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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/Environmental
ment Impact Statement, as a result of public review.

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

United States Department of the Interior • National Park Service
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.

Site | Date | Number Signed in
--- | --- | ---
Mission, Oregon | October 28, 1996 | 3
Wallowa, Oregon | October 29, 1996 | 18
Joseph, Oregon | October 30, 1996 | 8
Enterprise, Oregon | October 30, 1996 | 8
Widow, Montana | November 4, 1996 | 7
Chunok, Montana | November 6, 1996 | 25
Laurel, Montana | November 7, 1996 | 9
Lapwai, Idaho | November 12, 1996 | 11
Spalding, Idaho | November 12, 1996 | 14
White Bird, Idaho | November 13, 1996 | 10
Grangeville, Idaho | November 14, 1996 | 40
Weippe, Idaho | November 15, 1996 | 125
Nezperce, WA | November 18, 1996 | 21
Lewiston, Idaho | November 19, 1996 | 21
Kooskia, Idaho | November 20, 1996 | 122
Kamiah, Idaho | November 21, 1996 | 70
Total: 512

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 park. They are actively working toward developing an interpretive center in Laurel, and a wingshoot shelter at Canyon Creek.

In Nezperce, Washington, 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 resource, 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 concerning:

- The General Management Plan and the Park in General
- The Environmental Impact Statement
- Interpretation and Visitor Use
- Boundaries and Land Protection
- Surveys, Studies, and Plans for Resource Protection
- Partnerships

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 the 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 scoping 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, 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.
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 as 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 fee or easement, if any, are legislated boundaries. Since the boundaries indicate that federal resources are being used for the protection of significant resources and their enjoyment, some at a distance, by visitors.

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 federal resources are being used for the protection of significant resources and their enjoyment, some 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-interests, such as easements or rights-of-way; and
- acquisition of fee interests, possibly with arrangements for some rights to be preserved such as life estates 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 protect 38 sites scattered across 4 states, fee ownership in most cases is not feasible, cost-effective, nor appropriate. Therefore, the first of these — cooperative agreements — 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
[p. 74]

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 wide side at a curve 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 — only those who wish to be included in the proposed boundaries, but also those who wish to be excluded.

Boundaries for Weippe Prairie [p. 96]

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 northeast 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 remarked on 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. Studies and implementation plans 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 Dog Bar site in He's 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 owner 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 remarking 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 focused 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 (Nee-Me-Poo) 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 sugges-
tion that one park site be devoted entirely to Lewis and Clark interpretation. Such a site exists at Canoe Camp, described on pp. 72-73 of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPALDING UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant and Yellowjacket</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>Hasotino 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater Battlefield [p. 74]</td>
<td>Numerous comments and suggestions were made regarding this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kamiah/ Heart of the Monster [p. 80]</td>
<td>This site should be expanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolo Lake [p. 94]</td>
<td>Statement that &quot;NPS would support reestablishment of traditional uses&quot; is a contradiction to the statement on p. 16 that the NPS &quot;would try not to intrude on [contemporary Nez Perce] lifeways.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking Glass Camp [p. 88]</td>
<td>Concern that boundaries do not include all of the resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weippe Prairie [p. 96]</td>
<td>Numerous comments were made regarding this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weis Rockshelter [p. 96]</td>
<td>Concerns were expressed about ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bird Battlefield [p. 100]</td>
<td>Correct existing boundaries. Concerns about visitor facilities.</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>Favor Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree. 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. Agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Paw Battlefield</td>
<td>Numerous comments were made regarding this site.</td>
<td>Boundaries are revised to protect resources outside current boundary. We will work with the communities and other partners to refine the need, scale, and siting for the facilities at the battlefield. Proposed action is changed to Alternative 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Hole National Battlefield</td>
<td>Favor Alternative 2 Collections at Big Hole are inadequately described</td>
<td>Agreed. See corrections and revisions to Cultural Resources Status and Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas Meadows</td>
<td>Favor Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3 provides interpretation of the sites themselves, in addition to interpretation of the park and the Nez Perce (Nee-Me-Poo) National Historic Trail. Due to the fragile nature of the sites, and concerns of local people that they might be destroyed by visitors, we do not wish to draw additional attention to them. Therefore, we have retained Alternative 2 as our proposed action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Creek</td>
<td>Request that we interpret Calamity Jane.</td>
<td>Topic is outside park purpose. Suggest work with Friends of Canyon Creek to interpret. We will work with partners to be sure monument is protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about existing monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We gratefully acknowledge your appreciation of the complexity of developing this General Management Plan. The support of the Idaho delegation has been a keystone and a beacon for the park. The 15 designated sites. The park has operated since its establishment under the overriding philosophy of partnership and voluntary cooperation for management of designated sites. The boundaries proposed in the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement were based on the need to protect significant resources and provide opportunities for public enjoyment related to purposes of the park. These boundaries do not change the basic approach to providing resource protection and visitor enjoyment — partnership and voluntary cooperation. Based on public response, we have adjusted the site boundaries to exclude the 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.
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Mr. Frank Walker
Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
National Park Service
Post Office Box 90
Spalding, ID 83550-0090

