

ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY 1992

OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK



CULTURAL RESOURCES DIVISION*PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION*SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Color Scans

10/10/2002

ON MICROFILM

PLEASE RETURN TO:
TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
DENVER SERVICE CENTER
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK:
AN ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY

National Park Service
Pacific Northwest Region
Seattle, Washington
May, 1990

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

THE RESOURCES OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK	1
THE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF THE PARK	1
THE PURPOSE OF THE PARK	1
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARK	1
PRIMARY RESOURCES OF THE PARK	2
Geological Resources	2
Flora	2
Fauna	3
Cultural Resources	4
CONCLUSION	5

Chapter 2

THE PASSIVE FEDERAL PERIOD:

PRESETTLEMENT TO FOREST RESERVE, 1774-1897	7
EARLY EUROPEAN EXPLORATION	7
EARLY SETTLEMENT	9
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	11
INLAND EXPLORATION: 1885 - 1891	13
The O'Neil Expedition (1885)	13
The <i>Press</i> Expedition (1889-90)	14
The O'Neil Expedition (1890)	15
INLAND SETTLEMENT: 1888 - 1897	18
Queets River Valley Settlement	18
The Ozette Lake Settlement	18
Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault Settlements	19
CREATION OF THE OLYMPIC FOREST RESERVE: 1870 - 1897	20

Chapter 3

FEDERAL PRESENCE ON THE OLYMPIC PENINSULA:

THE UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, 1897-1933	23
REDUCTION OF THE OLYMPIC FOREST RESERVE: 1897-1901	23
J. W. Cloes, Olympic Forest Reserve	23
U.S. Geological Survey	25
Gifford Pinchot, Department of Agriculture	25
Binger Hermann, General Land Office	26
D. B. Sheller, U.S. Forest Service	27
Summary	28

EARLY FOREST SERVICE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: 1898-1912 ..	30
Fred Hansen, Superintendent, 1903-1909	30
R.E. Benedict, Superintendent, 1909-1912	32
Parish Lovejoy	33
THE CREATION AND REDUCTION OF MOUNT OLYMPUS NATIONAL MONUMENT	34
Protection of Elk	35
Opposition to the Monument	36
Timber and Mineral Industry Opposition	38
The Forester S. Graves Report	39
Agreement and Resolution 1916	43
FOREST SERVICE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: 1915-1933	44
EROSION OF FOREST SERVICE CONTROL: 1915-1933	46
Protection vs. Hunting of Elk	47
The End of Forest Service Jurisdiction Over Mount Olympus National Monument	52
CONCLUSION	54

Chapter 4

THE FEDERAL PERIOD PHASE 2:

THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE	55
EARLY ACTIVITIES 1933-1938	56
Brant Addition 1938-40	77
PWA Acquisition	80
Morse Creek Addition	83
The Truman Executive Order	84

Chapter 5

THE FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS:

PRESTON MACY AND FRED OVERLY, 1938-1958	87
THE EMERGENCE OF EARLY WILDERNESS CONCEPTS 1900-1933 ..	88
PRESTON P. MACY: 1938-1951	93
Administrative Staff	94
Administrative Facilities	95
FRED OVERLY: 1951-58	97
CONCLUSION	99

Chapter 6

THE SUPERINTENDENTS, 1959 TO THE PRESENT	101
THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW WILDERNESS PHILOSOPHY	101
Dan Beard and John Doerr	104
Bennett Gale and Stuer Carlson: 1964-1969	106
Roger Allin: 1970-76	108
James Coleman: 1977-79	110

Roger Contor: 1979-1983	111
Robert Chandler: 1983-Present	112
CONCLUSIONS	113
Chapter 7	
THE RANGERS OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK	115
PARK SERVICE PERSONNEL STANDARDS	115
Chief Rangers	118
Ranger Functions	118
Resource Protection Standards	120
NUMBER AND ACTIVITIES OF VISITORS	123
Visitor Protection	125
CONCLUSIONS	126
Chapter 8	
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	129
MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY OVERVIEW	129
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AT OLYMPIC ..	133
Fish	133
Wildlife	136
RAIN FOREST AND ALPINE VEGETATION	139
Rain Forest Management	139
Alpine Floral Management	141
CULTURAL RESOURCES	142
CONCLUSION	146
Chapter 9	
CONCESSIONS AND VISITOR FACILITIES	147
CONCESSIONS	147
VISITOR USE FACILITIES	154
Hurricane Ridge Lodge	154
Campgrounds and Shelters	155
CONCLUSION	158
Chapter 10	
MAINTAINING PARK RESOURCES	159
MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES: 1938-1970	159
MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES: 1970-present	162
CONCLUSION	165
Chapter 11	
INTERPRETATION	167
INTERPRETIVE PERSONNEL	167
INTERPRETIVE FACILITIES	170

