be the primary means of providing for protection and interpretation of the resources, and therefore cost of acquisition and administration is low. The type of agreement or interest, and the configuration of the area subject to an agreement will be negotiated with the landowner or managing agency. However, if the National Park Service and the landowner or agency determine that some type of acquisition such as easement or fee simple is the preferable means of administration of a property, having established boundaries will simplify the process of acquiring that interest.

Response. Boundaries were evaluated and established based on criteria presented in National Park Service Management Policies. However, in response to the many comments relative to boundaries, the park is again contacting those landowners who indicated a willingness to have their land included, to confirm their inclusion. When landowners are not willing, the boundary will not include their property, except in the few cases where there are legislated boundaries. In those cases the boundaries will be retained.

Future minor boundary adjustments can be made by following an established National Park Service process which includes:

- the need to include the resource in the park, based on the criteria listed above;
- willingness on the part of the landowner;
- notification of various levels of government; and
- publication in the Federal Register.

For Nez Perce National Historical Park, this process will not begin until an agreement with the landowner has been drafted. Agreements for land protection purposes will not be finalized unless the property is within the boundary, since the boundaries indicate that the natural resources are being used for the protection of significant resources and their enjoyment, sometimes at a distance by visitors.

Land Protection Plan [p. 9]

The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement did not spell out the details of land protection strategies that would be applied to protect the resources and visitor experience for each site. This lack of detail was unsettling to landowners whose property was included in the proposed park boundaries.

A Land Protection Plan is developed based on park boundaries, and periodically reviewed.
and updated for each park containing nonfederal lands. A Land Protection Plan cannot be developed for Nez Perce National Historical Park until the proposed boundaries are approved. This will occur at the time the responsible agency official signs the Record of Decision, 30 days after this Final Environmental Impact Statement is distributed.

Land Protection Plans identify alternative methods to provide for the protection of resources, for visitor use, and for development; identify the minimum interests necessary for those purposes; and establish priorities for acquisition of land (if any) or interests in land. These plans are subject to public review.

There are three techniques the National Park Service uses to protect land:

- cooperative approaches, such as agreements, local regulations and zoning, and other measures that do not involve acquisition of any interest in real property;
- acquisition of less-than-fee interests, such as easements or rights-of-way; and
- acquisition of fee interests, possibly with arrangements for some rights to be preserved such as office sites and lease-backs. (NPS Management Policies, p. 31, 1988)

Nez Perce National Historical Park is a partnership park, and has authority to enter into cooperative agreements with other entities; to expend funds on non-NPS properties. Because it is so difficult to project 38 sites scattered across 4 states, fee ownership in most cases is not feasible, cost-effective, nor appropriate. Therefore, the first of these — cooperative approaches — is usually the technique of choice for land protection for this park.

Since major boundary adjustments are usually initiated through a General Management Plan, major revisions to Land Protection Plans often occur immediately after a General Management Plan is completed. In the case of Nez Perce National Historical Park, the land protection strategies will be tailored to each site, based on its specific needs for resource protection and visitor experience, and on the needs and wishes of the land owner.

Response: As soon as is feasible, the Land Protection Plan for Nez Perce National Historical Park will be updated, based on the results of this plan. Some of the public participation undertaken in the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement has laid the groundwork for completion of the Land Protection Plan. The Land Protection Plan will be subject to public review.

Boundaries for Clearwater Battlefield

Boundaries at the Clearwater Battlefield site were proposed based on two primary considerations: location of the battle itself and the Nez Perce village west of the Clearwater River, and providing the opportunity to gain a clear overview of the battlefield and village site.

A recent historic resource study suggested an area that would include all the battle activities of the U.S. Army and the Nez Perce. The planning team proposed boundaries that would include this area, and also the view from a vantage point on Stites Road across the Clearwater River from the battlefield. In addition, directional signs and a wayside near the battlefield were proposed.

There were 141 landowners directly affected by the proposed alternative for Clearwater Battlefield. Both private land as well as allotment land was involved.

Stites Road Wayside. Many concerns were expressed about the wayside. First, the landowners on either side of Stites Road did not want their property included in the boundaries. Second, there were questions about how difficult it would be for visitors to reach the wayside in inclement weather or when driving recreational vehicles, and what the impact of heavier traffic would be on the county road. Third, landowners were concerned about trespassing. Furthermore, there was misunderstanding about what a wayside is — the planning team envisioned it as a widened area on the road where someone could stop to read a small interpretive sign, but it became clear that the public thought it would be on a much larger scale.

Battle Ridge. Although there was much opposition to including any of Battle Ridge within the proposed boundaries, some landowners expressed an interest in working cooperatively with the National Park Service to preserve the remnants of the 1877 battle and to provide the potential for limited visitor access and interpretation on the site.

Response: The National Park Service has changed its Proposed Action to Alternative 1: No Action. The proposed boundaries have also been adjusted to reflect landowner wishes. We will continue to work to preserve the property rights of all landowners in the area — not only those who object to being included in the proposed boundaries, but also those who wish to be included.

Boundaries for Weippe Prairie

There was overwhelming opposition to designating proposed boundaries on private property at this site. As a result, the proposed boundaries have been adjusted to include only the two existing waysides, one located on Idaho Highway 11, and the other on a section line road southeast of the town of Weippe. The National Park Service has changed its Proposed Action to Alternative 1: No Action.

SURVEYS, STUDIES, AND PLANS FOR RESOURCE PROTECTION

A number of comments made about the need for surveys, studies, and plans for resource protection. Others cited concern for potential impacts on resources, such as vegetative communities and archeological sites. Many of these concerns are related to topics that have been or will be addressed in other plans. The General Management Plan is the lead planning document for the park. Surveys and implementation proposals must support this document and be consistent with it [p. 3]. Additional compliance will be conducted as proposed actions are implemented. Please see Relationship to Other Planning Efforts [p. 9], Surveys, Studies, and Plans for Resource Protection [p. 18], and Compliance [p. 163-164], for information about various steps that will be taken to assure that resources are adequately protected during implementation of the proposals.