Dear Frank,

This letter is in response to your call for comments on the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (GMFPS) for the Nez Perce National Historical Park and Big Hole National Battlefield.

First, let me comment for your efforts in developing this plan. Trying to address the needs of the Park for the next 15 to 20 years in a daunting task, especially (or particularly) as we continue to come to grips with balancing the federal budget. Along with other Americans, that remains one of my top priorities.

Secondly, I need to express to you the amount of concern this proposed plan has garnered. I have received in excess of 400 letters, in addition to numerous phone calls, from worried constituents. My regional assistant in Lewiston, Susan Pagan, attended a number of your public meetings throughout the region in November where she heard an overwhelming negative response in a specific proposal within the GMFPS. I also met with several private property owners who expressed the concerns expressed in the letters, phone calls and at the public meetings.

This brings me to the key issue of this plan as expressed by so many of my constituents. On pg. 17 of the GMFPS under the "Boundaries and Land Protections" subtitle, the final sentence reads a "red flag" for me:

"Boundaries would be established, and the needs for land protection would be determined..."

The Plan goes on to say that "the legislation for Nez Perce National Historical Park authorizes sites in the five states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana," but nowhere in that legislation does it specify or even suggest boundaries for these sites. As you know, several Northwest states, including myself, sponsored the legislation that recognizes the 14 sites added in 1992. We saw the need to protect certain sites such as the grave site of Old Chief Joseph located near the banks of Wallowa Lake in northeastern Oregon. The legislation also recognizes the Nez Perce involvement in Wyoming although no specific sites are named in that state. I said then and I'll repeat today that this legislation allows recognition of the sites where history was made.

I have received several calls from constituents who are eager to enter into some type of land management agreement with the Park, be it easements or cooperative planning and management options. Where private property owners agree to participate, I fully encourage these actions. However, the majority of private landowners have spoken—loudly and clearly. They feel threatened by boundaries imposed by a federal agency, boundaries that suggest the federal government may infringe on their rights as private property owners.

Frank, Susan told me that in Weippe you assured those residents that "we (the National Park Service) are going to go back and ease these boundaries." From this vantage point, I fully concur with your comments. Where you have willing landowners, it will be appropriate to work with them. Where you have landowner concerns, it will be appropriate to directly address those concerns by dropping the boundary recommendations. I strongly believe the objectives of the act can be achieved by various means other than establishing boundaries.

Overall, any plan that addresses a 15 to 20 year span will undoubtedly contain suggestions that hit snags. My comments have addressed one of these directly. Other suggestions such as improving site interpretation, providing more accurate information for a better understanding of various battlefield components, arranging cooperative efforts with the Idaho Department of Transportation on road realignment, and making agreements with local law enforcement agencies to have them patrol some sites all have great merit. They directly relate to improving visitor experience at various sites of the park, which, in your words, Frank, result "in beneficial cumulative effects" for the park itself.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. If you have questions regarding these comments, please feel free to call me. I look forward to the final plan and its inclusion of public comments.