INTERPRETIVE INFORMATION	173
CONCLUSION	175
Chapter 12	
RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE ENTITIES	177
OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES	178
U.S. Forest Service	178
INDIAN TRIBES	181
OTHER AGENCIES	192
INHOLDERS	194
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	206
NATIONAL AND LOCAL CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS	214
BIBLIOGRAPHY	221
APPENDIX A	231
APPENDIX B	233
APPENDIX C	249
APPENDIX D	251

CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1

THE RESOURCES OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

Olympic National Park is a rich area of numerous and varied resources. Within a distance of about forty miles, the Olympic Mountains rise from sea level to the summit of Mount Olympus, 7,965 feet above sea level. Rocky bluffs and sandy beaches stretch along a fifty-seven-mile coastal strip; sea stacks and islands dot the waters offshore. As wind currents sweep moist air inland from the Pacific Ocean, mist rises against the mountains. As the air cools, it sheds its moisture on the western flanks of the Olympics, nourishing lush green temperate rain forests in the major river valleys. This is a land of contrasts. Mount Olympus, capped with several glaciers, receives as much as 200 inches of precipitation a year, most of it in the form of snow. The northeastern portion of the peninsula lies in the rain shadow of the mountains. There the nearby town of Sequim receives only about seventeen inches of rainfall per year, and irrigation is necessary to grow crops on the surrounding prairie.

THE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF THE PARK

Olympic National Park occupies the heart of the Olympic Peninsula as well as a narrow strip along most of the peninsula's Pacific coastline. Its more than 900,000 acres lay mostly in Jefferson and Clallam counties. Small portions of Mason and Grays Harbor counties are also within the boundaries of the park.

THE PURPOSE OF THE PARK

Section 1 of the June 29, 1938 act of Congress creating the park states that the park was established "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."¹ In fact, it was established as a "large park," much larger than most earlier parks, and as a wilderness park in the 1930s interpretation of that term. (See chapter 4.)

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARK

Olympic National Park encompasses many life forms that have existed in their natural state from time immemorial. The ruggedness of the Olympic Mountains and the density of the rain forests protect much of the area from any significant intrusion by man. The pristine condition of much of the park's ecosystem provides a baseline for the measurement of man's impact on the environment in other areas. The integrity of this resource has been recognized by the United Nations, which designated it as an International Biosphere Reserve in 1977 and as a World Heritage Site in 1981.

¹ *U.S. Statutes At Large*, Vol. 52:1241.

PRIMARY RESOURCES OF THE PARK

Geological Resources

Mount Olympus and the Olympic Mountain Range. The Olympic Mountains were formed between 15 million and 55 million years ago when two crustal plates collided and drove the mountains up from the ocean floor. The rock in the Olympic Mountains is formed from oceanic volcanics and off-shore sediments, which were carried and bound to the North American continent by the conveyor belt action of ocean floor movement caused by currents in the earth's mantle. In the Pacific Northwest, the ocean floor crust was created at the Juan de Fuca Ridge to the west of the peninsula. As it spread toward North America, some of it dove beneath the continental plate, while the remainder was scraped off and added to the continental crust. Through time, this movement has occurred in spurts and changed direction. Changes in the relative speed of this process caused the material that was to become the Olympics to float to the surface in a vast dome.² Because of the way they were created, the mountains are unusually jumbled and rugged. During the past millennia, streams and glaciers have carved the Olympics into the striking array of mountains and valleys of today.

Blue Glacier and other glaciers. The Olympics contain more than sixty alpine glaciers, including the Blue, the Hoh, and the Jeffers. These glaciers feed several of the park's major rivers.

Lake Crescent. This beautiful blue-green lake lies nestled within forested mountain slopes at the northern boundary of the park. Glacial activity carved the basin of Lake Crescent to a depth of more than 600 feet in some places. This lake is the home of the Beardslee trout, a species unique to the park.

Ozette Lake. Ozette Lake is the westernmost fresh water lake in the continental United States, less than three miles from the Pacific Ocean.