Several comments expressed concern about resource management issues on lands administered by other federal agencies. For example, fuel loading at the Bog Bar site in Hett Canyon National Recreation Area was a concern. Timber management was a concern at another site. Management of a site is the responsibility of the administering agency, based on its policies and practices. When the resources are on property owned and managed by another agency or individual, the National Park Service will work collaboratively with the responsible agency or managing agency to conduct necessary studies and meet resource protection goals in a manner least damaging to the cultural resources associated with Nez Perce National Historical Park.

PARTNERSHIPS

Several comments were received expressing remarks on the excellent relationship Nez Perce National Historical Park has with its partners, particularly tribes and other federal agencies. The enabling legislation for the park provides for contracting and making cooperative agreements with a wide range of partners to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any site, object, or property included within the park, regardless of whether it is owned by the government [p. 168-169].

Issues and desired futures related to partnerships are discussed in the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement on pages 5, and 8. Alternative 2, Minimum Requirements, which is the proposed concept for long-term management of the entire park, encourages a more focussed approach to partnerships [p. 12], and provides for taking maximum advantage of partnership opportunities whenever possible [p. 15] and involving greater numbers of partners [p. 18].

Some comments encouraged the National Park Service to work closely with others on efforts related to the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail and the Nez Perce (NPS) and Nez Perce (Army) National Historic Trail. Existing relationships and the desired future relative to these trails are described throughout the document, and are listed in the index. There was a suggestion...
These comments and responses are presented as briefly as possible here. The reader should refer to the section titled Corrections and Revisions to Draft Document, included later in this Final Environmental Impact Statement, to verify that changes were made where appropriate. The page numbers in brackets indicate where the sites are addressed in the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

### SPALDING UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art and Yellowjacket [p. 40]</td>
<td>Leave fence where it is.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyotes Fishnet [p. 44]</td>
<td>Include only wayside in boundaries.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Donation [p. 46]</td>
<td>Revise boundary to include more of actual site.</td>
<td>Unfeasible. Will include only wayside in boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haotino Village Site [p. 53]</td>
<td>Eastern boundary is artificial; doesn’t follow topography or viewshed.</td>
<td>Boundary is the same as the 1976 National Register of Historic Places boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Joseph’s Mission [p. 58]</td>
<td>Protect Nez Perce cemetery.</td>
<td>Cemetery is outside scope of plan. There may be future opportunities to work together on this cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding Visitor Center [p. 64]</td>
<td>Numerous comments and suggestions were made regarding this site.</td>
<td>Proposed actions will update interpretive media to include the new sites, provide more in-depth interpretation of the park’s primary interpretive themes, and facilitate visitors’ experiencing multiple park sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater Battlefield [p. 74]</td>
<td>Numerous comments and suggestions were made regarding this site.</td>
<td>Please see general responses, under interpretation and visitor use, boundaries and land protection, and socio-economic impacts. Proposed Action is changed to Alternative 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kamiah/ Heart of the Monster</td>
<td>This site should be expanded.</td>
<td>The National Park Service has included the McBeth House within the proposed boundaries, and will work cooperatively with its owners to preserve and interpret it. Proposed Action is changed to Alternative 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolo Lake</td>
<td>Statement that “NPS would support reestablishment of traditional uses” is a contradiction to the statement on p. 16 that the NPS “would try not to intrude on [contemporary Nez Perce] lifeways.”</td>
<td>Agreed. See corrections and revisions to Site Specific Information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking Glass Camp</td>
<td>Concern that boundaries do not include all of the resources.</td>
<td>The boundaries at this site were established based on the results of a recent historic resource study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weippe Prairie</td>
<td>Numerous comments were made regarding this site.</td>
<td>Please see general responses, under interpretation and visitor use, boundaries and land protection, and socioeconomic impacts. Proposed Action is changed to Alternative 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss Rockshelter</td>
<td>Concerns were expressed about ownership.</td>
<td>Boundaries were verified. See also response to Keuterville Highway District letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bird Battlefield</td>
<td>Correct existing boundaries. Concerns about visitor facilities.</td>
<td>Agreed. Site &amp; scope for visitor facility has not yet been determined. Detailed project planning with full public involvement will be conducted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Chief Joseph Gravesite [p. 113]</td>
<td>Maintain 8 acres as a buffer.</td>
<td>Agreed. Parking issues will be resolved outside of buffer, and will not intrude into the view from or the historic character of the cemetery. Improved interpretation will consist of small wayside panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favor Alternative 3</td>
<td>Agreed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND COPIES OF COMMENT LETTERS**

Twenty-nine of the 641 letters that were received in response to the *Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* are reproduced in this section. They are organized into groups as follows: letters from federal elected officials and agencies, tribes, state elected officials and agencies, local agencies, and organizations. Within each group the letters are arranged in the order in which they were received. Appendix A displays four form letters, which accounted for 430 of the responses received. All substantive individual comments were addressed in the section titled General Responses to Major Issues, except when it was clear they would be addressed in Specific Responses and Copies of Comment Letters.

Each distinct comment is numbered. The response of the National Park Service to each letter appears beside the letter, with the responses numbered to correspond to the comments. If the issue has been discussed in the general responses, the commenter may be referred to that discussion; if the comment has been answered in a previous letter, the commenter may be referred to that earlier response. When a page number is mentioned, it refers to the *Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*.

The National Park Service recognizes and appreciates the long-term support and volunteer contributions to the park of the many people who wrote comment letters. Implementing the plan will require the continued support and assistance of these people and organizations.
petition to influence the Park's activities. We believe that the public is entitled to be aware of these changes before they occur. The Park should consider our concerns and take appropriate action to address them. We look forward to further discussions on this important issue.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]

[Organization]
The specific land protection strategies were not spelled out in the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement because they must be based on approval of the boundaries proposed in the plan, and this approval does not occur until the Record of Decision is signed. The public comment period is included in the National Environmental Policy Act regulations for precisely this reason—to give individuals the opportunity to express their views prior to an agency decision. Based on public response, we have adjusted the site boundaries to exclude land where the owners objected to having their property included within the boundaries. We will continue to work with landowners who are interested in entering into land protection agreements.