Sincerely,

LARRY E. CRAN
United States Senator

cc: Concerned Idaho constituents
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.
We acknowledge the support you expressed for the proposed action. We look forward to meeting 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 are aware of the importance of the Looking Glass Campsite as a historically significant area. We have conducted preliminary studies to identify potential impacts associated with the proposed action. As you are aware, we are in the process of constructing an interpretive trail near to the old mill pond, located across the road from the hatchery. We would like to involve the USFWS in this process as much as possible, using the expertise of your White Bird Unit Manager and other interpreters in presenting factual information about this important historic site.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this plan, and look forward to discussing this proposal further. Information/Budget Specialist will be taking the lead on the Mill Pond Trail project for the Fish and Wildlife Service. You may contact her or myself at (208) 476-4591.

Sincerely,

William R. Miller, Manager
Department of Cultural Resources

Franklin C. Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
P.O. Box 93
Spalding, Idaho 83546-0093

Dear Mr. Walker:

We look forward to working with you to interpret the Looking Glass Campsite.

1. We are aware of the Looking Glass Campsite as a historically significant area. We have conducted preliminary studies to identify potential impacts associated with the proposed action.

2. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this plan, and look forward to discussing this proposal further. Information/Budget Specialist will be taking the lead on the Mill Pond Trail project for the Fish and Wildlife Service. You may contact her or myself at (208) 476-4591.

Sincerely,

William R. Miller, Manager
Department of Cultural Resources
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.

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.

Dear Mr. Walker,

Thank you for providing the opportunity to review and comment on the Park Service's proposed plans for the Nez Perce National Historical Park. Because the Hazleton Village (10 NP 151) is now included as one of the sites within the Park, we are interested in learning more about the specific actions which have been identified for this location and the Corps of Engineers' role in implementation.

The information contained in the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) reflects the current conditions at 10 NP 151. The Hazleton village site is located within three of our management units (MU): the Hells Gate State Park MU, currently leased to the Idaho State Department of Parks and Recreation; the Hells Gate Habitat MU, which fulfills wildlife habitat mitigation requirements as part of the Lower Snake River Fish and Wildlife Compensation Plan; and the Hells Gate Low Density MU. The manner in which these proposed actions will be carried out should be identified within the EIS (e.g., agency Park Service effort/funding or a joint effort between the Park Service and land owner). Until this information is available, we will have to reserve additional comments for a later date.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity for review and comment. We look forward to meeting with you on December 19th, to discuss the proposal. At that meeting, we will provide a map with our MU's and the respective land classifications with your proposed boundary.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Carl J. Christopher
Chief, Environmental Resources Branch

Dear Mr. Walker,

I was unable to attend the public hearing on the General Management Plan for the Nez Perce National Historical Park, however, during the Land Commission meeting the topic did surface in relation to the tribal member artists who access sites and the potential to sell their artwork.

1. Specifically there is an interest among tribal artists to lease or utilize either the old maintenance shop or the historic "bureau merchandise" building located at Spalding. The concept is to establish a viable location where local talent will be able to interact directly with the artist as well as being able to market products directly, since you are in a position to reference to the General Management Plan, perhaps these can be incorporated.

2. Also, on another subject, I understand the Nez Perce National Park has some land adjacent to the Clearwater river that is of good quality for hay production. Further, I understand it is currently leased to a local farmer. The Nez Perce Tribe would like to see this site produced in hay production for this purpose. We would like to sit down sometime and to discuss this with you.

Please let us know when it is convenient to meet. Thank you.

[Signature]

Carl J. Christopher
Land Commission Chairman

[CO: Land Commission members Young Americans Program]

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.

1. 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 - Nespelem, 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:

Attached is Tribal Resolution 1996-559 which is self explanatory.

The preliminary estimate cost for construction of the Interpretive/Cultural Center is $2,700,000. We wish to enter into a G&H contract for design and construction of the complex which is separate from the $2,000,000. Funding for this G&H contract for C & M of the complex is to be negotiated between the Colville Confederated Tribes and National Park Service. To facilitate planning of the complex, we have designated Rodney Carver, Archaeologist, as contact person. They may be reached at 509-634-4711.

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,

[Signature]

Joseph T. Pellett
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 a priority for the Nez Perce (Highest) Site in the General Management Plan (page 150) for the Nez Perce National Historical Park to be funded by National Park Service and built in Nespelem.