Flora

The Rain Forests. Rain forests stretch along the western slopes of the Olympics. They are the result of the Japan Current, which brings cold water from the coast of Siberia along the shores of the Olympic Peninsula. The temperature differential between land and water has created a rain cycle that deposits more than 140 inches of rain per year on the western slope. The result is a dense rain forest of Sitka spruce, western hemlock, Douglas fir, and other conifers that grow to spectacular size. The rain forests are located in the Hoh, the Quinault, and the Queets river valleys.

² Warren review notes.

The Subalpine Meadows. During the spring and summer, the meadows in the high country are filled with spectacular wildflower displays. It is estimated that as many as eight species of wild flowers survived the Ice Age. Some of the plants that are found here include Flett's violet, Piper's bellflower, Olympic Mountain daisy, lupine, glacier lilies, and avalanche lilies.

Fauna

Roosevelt Elk. The park contains the largest free-roaming herd of Roosevelt elk in the United States. Present estimates place the size of the herd at 5,000 to 7,000 head. The herd is migratory, spending the winters on the lower levels of the western slope rain forests. In the spring and summer, the elk tend to separate into two groups. One group migrates to the high country, while the other moves part way up the valleys within the rain forests. The Roosevelt elk was identified as a separate species in 1897 by Dr. Charles Merriam of the Biological Survey. He named the species after Theodore Roosevelt. Subsequent research determined that the herd is actually an elk subspecies.³

Other Mammals. The park is home to the cougar, the elk's principal predator, as well as the black bear, black-tailed deer, coyote, and bobcat. Several smaller animals that are found only on the peninsula reside here. The Olympic marmot, readily visible to visitors at Hurricane Ridge, is a distinct species. Subspecies unique to the Olympic Peninsula include the Olympic snow mole, the Olympic Mazama pocket gopher, the Olympic chipmunk, and the Olympic version of the shorttail weasel. Mountain goats, transplanted from British Columbia and Alaska in the mid-1920s, thrive in the higher elevations of the park. Their presence poses a severe natural resource management problem (see chapter 8.) The wolf was hunted and trapped until it disappeared from the Olympic Peninsula sometime before 1930.

River and Lake Fish. The streams of the park host several anadromous fish runs. All five species of Pacific salmon, as well as steelhead and cutthroat trout, migrate up the park's streams to spawn. The salmon are genetically distinct native stock, biologically distinguishable from salmon raised in hatcheries. The Beardslee trout of Lake Crescent is also a genetically distinct native species. (See chapter 8.)

Coastal Strip Intertidal Zone. This resource, which is the area between the high- and low-water marks along the Coastal Strip, is a recent addition to the park. Despite its narrowness, it contains four different life zones that are based upon water contact. The four zones are the spray, upper intertidal, middle intertidal, and lower intertidal.

These zones are distinguished by the amount of time each is exposed to sea water. The spray zone receives only ocean spray at high tide and is defined by the presence of black

³ D. B. Houston, B. B. Moorhead, and R. W. Olson. "Roosevelt Elk Density in Old-Growth Forests of Olympic National Park." *Northwest Science* 61 (1987): 1.

lichen and two barnacle species — the little acorn and the common acorn. The upper intertidal zone is covered by water only at high tide and is defined by the presence of rockweed and algae. The middle intertidal zone is covered by water approximately twelve hours each day and is defined by markedly more diverse and complex sea life forms, including two mussel species, the blue and the California; the ochre seastar, the controlling predator of this zone; and the sea cabbage. The lower intertidal zone is underwater except at low tide and is marked by the presence of split kelp and purple sea urchins. It also contains a greater number of seaweed species, as well as sea stars, crabs, and mollusks. The proximity of different and complex organisms in the intertidal zones provides opportunities to test ecological theories on a small scale. These theories can then be generalized to include much larger biological systems.⁴

Cultural Resources

Park cultural resources include archeological sites and historic structures, landscapes and trails representing pioneer settlement, tourism, recreation, Forest Service administration, and the presence of the National Park Service. Lake Crescent Lodge and the Rosemary Inn, both National Register properties on Lake Crescent, date from 1915 and 1914, respectively. Lake Crescent Lodge, where President Franklin D. Roosevelt stayed during his visit to the park in October, 1937, although recently renovated and restored, retains its original style, appearance, and atmosphere. The Rosemary Inn has also been renovated and restored. It serves as the campus for the Olympic Park Institute's environmental education programs. (See chapter 9.)