We acknowledge your support for continued cooperation with the local public, and your recognition of the unique character of Nez Perce National Historical Park.

Thank you for the support you expressed for the proposed action at Musselshell Meadow. We also appreciate the significant contribution the Clearwater National Forest has made in Ms. Fee’s time during development of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. We look forward to working with you further.
We acknowledge the support you expressed for the proposed action. We look forward to working with you to develop interagency agreements regarding management of this site. We do not anticipate that any of our plans will affect your research activities.
We appreciate the EPA's review of the document and are pleased that it was determined to be adequate.

The National Park Service will comply with all laws, regulations, and NPS policies, etc. regarding water and wetlands as they relate to anticipated development.

Thank you for noting this error. Please see Corrections and Revisions.

When site-specific project planning takes place, resources will be inventoried and appropriate natural and cultural resource compliance will be conducted. Please refer to page 164 in the draft document.

Development and anticipated use at the Spalding site [page 62] and the Canoe Camp site [page 72] would not change the habitat used by bald eagles nor disturb them. Sturgeon and sockeye salmon are not known to occur at the White Bird Battlefield site.
Thank you for your comments on the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. We look forward to continuing our working relationship with you.

1. The proposed boundary at Dug Bar was adjusted to reflect your comment. We acknowledge your comments regarding interpretation and resource management at this site.

2. The proposed boundary at Joseph Canyon Viewpoint was adjusted to reflect your comment. We share your concerns regarding human waste and the potential for a "de facto" trailhead into the canyon. We will work with you to develop a memorandum of understanding for operational and interpretive considerations for this site.

3. Thank you for the offer to share the opportunities for interpretation and information at your visitor center. We will work with you to determine how best to do this.
Management of a site is the responsibility of the administering agency, based on its policies and practices. When the resources are on property managed by another agency, the National Park Service will work collaboratively with that agency to meet resource protection and interpretation goals. We will work with you and the other involved agencies in the future to outline the details of cooperation and collaboration.

The proposed action at the Spalding Site [p. 60] specifies that adaptive use of the Watson’s Store will be provided for, possibly with leasing arrangements. Use of this structure by tribal artists seems very appropriate, and would benefit both the artists and the visitors. Watson’s Store will need substantial rehabilitation prior to any public use.

Indian preference in contracting is an operational issue, and outside the scope of the General Management Plan process. Additionally, the National Park Service, unlike the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Service, is not able to use Indian preference in contracting and hiring. We do, however, follow the procedures of the Tribal Employment Rights Ordinance and have successfully employed Indian-owned businesses for contracts. We will make every effort to ensure TERO is aware of all park contracting opportunities.
We gratefully acknowledge your support for this plan. We look forward to continuing to work with you to implement the plan.

The four delegates from the Colville Confederated Tribes contributed significantly to the planning process. We appreciate the time and effort they spent.

Colville Confederated Tribes
P.O. Box 150 - Nez Perce, WA 99155
(509) 634-4711

December 6, 1996

Franklin C. Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
P. O. Box 97
Spalding, ID 83551

Dear Mr. Walker:

At a Tribal Resolution 1996-559 which is self explanatory.

1 The preliminary estimate cost for construction of the Interpretive/Cultural Center is $2,700,000. We wish to enter into a G & M contract and maintenance of the complex which is separate from the $2,000,000. Funding for this G & M contract for G & M of the complex to be negotiated between the Colville Confederated Tribes and National Park Service. To facilitate planning of the complex, we have designated Rodney Carson, Architect, and John Etten, Planning as contact persons. They can be reached at 509-634-4711.

2 Thank you for allowing the four delegates that were approved by tribal resolution to participate in the planning process for the General Management Plan of the Nez Perce National Historical Park.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Joseph B. Peterson, Chairman
Colville Business Council

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the draft General Management Plan for the Nez Perce National Historical Park has been submitted to the Colville Confederated Tribes as well as the Chief Joseph Band of Nez Perce for review; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the Natural Resources Committee of the Colville Business Council that the Colville Confederated Tribes, as well as the Chief Joseph Band of Nez Perce support listing the Interpretive/Cultural Center as #1 priority for the Nez Perce (Nez Perce) Site in the General Management Plan page 118 for the Nez Perce National Historical Park to be funded by National Park Service and built in Nez Perce.

WHEREAS, it is further recommended that John Etten and Rodney Carson (509-634-4711) be contacted persons to provide technical assistance and follow up on the above-mentioned Interpretive/Cultural Center.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the Colville Business Council meeting in SPECIAL Session, on the 5th day of December 1996, acting for and in behalf of the Colville Confederated Tribes, do hereby approve the recommendation of the Natural Resources Committee.

The foregoing was duly enacted by the Colville Business Council by a vote of 7 FOR 0 AGAINST, under authority contained in Article V, Section 16 of the Constitution of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, ratified by the Colville Indians on February 26, 1938, and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on April 19, 1938.

ATTACH:
We gratefully acknowledge your support for this plan.

We will continue to work in partnership with the tribe to protect and interpret existing and additional sites.

The park and tribe are developing a new cooperative agreement to help address these issues. The National Park Service is required to follow Office of Personnel Management hiring guidelines.

We share your concerns regarding funding for the implementation of this plan, and will pursue funding according to the priorities established on pages 15 and 16 of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

We look forward to continuing our partnership with the tribe.

Thank you for your active support of the general management planning process.

Please refer to the discussion in the general responses section for Interpretation and Visitor Use.

We appreciate your contribution to the relationship between the park and the Tribe.

December 10, 1996

Frank Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
P.O. Box 93
Spalding, ID 83551-0093

Dear Superintendent Walker:

1. Thank you for attending the Natural Resources Subcommittee on November 15th to comment on the Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Nez Perce National Historical Park and Big Hole National Battlefield. The Nez Perce Tribe is in support of your efforts to develop this plan and appreciates the opportunity to provide comment.