WHEREAS, it is further recommended that John Stites and Rodney Carver (509-634-4711) be contact 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, this 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 1(a) of the Constitution of the Colville 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.

ATTEST:

Joseph T. Pellett
Chief
Colville Business Council
We gratefully acknowledge your support for this plan.

Please see Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, Land Commission Chairwoman Carla High Eagle #1, page 25.

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.

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 Resource Subcommittee on November 15th to discuss the Draft 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 appreciate 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 sales outlet 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 entire themselves would like to be able to establish a location, such as the Women Store site or a direct outlet. 2) To protect cultural sites such as the Fort and the Yellowstone and provide interpretive signage. This would include more signage especially at sites that are not currently marked such as James Place (legend site). 3) To identify within the Management Plan how tribal/tribe 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.

Lastly, we are very concerned that the appropriate process and funding of 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.

Sincerely,

Samuel N. Penney
Chairman

TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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 "Rielism" history for the generations to come. The area which I have a concern about is the lack of discussion of historic areas such as the Ahnape area. 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 homeland" because where you have an area of the Park which has been identified as the Nez Perce language and the English language are located on a sign allowing the visitor to follow along. The 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 not have a policy of hiring Indians for only Indian positions. I feel that Indian people should be employed on the same terms as any other employee. I have had many discussions about the Nez Perce people and feel we need more Nez Perce people employed to teach the public about the Nez Perce history than a Nez Perce person!

Lastly, I want to thank the Nez Perce National Historical Park for having this working relationship which exists between the Nez Perce Tribe and the Park Service.

Sincerely,

Arthur W. Taylor
Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee
Chairman

TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
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.

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

Dear Mr. Walker:

I have been informed by a number of my constituents and public officials of the park service notice to property owners regarding inclusion of a part of the Weippe Prairie in the Nez Perce National Park.

This has not only raised the concern of the individuals owning property that may be proposed for taking, but also local public officials that provide the public services to the proposed location.

Obviously, the recent action taken in Utah has raised the level of concern in this area and the local attitude toward the federal government. Impact of additional traffic on local roads (particularly those that are not asphalt surfaced) needs to be addressed. Who is your plan to manage dust abatement and increased maintenance on these roads, and various other services provided by local entities?

I also want to know and understand what constitutes a land protection plan, what it means and what effect it will have on the valuation of the land, and how it will affect the tax base of local entities.

In addition, I would like clarification on the statement that your planning effort will minimize land acquisitions and what the acreage of minimization represents.

Clearwater County has its own comprehensive plan, is zoned and has subdivision and building codes. At this point I have not been advised that you have approached any local government officials to discuss their concerns.
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 Kempthorne'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).
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.

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.

We do not object to including land under the ownership of Wallowa County within the Confiscation Site Boundary. We expect to participate in the Land Protection planning process in order to minimize any negative impact that might occur due to the property's proximity to the Confiscation 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 Confiscation Site.
November 14, 1994
Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
PO BOX 93
Spalding, Idaho 83551

Dear Superintendent,

I have read with interest the plan for the Nez Perce National Historical Park. I feel it unnecessary to comment on the Bear Paw Battlefield since the alternative has been changed to Alternative 3. However, I would like to offer some suggestions for a visitor's center being proposed. I believe two issues 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 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 is extremely important. The site is a part of 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 first hand 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,

Mayor

DELIER J. MILLER
Mayor

We gratefully acknowledge your commendation for our efforts at Bear Paw Battlefield.

Please see Mayor Miller, Harlem, page 36.

Please see the general response section on Boundaries and Land Protection Plan. The National Park Service agrees that Bear Paw Battlefield is extremely important to the story of Nez Perce National Historical Park, and appropriate boundary adjustments and land protection strategies will be carefully formulated for this site.
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.

December 1, 1995

Mr. Frank Waller
National Park Service
P.O. Box 93
Spalding, ID 83550-0093

Dear Mr. Waller,

We have received your letter of October 15, 1995 regarding the boundaries of the Weiss Rockshelter Wayside park site. At this time, we do not oppose the recognition of the area as a park site. However, as Commissioners of the Keuterville Highway District, we do need to consider the road right-of-way and environment surrounding the area. The area surrounding the site has from time to time been subject to flooding and washouts from Greaves Creek. It is our interest to ensure safety and travel of our local roads.