Pioneer settlement is represented by the Humes Cabin and the Roose homestead. The Humes Cabin, located in the Elwha Valley, was built by Will and Grant Humes around 1900. It is the oldest settlement structure in the park. The Roose homestead is located on a small prairie between Ozette Lake and Cape Alava on the Pacific Coast. The present group of structures was built by Peter Roose in the early 1930s on the site of his older cabin.⁵ Roose and his neighbor, Lars Ahlstrom, were at one time the westernmost homesteaders in the contiguous United States.

The Forest Service era is represented by front- and back-country guard and ranger stations, trail shelters, and miles of trail systems. The largest complex is the Elwha Ranger Station, which includes residences, a ranger station, and a maintenance complex. Structures such as the Elwha and Altaire campground shelters are associated with the presence of Civilian Conservation Corps camps on the peninsula during the 1930s. The most ambitious Public Works Administration project in the park is the headquarters complex built for the National Park Service in Port Angeles between 1938 and 1941.

⁴ Henry C. Warren. *Olympic: The Story Behind the Scenery* (Los Vegas: KC Publications, 1982), 40-51.

⁵ T. Allan Comp et al. *Historic Building Inventory: Olympic National Park* (Seattle: National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, 1984), 699, 1217-19.

This complex is also significant as an example of the last phase of the National Park Service rustic style, which provided the design vocabulary for Park Service structures throughout the system from the late 1920s to the outbreak of World War II.

CONCLUSION

Olympic National Park contains spectacular and diverse resources. The park's flora and fauna, for the most part, exist as they have from time immemorial. They have been protected because of the geographic isolation of the Olympic Peninsula, because its ruggedness made pioneer settlement difficult, and because, in 1897, President Grover Cleveland reserved much of the peninsula from settlement. In the 1930s, President Franklin D. Roosevelt supported the establishment of a large national park on the Olympic Peninsula. The National Park Service's mandate is to preserve these resources for present and future generations and to provide the park visitor with the opportunity to experience at many different levels the existence of nature relatively unmodified by the presence of man.

CHAPTER 2

Chapter 2

THE PASSIVE FEDERAL PERIOD: PRESETTLEMENT TO FOREST RESERVE, 1774-1897

This chapter discusses the history of the Olympic Peninsula from its earliest observation by European explorers to the February 22, 1897 proclamation by President Cleveland establishing a forest reserve of more than two million acres and a permanent active federal government presence on the Olympic Peninsula.

Prior to granting statehood to Washington in 1889, all lands in the territory were controlled by the federal government and were managed passively. That is, they were held by the United States for the sole purpose of entry and acquisition by prospective farmers or mineral developers. Upon statehood, sovereignty over all lands within the state, including unreserved lands of the United States, became vested in the state. Prior to the formal tender of statehood, however, the territorial legislature disclaimed title to all lands then owned by the United States. Most of the Olympic Peninsula, because it was unoccupied and therefore unreserved, remained the property of the United States and, until 1897, was managed as though the lands were still a territory.

This chapter reviews the coastal explorations of the Spanish and English, the settlement patterns and economic activities of peninsula pioneers, 19th century attempts to explore the areas which are now included in Olympic National Park, and the events that led to the creation of the Olympic Forest Reserve.

EARLY EUROPEAN EXPLORATION

The first documented European sighting of the Olympic Peninsula and its mountains was by the Spanish explorer Juan Perez, captain of the *Santiago*, on August 11, 1774. He named the highest peak in the range Santa Rosalia. This high peak was named Mount Olympus by the English explorer Captain John Meares, who first sighted the mountain on July 4, 1778. Meares chose the name because he felt that the rugged beauty of the mountain and those surrounding it made it a residence befitting the gods of ancient Greece.¹

In 1792, British Captain George Vancouver led an expedition on what was to be the first systematic exploration and mapping of the Pacific Northwest coastline. Vancouver used Meares's name for the mountain on his maps. He extended the concept by naming the surrounding mountains the Olympics. Because of the primacy and accuracy of

¹ Robert L. Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains: Lieutenant O'Neil's Olympic Expeditions* (Binghamton, N. Y.: Vail-Ballou Press, 1976), 1.