2. Issues or concerns received through our office and staff include: 1) A desire to include Nez Perce artifacts with an office or display space to set up displays and interact directly with the public. We understand the Park does provide for the purchase of Nez Perce artwork, however, the artists themselves would not be able to be housed in a location such as the Visitor Center; or a public space; 2) To protect cultural sites such as the Fort and the Yellowtail Dam and provide interpretive signage. This would include more signage especially at sites that are currently marked such as Adams Place and Indian Site. 3) To identify within the Management Plan how tribal staffing preferences in recruitment and retention of Park employees will be implemented. It is a tribal goal to have employed tribal members who can interact with the public in areas of interpretation, management and ethnography at the National Park level.

3. Lastly, we are very concerned that the appropriate process and funding for this project is carried forward. Currently, there are no funds allocated to implement this plan and we request the National Park Service through the Department of the Interior and U.S. Congress to adequately fund this very important project.

4. Thank you for your cooperation and positive working relationship with the Nez Perce Tribe.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Samuel N. Penney
Chairman

TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Nez Perce

December 11, 1996

Frank Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
P.O. Box 93
Spalding, ID 83551-0093

Dear Superintendent Walker:

1. Thank you for giving us this opportunity to support the efforts by the Nez Perce National Historical Park in developing the General Management Plan.

2. I think the General Management Plan is vital to the future of the Nez Perce National Historical Park and the preservation of "binskau" history for the generations to come. The area which I think a complete management plan is needed is the area surrounding the park proper. There are numerous legend stories surrounding this area and I think the history of this location needs to be preserved in order for people to learn about the Nez Perce People. I like the "heart of the mother" term given where you have an area which is the heart or center of the Nez Perce people and the English cultures are located on a sign allowing the "visitor in" to follow along. Only other area that I would like to address would be the Indian preference hiring practices at the park service. Personally, I appreciate the fact that we do have a great variety of employment opportunities to work for the Park Service, but I do not believe that we can be part of the decision making circle as we are the descendants of the Nez Perce people. People want to listen to the public all about the Nez Perce, the question which is in my mind, who better to tell the public about Nez Perce history than a Nez Perce person?

3. Lastly, I went to thank the Nez Perce National Historical Park for the great working relationship which exists between the Nez Perce Tribe and the Park Service.

Sincerely,

Arthur W. Tayler
Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee

TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Nez Perce
If traffic on local roads increases due to higher visitation at park sites, we will work with county governments to address these needs. Authority for the park to enter into agreements with county governments for this purpose is provided in 16 USC 8a and 8b.

For explanation of a land protection plan, please refer to the discussion under General Responses to Major Issues, Boundaries and Land Protection, Land Protection Plan, earlier in this document. Valuation of land is established by the County Assessor’s office. Because there are no proposals for acquisition at Weippe Prairie, there will be no effect on the tax base.

There is no proposal to acquire land for Weippe Prairie.

A meeting was held with the Clearwater County Commission and with the Mayor of Weippe, Idaho.
Thank you for your support of the general management planning process.

We agree that the interrelationships between the park and the Nez Perce (Nee-Me-Poo) National Historic Trail would have benefited from more discussion. We intend to work toward improving our coordination with the agencies, organizations, and individuals who manage and support the trail.

A more detailed map of the park will be included in the final General Management Plan.

We and our partners have been working with Travel Montana.

Yes, we have been working with the scenic byways programs in states where they exist.

As discussed in the general responses under Land Protection Plan, and in Senator Kemperline's page 16, specific land protection strategies have not been developed for each site, and therefore we cannot yet establish priorities for implementation activities. We, too, look forward to working with you on title transfer for Bear Paw Battlefield to the National Park Service.

We gratefully acknowledge your support for the Big Hole National Battlefield in general, and for the proposed action (Alternative 2).
1 We acknowledge your support of the selection of the proposed alternatives for Dug Bar, Joseph Canyon Viewpoint, Lestine Campground, and Old Chief Joseph Gravesite.

2 As stated in the general response to questions about Surveys, Studies, and Plans for Resource Protection, the National Park Service will work collaboratively with property owners and managers to conduct necessary studies and meet resource protection goals. This includes collaboration to control noxious weeds.

3 Please refer to our general response regarding Establishing Boundaries, and to Senator Craig #2, page 14.

4 We do not object to including land under the ownership of Nez Perce within the Confluence Site boundary. We expect to participate in the Land Protection planning process in order to minimize any negative impact that might ensue due to the property's proximity to the Confluence Site. We also expect to have input into ways to limit the increased traffic on Baker Road that may result as visitors seek to access the Confluence Site.

5 We concur in the selection of Alternative 2 as the proposed action. We reiterate our concern expressed in our letter of November 13, 1996 about the level of fuel loading as a result of decreased grazing at the Dug Bar site. We advocate that the Park Service work with the Forest Service to maintain a reduced level of grazing so that any increase in fuel loading that occurs will be minimized. We also note that the proposed Alternative 2 includes the Hennessey Ranch and the proposed property addition. We also wish to remind the Park Service of the need to make payments in lieu of taxes for lands in Park ownership.

6 We acknowledge your concern regarding increased traffic on Baker Road, and we look forward to working in partnership with you to resolve this and other similar issues as the plan is implemented.

7 The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement states that a fee or partial interest will be acquired only when there is a willing seller and a willing buyer, subject to specific exceptions, such as the property proposed for acquisition adjacent to the Old Chief Joseph Gravesite. Congress designated these exceptions, designated by Congress, which allow for condemnation as a last resort for certain properties if they are threatened. Please refer to the park legislation on page 168 of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.
November 14, 1996
Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
For 92
Spalding, Idaho 83551

Dear Superintendent,

I have read with interest the plan for the Nez Perce National Historical Park. I feel it necessary to comment on the Bear Paw Battlefield portion of the plan. I believe the recommendation for a visitor center is being proposed. I believe too many of major importance should be addressed.

First, the battlefield is in a remote section of Blaine County through accessible by a paved road. The battlefield, historically, is of the utmost importance. It signifies the end of the final Nez Perce Indian War. An important, it further signifies the beginning of the influence of the white man as much as it signifies the end of an era for the Native Americans, not just the Nez Perce tribe. Obviously, Chief Joseph aside, this important historical fact will probably attract people to this site more than any of the already developed sites of the Nez Perce Trail.