In view of the above, we would request that if the site were to be used as proposed, that Keuterville Highway District have the unencumbered right to maintain the road right of way, and perform repair work major or minor due to flooding or other acts. Further, it appears that parking may not be sufficient at the site to allow for safety of the visitors and those traveling the roads. Would it be the intention of the Park Service to enhance the parking area or direct parking to another spot further up the road?

The Keuterville Highway District also may be interested in a cooperative agreement to set out the responsibilities of each of the parties at the site. The agreement could address certain items such as liability insurance, signage, and permits, etc., for coverage and use on the site. We would be happy to discuss these items further at your convenience. Our regular meetings are held on the 3rd Tuesday each month at 6:00 pm at the District Shop. Please feel free to contact myself at (208) 963-3163 or Joe Forrman at (208) 963-3161.

Sincerely,

Charles Grating
Chairman

Keuterville Highway District
P.O. Box 137
Cottonwood, ID 83522

November 13, 1996

Franklin C. Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
Spalding, Idaho 83551

Dear Superintendent Walker,

The Oregon Trails Coordinating Council has reviewed the Draft Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Nez Perce National Historical Park and Big Hole National Battlefield. The Council appreciates this opportunity to provide comments on the proposed park site in Oregon.

The partnershipe developed in association with planning for this site sets an excellent example of the leverage that can result from the organized efforts of small communities working together with agencies and organizations toward a common goal. We look forward to the continued success of this partnership.

We acknowledge your question commenting the need for additional staff at Dog Bar, and your suggestions and support for interpretation and development at Joseph Canyon Viewpoint and Old Chief Joseph Gravesite.

Thank you for your support of the National Park Service.

Sincerely,

James Rosner, Executive Director
Oregon Trails Coordinating Council

Please see Walla Walla County Court #1, page 34.

1. The partnerships developed in association with planning for this site sets an excellent example of the leverage that can result from the organized efforts of small communities working together with agencies and organizations toward a common goal. We look forward to the continued success of this partnership.
2. We acknowledge your question commenting the need for additional staff at Dog Bar, and your suggestions and support for interpretation and development at Joseph Canyon Viewpoint and Old Chief Joseph Gravesite.
3. Thank you for your support of the National Park Service.
1 The planning team gratefully acknowledges your recognition of the complexity of the park and the process we followed in developing this document. Unfortunately, we believe your comments reflect misunderstanding of the present status of park management. The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement does not need to propose significant steps beyond the current management philosophy because, in the past several years, park staff has worked diligently to develop ways to unify this group of diverse sites that are scattered across four states. What is needed are the resources to be able to actualize the potential that already exists. These resources include the full participation of all possible partners, and this participation will be jeopardized if the National Park Service adopts too aggressive a stance in the interests of being ambitious and visionary.

2 The concerns noted here are addressed on page 16 of the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement under Actions Common to All Sites and All Alternatives, Interpretation and Visitor Experience. How these goals are achieved through specific design elements and interpretive media at each site, is a level of detail beyond the scope of a General Management Plan. When the GMP has been approved, the park will immediately begin work on the more detailed plans necessary to implement the GMP for interpretation and visitor use.

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 DGMP 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 each with different critical 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 fee simple and conservation easement acquisition, as well as voluntary agreements to accomplish same. We also advocate, in lieu of the DGMP’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 decentralized nature of the NHPHP prescribes that there be cooperative management agreements between local, state and federal agencies. However, we strongly oppose any management structures 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 DGMP’s preferred site-specific alternatives (save for large capital expenditures on expansion of the visitor center), but here again, we feel they do not go far enough to protect the resource and 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>November 22, 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Walter</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce National Historical Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 90</td>
<td>Spalding, ID 83551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RE: Draft General Management Plan

Dear Frank:

Thank you for the opportunity to offer the following comments on the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DGMP) for the Nez Perce National Historical Park (NHPHP).

First, NPCA encourages the planning team on this monumental effort. The complexity of managing thirty-eight sites over five states has now been eclipsed by the complexity of this document. Generally speaking, it is thorough and thoughtfull.