Vancouver's maps, the place names he devised or adopted generally endured. Therefore, Mount Olympus "became the first geographic feature within the present...State of Washington" to have an official place name.²

Vancouver's expedition also named Grays Harbor in honor of its discoverer, Shipmaster Robert Gray. Gray, who had served on the crew that first carried the American flag around the world, was the first American to sail the waters off the Olympic Peninsula. On May 7, 1792, Gray entered a large bay aboard his ship, the *Columbia Rediviva*. He named the bay Bullfinch's Harbor, after one of the Boston shipowners who had financed his expedition. However, shortly thereafter, Vancouver sent one of his officers to explore and evaluate Gray's discovery. The officer named the bay Gray's Harbor in his report and Vancouver duly recorded that name on his maps. Vancouver's place name endured, in part because his maps were published and Gray's were not.³

Dangerous coastal sailing conditions and hostile natives hindered early exploration. The coastal waters of the Pacific Northwest, especially those above Rialto, challenged navigators with violent winter storms, hidden or obscured rock formations, and treacherous tides. Cape Johnson was given its name by Vancouver in 1792 in memory of a Scandinavian fisherman who lost his life in a wreck near the cape.⁴ In October 1893, a Chilean ship was trapped by a gale and smashed against the rocks near the same site. Another Chilean ship, the *W. J. Pirrie*, was lost here in 1920.⁵ Giant's Graveyard, a dangerous rock formation near Point of Arches, was not charted until 1887.⁶

The Native American inhabitants of the western coast of the peninsula also posed a threat to European explorers. On July 14, 1775, a seven-member foraging party was sent inland by Juan Francisco de la Bodega y Quadra, captain of the *Sonora*, to replenish the ship's water supply, gather firewood, and find a replacement for the ship's topmast. The party, armed with muskets, cutlasses, pistols, cartridge boxes, and several hatchets, landed on the shore south of the Quinault River. They were met by a party of 300 Indians and killed after two hours of fighting.⁷ A similar event occurred in July of 1787. Charles Barclay, British captain of the *Imperial Eagle*, sent six sailors to the mouth of the Hoh River, where they were killed by Indians.

² Smitty Parratt. *Gods & Goblins: A Field Guide to Place Names of Olympic National Park* (Port Angeles, WA: CP Publications, Inc., 1984), 131.

³ Ruth Kirk. *Exploring the Olympic Peninsula* (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 56.

⁴ Parratt. *Gods & Goblins*, 22, 25.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid., 53.

⁷ Ibid., 35.

Another event illustrating the problems faced by early explorers occurred in 1808. On November 1, a Russian brig, the *Saint Nicholas*, was engaged in fur trading when she was wrecked at Rialto Beach. The crew of twenty-one managed to abandon ship, but were attacked later the same day by the Quileute Tribe. The crew used their superior firepower to fend off the attack and fled south toward Grays Harbor to meet another Russian ship. The Quileutes followed at a safe distance until the crew reached the Hoh village, where the crew met with what they presumed to be a friendly group of Hoh natives and negotiated for safe passage across the Hoh River.

The Indians took some crew members in two canoes and, when they reached the middle of the river, pulled cedar plugs out of the bottoms of the canoes, which then sank, leaving the Russians to struggle in the middle of the Hoh River with their gear. Four were taken prisoner, and the rest fled up the Hoh where they spent part of the winter. In February 1809 the group moved back downriver. A few surrendered to a party of Makah Indians; the rest were captured and held by the Hoh and Quileute until they were ransomed in 1810. They learned later that the Indians with whom they had negotiated passage were not Hohs, but members of the attacking party who had preceded them to the Hoh village.⁸

EARLY SETTLEMENT

The early European exploration resulted in the systematic mapping of much of the Pacific Northwest coastline. The Vancouver expedition completed much of the work. By 1800, sufficient exploration had been completed to allow for settlement to occur. During the first half of the 19th century, however, there was little permanent settlement. The interior of the peninsula was as hostile to transportation as the coastline was to navigation. A political dispute over the ownership of the territory after the War of 1812 between Britain and the United States also discouraged settlement.

During the first two decades of the 19th century, the principal economic activity on the peninsula was fur trading. The British North West Company and America's John Jacob Astor competed for control of the trade. Astoria, the headquarters for Astor's trading operation, was established in May 1811, ten miles from the mouth of the Columbia River on its south bank at the site of present-day Astoria, Oregon. It was captured by the British Navy in 1814 and, for the next thirty years, the respective rights of the British and Americans in the region were not defined. Fur prices declined. Thus, there was little economic incentive for settlers to enter the region during the 1820s and 1830s. Unstable political conditions added to the geographic factors inhibiting growth.