Second, because of the impact of people at this site, the battlefield portion of the plan, in my opinion, the story of the historical significance of this site, is needed to handle the influx of people and a myriad of problems that could possibly crop up, such as medical emergencies, toilet facilities, and A.D.A requirements.

I have taken it upon myself to follow a major portion of the Nez Perce Trail as a historian and as a community leader to see firsthand what has happened at other sites. Due to the importance of this site, at the very least a need for more improvements is needed and a visitor center, in my estimation, is a real possibility needed for this site.

Sincerely,

Wendell J. Miller
Mayor
Thank you for agreeing to the proposed boundaries at the Weiss Rockshelter site. The National Park Service does not intend to restrict any rights of the Keuterville Highway District to maintain and repair the road. We hope to enlarge the parking area at the site, subject to future site-specific planning. The safety of visitors and travelers would be an important consideration in that effort.

We look forward to working with you to develop a cooperative agreement.
Improving and better tying individual park sites together is the major challenge of the NHPHP. The present level of interpretation and coordination between sites is lacking in both form and substance. And, aspiring to something "just a little bit better" is simply not going to yield the results the Nez Perce story deserves.

Clearly, there are many ways to improve interpretation and coordination. The site specific information contained in the DGMIP begins to address this. But to make the NHPHP live up to its potential and hold together as a unit worthy of national park designation, it is imperative that each step be made interesting enough to encourage the visitor to engage himself and travel on to the next site. There must also be sites that use relatively high critcal mass to make the park, or major sections of the park, hold together thematically.

More specifically, NPCA strongly supports the aggressive protection of existing and additional sites (including viewpoints) through fire suppression and conservation easement acquisition, as well as voluntary agreements to accomplish same. We also advocate, in lieu of the DGMIP’s emphasis on an expanded visitor center in Spalding and/or significant increases in staff size, emphasis on greatly improving educational and interpretive materials.

Regarding management, the de-centralized nature of the NHPHP prescribes that there be cooperative management agreements between local, state and federal agencies. However, we strongly oppose any management structure that involves the creation of a local park board and/or executive director. The NHPHP should be managed by the National Park Service in accordance with National Park Service policies and guidelines.

Generally speaking, NPCA agrees with the DGMIP’s preferred site-specific alternatives (save for large capital expenditures on expansion of the visitor’s center), but here again, we feel they do not go far enough to protect the resource and/or thematically unify the NHPHP.

In summary, NPCA encourages the NHPHP to exercise more vision and ambition in planning for the unit’s next fifteen to twenty years. While we agree that the preferred Alternative #2 (for general management) may seem the most “practical” in these financially constrained times, it is imperative that the National Park Service be a much stronger advocate for the park and Nez Perce story.

Stevenson

Phil Pearl
Regional Director

cc: William Watters
We will work with you to assure that the marker is protected.

The story of Calamity Jane is beyond the scope of Nez Perce National Historical Park. However, this does not preclude the Yellowstone Historical Society and other organizations such as the Friends of Canyon Creek from developing interpretive information at this location.
Comment Letter
Nez Perce National Historical Park and
Big Hole National Battlefield
P.O. Box 93
Spalding, Idaho 83545-0093
(208) 883-2881, ext. 213

Mail to comments must be postmarked by December 11, 1996

Name: Barnea J. Johnson
Affiliation: Blaine County Museums Collection, Chicoine, MT.
Address: 390 South Bell Dr.
Boise, ID 83702-4605

To: Franklin C. Walker, Superintendent
My comments on the DRAFT General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement are:

It seems silly, at least in my view, that the most significant location of the Nez Perce war, the Bear Paw battlefield, is located in a large oprone combat area. It is the most outstanding example of the conflict engendered between the Nez Perce and the U.S. Army, and the final victory of the battle to recognize the importance of the area's background to not protect the area from outside forces, so that leaving the greatest door of a base unsecured day and night, open for whoever wanders in, or out, under an overcast whatever.

The Bear Paw battlefield needs protection from outside forces that can easily reduce and destroy this important site.

Adding new facilities is causing the town of a dilemma. Please continue on second sheet.

...Now to properly protect this area, as remotely located, poses a big question. A visitor's center would be appropriate during several months of the year when tourists travel far and wide, attended by National Park personnel, but a permanent question isn't sustained at the site during off season months. Like the open door of a bank, it is an uncomfortable notion that the battleground area will remain the same from year to year.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: [Date]

We acknowledge your support of the proposed alternatives at Lostine Campsite, Dug Bar, Joseph Canyon Viewpoint, and Chief Joseph Gravesite.
We acknowledge your support of the proposed alternatives at Lostine Campsite, Dug Bar, Joseph Canyon Viewpoint, and Old Chief Joseph Gravesite.

As the General Management Plan is implemented, we will continue to work with neighbors to be sure that all concerns are addressed.

1

Regarding the Lostine Campsite, the Wallowa County Chamber of Commerce supports the preferred alternatives at Lostine Campsite, Dug Bar, Joseph Canyon Viewpoint, and Old Chief Joseph Gravesite.

2

The preferred alternatives for both Clearwater Battlefied and Weippe Prairie have been adjusted to reflect public comment. We look forward to working with public and private entities in accomplishing the goals of the General Management Plan.

Please also refer to the statements both in the general response section and in earlier letters regarding revision of boundaries based on public comment.
We agree that a limited facility of some type is needed on-site to provide visitor orientation. Please see Mayor Miller, Harlem, MT #1, page 36.
Please see Senator Craig #2, page 14, and also the general response section discussing the Clearwater Battlefield site.

INTRODUCTION

The following sections are the same as the draft document. If there are no changes to a section, that heading is not repeated. Corrections and revisions are noted by page number, paragraph, and, where necessary, line number. A partial paragraph at the top of a page counts as paragraph 1. Material that has been deleted is shown in strikethrough; added material is underlined or otherwise highlighted.