However, NPCA is disappointed over the DGMP’s lack of ambition and vision. Rather than aspire to and plan for significant improvements to land/resource protection (including new site acquisition) and interpretation, the DGMP unnecessarily limits the NHPHP’s potential. In this regard, the story of Nez Perce country is simply too important and too compelling to settle for anything close to the status quo.

We agree that the preferred Alternative #2 (for overall park management) may be the most practical in these financially constrained times. However, we also believe that a window of opportunity to improve and better tie individual park sites together is rapidly closing. Unless aggressive action is taken, much will be lost within this time-frame contemplated by the DGMP. Potential sites will be lost, viewpoints will be compromised and existing sites will be lost to a sea of needless development.

| William Walters |
| Regional Director |
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 informative information at this location.

November 21, 1996
Franklin C. Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
P. O. Box 93
Spalding, ID 83551

Dear Superintendent Walker:

1. The Yellowstone Historical Society is most interested in the plans as they develop for the Canyon Creek Battle Site north of Laurel Mountains being included in the Nez Perce National Historical Park. Many years ago we received an excellent and placed a marker there. (We realize the answer is not particularly helpful since it gives absolutely no dimensions of any sort for the land under the marker.) However, it is our marker and we are most interested in your plans for it as well as for development of the area.

2. I realize that you are the Nez Perce park. However, I would also like to call your attention to a famous, female western character who lived in the area not many years after the Nez Perce passed by. This character is Calamity Jane (Martha Jane Canary). Her cabin site was quite close to our marker and is easily visible from the marker. Her Horse Cache Butte is also visible from the marker and is currently for sale (so I have been told). Calamity Jane had a cabin along Canyon Creek. She at least worked for and may have been a part of a small gang of horse thieves who went in the area. (The two men were killed in Lewiston NA in an almost straight-from-the-movies shoot-out.) She undoubtedly did "gift their horses down from the home to water each day. She probably cooked for the men. She cut wood and brought it into Billings to sell. Calamity must have had quite a personality. She did all the things no "lady" would ever have done. Yet she is written about (at the time) as a rather out of control, economic, favorite man. She was an enterprising good name and helped folks who needed help, although her help often took strange form. There are many people such as Stella Force (1207 Holmwood Way; Billings, MT 59102) and Dr Richard Holm (University of New Mexico; Center for the Americas West; Albuquerque NM 87113) who have made quite a study of Calamity. Stella's book has recently been published. Dr. Holm is still working on his book on Calamity.

We would hope that you could include at least a little about Calamity Jane in some of your interpretive displays about the area. And we would like to know you plans for our marker as the Canyon Creek Battle Site north of Laurel Mountains.

Sincerely,

Thank you for your support of Nez Perce National Historical Park sites in Oregon.

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

November 26, 1996
Franklin C. Walker, Superintendent
Nez Perce National Historical Park
Box 93
Spalding, Idaho 83551

Dear Superintendent Walker:

The Oregon Tourism Commission's Task Force on Cultural Heritage Tourism supports the efforts of the National Park Service to develop the four Nez Perce National Historical Park sites in Oregon. The Task Force has reviewed the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement released in October and would like to submit comments for consideration.

Tourism is a healthy and growing segment of Oregon's economy, realizing over $4 billion in revenue to the state each year. Cultural heritage tourism is a critical element of the state's visitor industry. It is consistent with Oregon's image and preserves the state's cultural heritage for future generations. The Oregon Tourism Commission has designated cultural heritage tourism as a "niche market" of the state, allocating resources to the development and marketing of high quality visitor facilities and attractions.

The development of the four sites and the addition of interpretation that tells the story of the Nez Perce people in Northeastern Oregon will enhance the visitor product existing in the region. The projects will also complement and advance the efforts of local communities and the Oregon Trails Coordinating Council to develop the Nez Perce Trail as a cultural, educational, economic, and historical resource for the state.

The Task Force supports Alternative 3, the development of an interpretive facility in the Wallowa area. The Oregon Trails Coordinating Council is providing funding and technical assistance to the members of a community coalition already working to develop a facility in Wallowa. A cooperative effort including the National Park Service would advance the work of the local organization. Alternative 2, minimal upgrading at Dog Bar is most appropriate as in Alternative 2, the addition of memorials and interpretation at the Joseph Canyon Viewpoint. The Task Force supports Alternative 3 at the Chief Joseph Gravesite, enhancing the visitor experience through accessibility and interpretation.