⁸ Ibid., 142. See also *The Wreck of the SV. Nikolai: Two Narratives of the First Russian Expedition to the Oregon Country 1808-1810*, ed. with an introduction by Kenneth N. Owens, trans. by Alton S. Donnelly (Portland, OR: Western Imprints, The Press of the Oregon Historical Society, 1985).

During the 1840s, the eyes of eastern America began to look to the west. The Oregon Trail, blazed in 1843, brought a new wave of immigrants to the Pacific Northwest, and the June 15, 1846 treaty between Great Britain and the United States gave the United States clear title up to the 49th parallel.⁹ This enabled the federal government to establish the Oregon Territory and formally define its boundaries. The leading candidate to be the first territorial governor, Abraham Lincoln, turned down the offer. As a result, Joseph Lane was appointed.¹⁰

The discovery of gold in California in 1849 not only attracted a large number of immigrants westward, but also created a market for the principal resource of the Olympic Peninsula — timber. Individual settlers began arriving on the peninsula in the 1840s. They tended to settle on the northern and eastern peripheries of the peninsula, where they were protected from the harsh coastal weather by the Olympic Mountains. No evidence exists to show that there was any settlement during the antebellum period on the peninsula except along the coasts.¹¹

During the years 1853 through 1855, two events occurred which encouraged population growth on the peninsula. First, in 1853, Congress established a separate territorial government for Washington Territory and Isaac Stevens was named the first governor. Second, during the years 1854 and 1855, Stevens worked diligently to establish stable and peaceful relations with all the Indian tribes within the territory and on the peninsula by signing a series of treaties. The treaties included the Treaty of Neah Bay, signed on January 31, 1855; the Treaty of Point-No-Point, signed on January 26, 1855; the Treaty of Point Elliott, signed on January 22, 1855; and a treaty with the coast tribes north of Grays Harbor, signed on July 1, 1855.¹²

The language of each treaty varied slightly, but all contained certain common elements. The tribes agreed to relinquish ownership of most of the land that they occupied and to reside peacefully on lands chosen by the U.S. government. They agreed to free their slaves, to avoid trade with Canada, and to keep liquor off the designated reservation areas. In return, the United States promised to pay the tribes a fair amount for the lands ceded to the government, to protect the rights of the tribes and their members to fish in common in their usual and accustomed places, and to provide schools, doctors, and other needed services.¹³

⁹ Mary W. Avery. *Washington: A History of the Evergreen State* (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 141.

¹⁰ WPA Federal Writers' Program. *Washington: A Guide to the Evergreen State* (Portland, OR: Binford & Mort, 1941), 43.

¹¹ Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 2-3.

¹² Edmond S. Meany. *History of the State of Washington* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1909), 173-74.

¹³ Avery. *Washington: A History of the Evergreen State*, 176-77.

The first concentration of population sufficient to plat a town occurred at Port Townsend on the northeastern corner of the peninsula in 1852, a year before the territorial government was established. The town thrived for a number of years thereafter as a port for ships entering or leaving Puget Sound. Port Gamble, Shelton, and Port Ludlow were established within two to three years of the founding of Port Townsend.

Port Angeles, on the northern coast of the peninsula, was given its first developmental boost by Victor Smith, United States Treasury agent, collector of customs for the Puget Sound District, and land speculator. Settlers had begun to gather at this natural harbor as early as 1857, and the 1860 census counted the members of the community as residents of Cherbourg. (Cherbourg was an earlier name for the townsite because Isaac Stevens, who represented Washington Territory in Congress during the years before the Civil War, had compared the harbor with the French seaport when seeking funds for a military installation at Port Angeles.) Smith, who had a financial interest in the Cherbourg Land Company, was a political operator with strong connections. He managed to persuade his friend, Secretary of the Treasury Salmon Chase, to recommend to Congress that the customs office at Port Townsend be moved to Port Angeles. He also prevailed on President Abraham Lincoln to proclaim Port Angeles a "National City." In 1862, the president signed an executive order setting aside the Port Angeles townsite as a lighthouse and military reserve, removing it from the public domain. In addition to establishing a lighthouse on Ediz Hook, it was hoped that public sale of townsite lots within the reserve would produce revenue for the Civil War-depleted federal treasury.¹⁴

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

Since the beginning of permanent habitation of the Olympic Peninsula, the dominant economic activity has been the harvest, milling, and transport of timber. In 1852, the first sawmill in Jefferson County was built in Port Ludlow. Felling trees and floating them to ships bound for California were among the earliest economic activities at Port Townsend.¹⁵ At the eastern tip of Grays Harbor, "Aberdeen and Hoquiam were born of lumber, and through it chiefly they lived."¹⁶

The main reason for the timber industry's dominance was the immense value of the resource. During the 19th century, the stands of old-growth timber today found almost solely within Olympic National Park extended throughout the western half of the peninsula. Near Grays Harbor stood the greatest stand of Douglas fir ever found in the

¹⁴ Paul J. Martin. *Port Angeles, Washington: A History*, vol. 1 (Port Angeles: Peninsula Publishing Company, 1983), 23.