Throughout the document, all references to Idaho Department of Transportation or IDOT are changed to Idaho Transportation Department.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Based on public input, the proposed action was modified. The following changes accommodate those revisions.

Page 15, Alternative 2 heading is revised as follows:

Alternative 2: Minimum-Requirements
Proposed Action

Phasing

Page 15, Paragraph 7 is revised as follows:

Second Priority - Visitor contact facilities would be developed at White Bird Battlefield in Idaho;

Traditional Campsite near Wallowa, Oregon, Bear Paw Battlefield, and the Blaine County Museum in Chinoonk, Montana, and in the Nespelem, Washington area. Improved visitor contact facilities at White Bird Battlefield, Canyon Creek, and Heart of the Monster would be provided. The National Park Service would assist the city information center in Laurel, Montana. During implementation, the need, scale, and siting for any development will be carefully evaluated, and will be subject to public review.

Page 15, Paragraph 9 is revised as follows:

Costs. It is estimated that the construction costs for this alternative would be $14,442,569.$520,388,494. This includes $1,510,579 for first-priority items and $4,945,554 for second-priority items. It is estimated that the rehabilitation and expansion of the visitor facilities would cost $5,609,414 for Spalding, Idaho and $2,603,674 for Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana. See appendix B for more detailed cost estimates.

Page 15, Paragraph 10 is revised as follows:

Staffing. A total of 42.5 additional full-time equivalents would be required for staffing under alternative 2, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Support Unit</th>
<th>10.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spalding Unit</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Clearwater/White Bird Unit</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon/Washington Unit</td>
<td>5-9 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Hole Battlefield/Montana Unit</td>
<td>5-9 10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL SITES AND ALL ALTERNATIVES

Boundaries and Land Protection

Page 17, Paragraph 5 is revised as follows:

The boundaries for each site that are presented in this document are proposed boundaries. Where landowners objected to having their property included within the proposed boundaries, and the site was not a legislated exception, they were deleted. The site-specific maps have been revised to indicate the proposed boundaries as they have been adjusted to respond to public comment. The record of decision for the final environmental impact statement will include identification of the final boundaries, based on the maps shown in...
SUMMARY OF OVERALL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

SOCIOECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

Alternative 2: Minimum Requirements
Page 36, Paragraph 2, revise as follows:

Under this alternative the National Park Service might acquire more private property on a willing-seller basis or might buy more scenic easements than under the no-action alternative. One-time payments at fair market value for lands received would placed federal monies into the private sector. Thus, there would be no adverse effect on owners of private property. Once in federal ownership the affected properties would be removed from the local tax rolls. However, the local tax base would not be significantly affected because most of the land that might be acquired is rural agricultural land; which is taxed at a relative low rate; and the acreage involved is relatively small in comparison to the size of the counties; this would be offset by federal payments in lieu of taxes to local governments.

SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

SPALDING UNIT

COYOTES FISHNET

Page 45, Revise Alternatives as shown below:

Alternative 1: Coyote's Fishnet

PROPOSED ACTION

Alternative 2: Minimum Requirements

Fishnet feature would be correctly identified and sign revised; ownership of both features ascertained; current memorandum of understanding with Idaho Department of Transportation (covering sign and pullout) would be retained; surveys for special concern species conducted, any mitigation needed to avoid impacts on such species would be implemented.

Alternative 3: Actions Beyond Minimum Requirements

Same as 1, plus: site interpreted in context of other nearby Nez Perce legend sites; sign replaced with a less obtrusive display; exhibit features and viewed protected interpretation methods to be included in land protection plan.
CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

P. 161: The following new section has been inserted before the heading "Consultation with States and Other Federal Agencies."

Public Review of the Draft Document

A notice of availability of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register, Vol. 61, No. 199, p. 5373, on October 11, 1996. Approximately 1,200 copies of the draft were distributed to governmental agencies, public interest groups, businesses, media, local libraries, and individuals.

Workshops were held in 16 communities near park sites. Press releases announced these meetings. They were also announced in a transmittal letter enclosed in each mailed copy of the draft document. An additional meeting in Weippe was scheduled at the request of landowners and the community; it was not announced to the general public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number Signed In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missou, Montana</td>
<td>October 28, 1996</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa, Oregon</td>
<td>October 29, 1996</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph, Oregon</td>
<td>October 30, 1996</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise, Oregon</td>
<td>October 30, 1996</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, Montana</td>
<td>November 4, 1996</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook, Montana</td>
<td>November 6, 1996</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel, Montana</td>
<td>November 7, 1996</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapwai, Idaho</td>
<td>November 12, 1996</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding, Idaho</td>
<td>November 12, 1996</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bird, Idaho</td>
<td>November 13, 1996</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grangeville, Idaho</td>
<td>November 14, 1996</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weippe, Idaho</td>
<td>November 15, 1996</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespelem, WA</td>
<td>November 18, 1996</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston, Idaho</td>
<td>November 19, 1996</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooskia, Idaho</td>
<td>November 20, 1996</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiah, Idaho</td>
<td>November 21, 1996</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>512</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The legislative history of the park was reviewed, and the planning process to date was summarized. The cooperative nature of park management was stressed. Copies of newsletters, enabling legislation, the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, and other informational materials were available. After the introduction, the floor was opened to questions. Most of the questions requested clarification of statements within the draft document.

Written comments were accepted through December 11, 1996, which was the close of the 60-day public comment period for the draft document. Six hundred forty-one letters were received. The National Park Service greatly appreciates the time and effort that many people took to participate in the review of the draft document and to comment on the proposals.

APPENDIX C: CULTURAL RESOURCES - STATUS AND PROGRAM

STATUS OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

Museum Collection

Replace Paragraph 3, P. 174, with the following:

The museum collections at Big Hole National Battlefield include archeological collections made by park staff in the 1960's and 1970's, and during the 1991 archeological survey. Important military equipment and original pieces belonging to Nez Perce participants have been gathered and are on loan from such institutions as the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.
November 1996

National Park Service
Nez Perce National Historic Park
Box 97
Spalding, ID 83551-0993

Dear Park Administrator:

I wish to go on record stating that I am OPPOSED to establishing a National Historical Park on the Wapato Prairie and any boundaries around private land.