The Oregon Tourism Commission Cultural Heritage Tourism Task Force supports the efforts of the National Park Service to develop the four sites in Oregon. We look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

Julie R. White, Chair
Cultural Heritage Tourism Task Force
Comment Letter

To: Nez Perce National Historical Park

From: Norman J. Johnson

Date: November 5, 1996

Subject: Concerns about the Proposed Alternatives

Dear Mr. Wahtoim,

I wish to express my concerns about the proposed alternatives for the Lostine Campsite. I believe that the Lostine Campsite is a historically significant location and should be preserved for future generations. The proposed alternatives do not fully address the cultural and historical significance of the site.

Specifically, I am concerned about the proposed development of a interpretive facility. I believe that this facility should be located away from the actual site to avoid any potential damage or alteration of the archaeological remains. Additionally, I believe that the proposed development of a parking lot and visitor center should be minimized to ensure that the site remains as unobtrusive as possible.

I urge you to consider these concerns and work towards a solution that will protect the cultural and historical significance of the Lostine Campsite.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Norman J. Johnson

[Address]
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 our letter, The Wellows County Chamber of Commerce supports Alternative 5: Indian Special Use Areas. The development of this site for public use is important to our vision to preserve the history and cultural information of the people who once lived here.

2. We appreciate your suggestions and encourage us to make this a desirable project for all parties involved.

Sincerely,
[Name]
[Title]
Nez Perce Interpretive Center, Inc.

December 10, 1996

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. 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.

2. The preferred alternatives for both Clearwater Battlefield 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.

3. The preferred alternatives for both Clearwater Battlefield 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.
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.
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 Chinook, 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 $14,442,266 to $20,386,494. This includes $1,910,579 for first-priority items and $14,544,917 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>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Hole Battlefield/Montana Unit</td>
<td>5.5</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 relatively 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 FISHER NET

Page 45, Revise Alternatives as shown below:

Alternative 3: Actions Beyond 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 2: Minimum Requirements

Same as Alternative 1: No Action

Projected ACTION

Alternate 3: Actions Beyond Minimum Requirements

Same as Alternative 1: No Action

Boundaries for the sites listed below were revised based on public comment. Please see the revised maps presented in Appendix C.

ANT AND YELLOWJACKET

Buffalo Eddy

Coyote's Fishnet

Craig Donation Land Claim

Also in Appendix C is a map showing the CONFLUENCE OVERLOOK site, formerly known as DONALD MACKENZIE'S PACIFIC FUR COMPANY TRADING POST.

UPPER CLEARWATER/WHITE BIRD UNIT

Boundaries for the sites listed below were revised based on public comment. Please see the revised maps presented in Appendix C.

Clearwater Battlefield

Weippe Prairie

The corrected map for the White Bird Battlefield site also appears in Appendix C. A location map for the Asi Smith Mission and Lewis and Clark Long Camp waysides is shown in the same appendix.

CLEARWATER BATTLEFIELD

Alternatives

P. 74: Designate Alternative 1 as the PROPOSED ACTION instead of Alternative 2.

TOLO LAKE

Alternatives

P. 94: Revise Alternative 2 to read as follows:

Same as 1, plus: interpretive materials and waysides would be developed to include full range of events and resources, including ca-mas prairie and canyons; NPS would promote preservation of wider area of prairie and canyon; NPS would support reestablishment of traditional uses by the Nez Perce people; would cooperate with Idaho Department of Fish and Game and others to prevent encroachment on site (implementation methods to be included in land protection plan.)

WEIPPE PRAIRIE

Alternatives

P. 96: Designate Alternative 1 as the PROPOSED ACTION instead of Alternative 2.

OREGON/WASHINGTON UNIT

Boundaries for the sites listed below were revised based on public comment. Please see the revised maps presented in Appendix C.