¹⁵ WPA Writers' Project. *Washington: A Guide to the Evergreen State*, 546-547.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 166.

Pacific Northwest. Township 21 N, Range 9 E, abutted the harbor. This single 36-square-mile tract was logged for old growth for thirty years.¹⁷

In the 1880s, with the development of better timber-harvesting equipment, the speed with which trees could be cut increased, as did the value of the peninsula's timber. The introduction of the steam engine, which moved north from the redwood forests to the peninsula in 1882, drove this development.¹⁸ During the 1880s, the ability of a logger to cut more efficiently within a stand of timber led to an increase both in mill capacity and in the number of mills. The equipment for the first Aberdeen mill was brought in by George Simpson in 1882. The mill was up and running by 1884. Hoquiam, Aberdeen's sister city at the eastern end of Grays Harbor, had a mill by 1885.¹⁹ Mills were also built in Port Angeles and Port Crescent and "proliferated on the Hood Canal side" of the peninsula.²⁰

A second reason for the dominance of timber in the peninsula economy was that it was the only known resource on the peninsula. The heavy stands of timber prevented or severely hindered the development of agriculture, and the inhabited areas of the peninsula did not contain mineral wealth of any kind. Newspapers in the Puget Sound area speculated that the unexplored interior of the peninsula contained significant mineral resources, but no actual discoveries were documented.²¹ The speculation concerning mineral wealth remained just that. The timber resource was substantial, in fact, seemingly infinite. The technology for exploiting the resource existed. And by 1890 the economy of every community on the peninsula was based on timber.

¹⁷ Ibid., 167.

¹⁸ Kirk. *Exploring the Olympic Peninsula*, 12.

¹⁹ WPA Writers' Project. *Washington: A Guide to the Evergreen State*, 167.

²⁰ Kirk. *Exploring the Olympic Peninsula*, 12.

²¹ Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 3.

INLAND EXPLORATION: 1885 - 1891

The O'Neil Expedition (1885)

Some inland exploration may have occurred as early as 1855, when Indian agents Michael Simmons and Benjamin Shaw reportedly crossed the Olympic Mountains by way of the Quinault and Skokomish rivers. However, no systematic exploration of the interior of the peninsula was attempted until July 6, 1885, when Brig. Gen. Nelson Miles ordered Lt. Joseph O'Neil to proceed to the section of country west of Puget Sound to conduct a reconnaissance into the Olympic range of mountains. O'Neil, who had received a bachelor's degree in science from Notre Dame, was at this time stationed at Vancouver Barracks on the Columbia River. A party of six men and eight mules travelled to Port Townsend and from there took a steamer down the strait to Port Angeles on July 16. At Port Angeles they were joined by Norman Smith, a son of Victor Smith, the town's founder. The exploring party entered the mountains the next day. They found the going more difficult than expected. On some days they made the anticipated three miles of progress. On other days, because of the density of the timber and undergrowth, they travelled less than a quarter-mile a day.²²

O'Neil was recalled on August 26, when he received orders to report to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas for further training. By that time, the exploration party had managed to establish a "main-cache" camp on Hurricane Ridge and explore the Elwha Valley. O'Neil and a companion had explored almost as far south as Mount Anderson in the eastern Olympics. The group also built a trail that made it much easier to reach Hurricane Ridge. The trail was used by the Forest Service after the area was included in a forest reserve and eventually evolved into the present parkway which runs from Port Angeles to Hurricane Ridge.²³

In 1883, the transcontinental line of the Northern Pacific Railroad reached the mouth of the Snake River, where it connected with the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company line. This line ran along the south bank of the Columbia River to Portland. From there a branch line ran to Tacoma.²⁴ The arrival of the transcontinental railroad brought rapid population growth to the Puget Sound area in the 1880s. This growth in population led to statehood in 1889. It also generated pressure to explore the interior of the Olympic Peninsula to determine whether it contained mineral deposits or other exploitable resources and to assess its agricultural potential.