I feel making this property a national park is an infringement on the rights of the private property owner and will have a negative economic effect on the property owners involved and will financially hurt our community.

I DO NOT FEEL this park will benefit the MAJORITY of the people in this, or any other area.

Sincerely,

cc: Helen Chaves
Larry Craig
Dale Kagenhame
Mike Cope

Nez Perce National Historical Park
P.O. Box 97
Spalding, ID 83551

Franklin C. Walker
Superintendent

Dear Mr. Walker:

I have reviewed the proposed boundaries and information of the Clearwater Battlefield Site located near Stites, Idaho.

For the record, I am strongly opposed to the development of this proposal, for many reasons a few for example.

1. Lower property value
2. Burden County road system
3. Infringement on private property owners

Sincerely,
December 4, 1996

National Park Service
Nez Perce National Historical Park
Box 93
Spalding, ID 83551-0093

Dear Park Administrators:

I wish to go on record stating that I am OPPOSED to the National Park Service or any other government agency establishing boundary around private property on the Weippe Prairie.

I feel making this property a national park is an infringement on the rights of the private property owners and will have a negative economic effect on the property owners involved.

I feel the Musselshell Meadow already represents the canvas and short grass prairie of this area and is already owned by the government. No other park is needed or wanted.

I DO NOT FEEL this park will benefit the MAJORITY of the people in this, or any other area.

Sincerely,

cc: Helen Chenoweth
Larry Craig
Dirl Kemptown
Mike Crops
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Adams, Carolyn M.
Adams, Mark L.
Adkison, Gary R.
Aeschliman, Brian
Aeschliman, Lois E.
Aldrich, James
Aldrich, James D.
Aldrich, Pauline
Aldrich, Alice E.
Aldrich, James D.
Aldrich, Pauline M.
Allpress, Cheryl
Anderson, Shane Lee
Anderson, Clifford L.
Anderson, Leroy Andy
Andrews, Frank B.
Applegate, Gene
Armitage, Gerry L.
Armitage, Marie
Ausman, Nick J.
Bailey, Erik
Ball, Cecil M.
Ball, Diana L.
Ball, E. Arlene
Balley, Ron
Barber, Richard W.
Berreth, Charles C.
Barteaux, Bill
Barteaux, Sheila L.
Baune, Jan M.
Baze, Sheila
Beard, Michael J.
Bell, Mark and Connie
Benson, Renee
Benson, Terrace Lee
Berreth, Michelle
Berreth, Edward L.
Berreth, Cathlin
Berreth, Jason
Billups, Lynette
Billups, Greg.
Binder, Leo
Binder, Alva May
Blair, Patricia A.
Blair, Don
Blanchard, Jerry
Blankenship, Melvin R.
Bieger, Kevin
Blewett, Verda
Bolen, William R.
Bolen, Darlene K.
Bolz, Kevin L.
Bolz, Shannan Lynn
Bon Anno, Mr. & Mrs. Edward G.
Borders, Fred F.
Boose, William M.
Bowen, Jack E.
Bower, Beverly
Boyd (?), Timothy
Brandt, Gramma John
Brandt, Rocky S.
Brandt, Lucky
Breedlove, Jason F.
Breedlove, Jim W. and Linda J.
Breedlove, Jim
Breedlove, Linda
Bredoerker, Tamera K.
Brentaker, James
Brown, Jim
Brown, Sharon
Brown, Robby
Bryson, Freda
Buchel, Sue
Cahala, Robert
Cahala, Steven H.
Cahala, James
Cahill, Nancy
Cahill, Nancy Jo
Card, Lynn B.
Carlen, Ronald
Carlen, Susan
Carson, Mary Catherine
Carpenter, Norma
Carver, David W.
Carver, J. L.
Cash, Frank R.
Chapman, Everett
Chapman, LeRoy
Chapman, James L.
Chapman, Kenneth L.
Children, Wayland
Chuat, Stan
Christian, Wayne
Claffey, James F.
Clark, Dwain
Clark, Christopher L.
Clark, Clarence
Clark, James L.
Clark, Steve
Clark, Alona
Cleveland, Thomas E.
Cleveland, Nicky E.
Cochrane, Art
Cochrane, Diane
Cochrane, Barbara
Cochrane, Jason
Cochrane, Brant
Cochrane, Preston
Colgan, Roger
Colgan, Roger
Consoliner, Pat