Dug Bar

Joseph Canyon Viewpoint

Lostine Campsite

NEZ PERCE (NEspelem) CAMPSITES

Alternatives

P. 116: Designate Alternative 3 as the PROPOSED ACTION instead of Alternative 2. Replace wording in Alternative 3 with the following:

NPS would participate in developing an interpretive facility in the Nez Perce area, would work with tribal partners on operations and maintenance.

MONTANA UNIT

BEAR PAW BATTLEFIELD

Alternatives

P. 122: Designate Alternative 3 as the PROPOSED ACTION instead of Alternative 2.

Boundaries for Bear Paw Battlefield were revised based on public comment. Please see the revised map presented in Appendix C.
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. 53373, 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.

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.

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.

APPENDIX A: Examples of Form Letters

The following letters are examples of the four types of form letters that individuals submitted. We received 430 form letters.
November 1996

National Park Service
Nez Perce National Historical Park
Box 32
Spalding, ID 83551-0009

Dear Park Administrator:

I wish to go on record stating that I am OPPOSED to establishing a National Historical Park on the Weippe 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 owners 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 Chesworth
Larry Craig
Dole Kepphrase
Mike Cause
I wish to go on record stating that I am OPPOSITE to the National Park Service or any other government agency establishing boundary around private property on the Weepe 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.

I feel the Moosebell Meadow already represents the grass 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 Chesneth
    Larry Craig
    Dirk Kempthorne
    Mike Crapo

 Adams, Carolyn M.
 Adams, Mark L.
 Adkinson, Gary R.
 Aeschliman, Brian
 Aeschliman, Louis E.
 Aldrich, James
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 Berreth, Charles C.
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 Breedlove, Jim W. and Linda J.
 Breedlove, Jim
 Breedlove, Linda
 Broderick, Tamara K.
 Brotnor, James
 Brown, Jim
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 Brown, Robby
 Bryson, Freda
 Buel, Sue
 Cahala, Robert
 Cahala, Steven H.
 Cahala, James
 Cahill, Nancy
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 Carden, Ronald
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 Carpenter, Norma
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 Chapman, Kenneth L.
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 Cochrrell, Art
 Cochrrell, Diane
 Cochrrell, Barbara
 Cochrrell, Jason
 Cochrrell, Brant
 Cochrrell, Preston
 Coogan, Roger
 Colgan, Roger
 Consoliver, Pat

 Converse, Jeannie M.
 Coon, Ira Daud
 Coon, Jo
 Cooper, Billi
 Cooper, Michael
 Corbett, Dwight L.
 Cox, Margaret M.
 Cox, Sandra S.
 Cox, Dale L.
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 Davis, Neora
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 Dickinson, Steve
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 Eason, Charles and Linda
 Eason, Chance
 Eason, Susan
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 Eason, Vance
 Eberhardt, Shane
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 Emmett, Jim
 Emmett, Mickey
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 Evans, Robin
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 Farbo, Thomas P.
Sharp, Lisa K.  
Sheets, Mike  
Sheets, Bob  
Shen, Ken  
Shepherd, Jesse A.  
Sheemaker, Mr. & Mrs. Del  
Sheemaker, D. W.  
Shupe, Sisalene A.  
Simonson, James R.  
Sinclair, Kristy K.  
Sinclair, Ralph W.  
Skinner, Ralph W.  
Smeltz, Terri  
Smith, Bob  
Smith, Vickie  
Smith, Joseph L.  
Smith, Debra L.  
Smolinski, Alvin  
Smolinski, John  
Snyder, Thomas L.  
Snyder, Jane  
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Snyder, Alan  
Snyder, Shannon  
Snyder, Louie E.  
Sonneck, Louie E.  
Sonniberg, Becky  
Vargovich, Adam  
Vargovich, James E.  
Vaughn, Dan  
Weed, Ben  
Waide, William M.  
Waide, Billie L.  
Ward, Ora M.  
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Weber, Bill  
Webster, James A.  
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Weidner,Arminta  
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Wilson, Mary Ann and Gene  
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Wright, Thomas L.  
Wright, Bonnie J.  
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Wyatt, John A.  
Yates, Shirley M.  
Yates, Stan  
Yates, Barbara  
Yocum (?), J.
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Canyon Creek  
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DUG BAR

JOSEPH CANYON VIEWPOINT

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