Converse, Jeanie M.
Coon, Ira Daud
Coo, Jo
Cooper, Billi
Cooper, Michael
Cornett, Dwight L.
Cox, Margaret M.
Cox, Sandra S.
Cox, Dale L.
Cox, Steve R.
Cox, John L.
Cramer, Rick R.
Cramer, William E.
Cuddy, Charles D.
Cullin, Todd
Curtin, Michael E.
Curtis, Sharon
Daeges, Charles and Sandra
Dahler, Merlina J.
Dahler, Kim and Cindy
Daniels, Cathy
Daniels, Dave and Kathy
Davis, Neona
Deal, Judy
Deal, Mike
Denham, Stanley J.
Deyo, Barbie
Dickinson, Steve
Dieringer, Mr. & Mrs. Henry
Dietz, Laura A.
Dietz, Jolyan E.
Diraim, Kim
Dobson, Patricia
Dobson, Edward J.
Donley, Chester R.
Donnelly, Patrick and Virginia
Dub, Kelly J.
Duffy, Debbie
Dugger, Mike
Dunn, Bruce H.
Dune, Mary and C. Albert
Dunning, James E.
Eagan, Joe and Louella
Eason, Charles and Linda
Eason, Chance
Eason, Susan
Eason, Alice
Eason, Vince
Eberhardt, Shuree
Ely, Kevin R.
Emmert, Jim
Emmert, Mickey
Emory, Cathy L.
Estes, Robin
Evans, Steven R.
Farbo, Thomas P.
Sharp, Lisa K.  
Sheets, Mike  
Sheets, Bobi  
Sheaña, Ken  
Shepherd, Jesse A.  
Shoemaker, Mr. & Mrs. Del  
Shoemaker, D. W.  
Simpson, James R.  
Sinclair, Kristy K.  
Sinclair, Ralph W.  
Skinner, Terri  
Smeltz, Bob  
Smith, Vickie  
Smith, Joseph L.  
Smith, Debra L.  
Smolinski, Alvin  
Smolinski, John  
Snyder, Thomas L.  
Snyder, Jane  
Snyder, Dorothy  
Snyder, H. Dean and Irene F.  
Snyder, Alan  
Snyder, Shannon  
Snyder, Louise E.  
Sorneck, Vera  
Souders, Melinda S.  
Spence, Alexander R.  
Spencer, Roberta  
Spencer, M. M.  
St. Peter, Jeff  
Stamper, Tina  
Stark, Cindy Lou  
Steiner, Chris E.  
Stenzel, Harry  
Stewart, Shelly  
Stewart, William R.  
Stewart, Donald G.  
Stewart, Joyce  
Stewart, Jim  
Stone, Richard  
Stone, Glenn L.  
Stone, Bill S.  
Swanson, Mary Ann and Gene  
Tennent, Jerry V.  
Thigpen, Lee  
Thigpen, Peggy M.  
Thomas, Keith W.  
Thomas, Mary P.  
Thornton, Rose Anne  
Thornton, Lyle A.  
Thornton, Carl  
Tondevold, Bob  
Townsend, Susan  
Townsend, John E.  
Trainor, Roseann  
Trainor, Richard  
Trie, Tamara R.  
Trie, Russell J.  
Umphenour, Maxine  
Umphenour, William F.  
Umphenour, Claud E.  
Umphenour, Steve A.  
Umphenour, Becky  
Vargovich, Adam  
Vargovich, James E.  
Vaugan, Dan  
Weeder, Ben  
Waide, William M.  
Waide, Billie L.  
Ward, Ormai L.  
Wassen, Harold and Eldene  
Watson, Dolores  
Weholt, Rick  
Wells, James E.  
Wells, Vera Jean  
White, Joyce B.  
Wilberton, Steven  
Wilcox, James  
Willet, Gary and Kathy  
Willhib, Dick  
Williamson, Larry  
Wilson, JeAnn  
Wilson, Chris  
Wilson, Gary K.  
Wilson, Chris  
Wilson, Arnold E.  
Wilson, Sharon R.  
Wilson, George E.  
Wilson, L. Kelly  
Win, Linda J.  
Wirth, Bruce M.  
Wirth, Catherine N.  
Wise, Mildred  
Witt, Orville  
Wolverton DVM, Duane D.  
Wood, Richard  
Wright, David C.  
Wright, Thomas L.  
Wright, Bonnie J.  
Wyatt, Sue  
Wyatt, John A.  
Yates, Shirley M.  
Yates, Stan  
Yates, Barbara  
Yocum (?), J.  
Zimmerman, Joan  
Zimmerman, Robert D.  
Zimmerman, Alona R.  
Zimmerman, Donald MacKenzie's Trading Post  
Craig Donation Land Claim  
Camas Prairie  
Clearwater Battlefield  
Looking Glass Camp  
Pierce Courthouse  
Tolo Lake  
Weippe Prairie  
White Bird Battlefield  
Bear Paw Battlefield  
Camas Meadows  
Norwood's Encounter and Howard's Camp  
Canyon Creek  
Ant and Yellowjacket  
Buffalo Eddy  
Coyote's Fishnet  
Confluence Overlook  
Washington/Oregon Unit  
Dug Bar  
Joseph Canyon Viewpoint  
Lostine Campsite  
Montana Unit  
Bear Paw Battlefield  
Camas Meadows  
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ANT AND YELLOWJACKET

BUFFALO EDDY

BUFFALO EDDY, SPALDING UNIT.
USGS QUAD: LAPWAI, IDAHO.

COYOTES FISHNET

COYOTE'S FISHNET, SPALDING UNIT.
USGS QUAD: LAPWAI, LEWISTON ORCHARDS NORTH, IDAHO.
CONFLUENCE OVERLOOK
FORMERLY DONALD MACKENZIE'S TRADING POST

CONFLUENCE OVERLOOK, SPALDING UNIT.
USGS QUADS: CLARKSTON, WASH-IDAHO, LEWISTON ORCHARDS NORTH, IDAHO.

CRAIG DONATION LAND CLAIM

CRAG DONATION LAND CLAIM, SPALDING UNIT.
USGS QUADS: SWEETWATER, CULDESAC, IDAHO.

CAMAS PRAIRIE

CAMAS PRAIRIE, UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT.
USGS QUAD: GRANGEVILLE WEST, IDAHO.
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TOLO LAKE

WEIPPE PRAIRIE

Proposed Site Boundary
(existing Idaho Department of Fish & Game boundary)

TOLO LAKE, UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT.
USGS QUAD: GRANGEVILLE WEST, IDAHO.

Existing Wayside

WEIPPE PRAIRIE, UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT.
USGS QUAD: WEIPPE SOUTH, WEIPPE NORTH, IDAHO.

WHITE BIRD BATTLEFIELD

Federal or other public land within existing boundary
Existing easement within boundary

Highway pull-out and wayside interpretive shelter

WHITE BIRD BATTLEFIELD, UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT.
USGS QUAD: WHITE BIRD, WHITE BIRD HILL, IDAHO.
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BEAR PAW BATTLEFIELD

BEAR PAW BATTLEFIELD, MONTANA UNIT.
USGS QUADS: CLEVELAND NW, CLEVELAND, MONTANA.

CAMAS MEADOWS BATTLE SITE
NORWOOD'S ENCOUNTER

CAMAS MEADOWS, MONTANA UNIT.
USGS QUADS: ANTALOPE VALLEY, IDAMON, KILGORE, PINE BUTTE, IDAHO.
CANYON CREEK

CANYON CREEK, MONTANA UNIT.
USGS QUADS: LAUREL, TWO PINE SCHOOL, MONTANA.

Appendix C
Nez Perce
National Historical Park

Final Environmental Impact Statement