²² Ibid., 13, 15, 18.

²³ Ibid., 41-42.

²⁴ Avery. *Washington: A History of the Evergreen State*, 316-17.

The Press Expedition (1889-90)

An October 23, 1889 story in the *Seattle Press* reported a conversation with Governor Elisha P. Ferry, who "expressed himself very forcibly" in favor of exploring the peninsula's interior. The *Press* article was reprinted in newspapers nationwide, in part because Henry M. Stanley's African explorations had made the existence of unknown and unexplored areas a national fascination. The result was a steady flow of inquiries, which, for the most part, concerned the possibilities of mounting an exploration party.²⁵

However, some of the correspondence from local figures may have indicated that some preliminary exploration had been done, and that further and more complete efforts were pending. Judge James Wickersham of Tacoma had hiked more than 20 miles up the Skokomish River in the summer of 1889 and was planning, in conjunction with the Buckley *Banner*, an expedition from Lake Cushman through the Olympics to the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Lieutenant O'Neil was also planning another exploration effort, "this time across the southern part of the mountains."²⁶

The letter which most interested the *Press* staff was written on November 6, 1889 by James Christie. Christie stated that he was planning to enter the Olympics "this next month" and presented his credentials as an explorer. Christie alleged that he had explored various regions of Canada between the 49th Parallel and the Arctic Circle and had discovered the Peace River coalfields. He had been visiting friends in North Yakima when the *Press* article appeared and was anxious to explore the unknown territory before departing to Africa. He then noted that he did not have sufficient funds to adequately equip his entire party and asked, "Why not let the PRESS give its countenance and support to an expedition for the clearing up of a mystery lying at the very door of Seattle?"²⁷

The *Press* ownership agreed to bear the cost of equipping the party and, on December 8, 1889, the party embarked for Port Angeles. After conferring with local citizens, Christie determined to follow the Elwha to its source in the interior Olympics and leave the range by following the Quinault River.

It is difficult to assess why Christie was determined to begin the exploration in December. Christie's letter to the *Press* indicated that he was planning to travel to Africa, presumably to share in Stanley's glory, and he probably felt that his Alaska explorations had inured him to the cold. The *Press* clearly did not discourage him,

²⁵ Robert L. Wood. *Across the Olympic Mountains: The Press Expedition, 1889-90* (Seattle and London: The Mountaineers and the University of Washington Press, 1967), 15.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 25.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

perhaps because Wickersham and O'Neil's plans were well known. If Christie had waited until spring, the paper might not have the honor of sponsoring the first exploration and crossing of the Olympic Mountains.

For whatever reason, the choice was not a good one. The party of six men, four dogs, and two mules suffered terribly during one of the peninsula's worst winters. Nevertheless, five men and three dogs completed the route as planned. (The sixth explorer, a physician, was called back to tend to his seriously ill wife before the tough going began.) They reached the headwaters of the Elwha on April 24, 1890, and arrived at Aberdeen on May 21, 1890, becoming the first group to travel a north-south(west) route through the Olympic Mountains.

While the *Press* expedition probably heightened public awareness of the need to explore the interior of the Olympic Peninsula, it did not bring back much significant information about the interior's resources. One reason was that the most highly trained observer was the member of the party forced to return early to attend his wife. Another reason was presented by A. A. Smith in the July, 1907 issue of *Steel Points*, who pointed out that "little or nothing was attempted in the way of side trips." As a result, "little information of a lasting or valuable character was acquired."²⁸

The O'Neil Expedition (1890)

Shortly after the *Press* party emerged from the Olympics, Lt. Joseph O'Neil organized a second expedition to explore an east-to-west route across the southern part of the Olympic Peninsula. After O'Neil returned to his post at Vancouver, he became secretary of the newly-formed Oregon Alpine Club, which later became the Mazamas.²⁹ O'Neil and William Steel, chairman of the Alpine Club's Exploration Department, persuaded Brig. Gen. John Gibbon to authorize another expedition. Special Order No. 63 was published on June 20, 1890.³⁰

O'Neil and his party sailed from Port Townsend on July 1, 1890 aboard the sternwheeler Louise, travelling down Hood Canal to the mouth of Lilliwaup Creek. The party consisted of ten enlisted men, a civilian packer in charge of the mule train, a dozen pack animals, and a large hound called Jumbo. There were also three scientific experts provided by the Oregon Alpine Club: Louis F. Henderson, botanist; Nelson E. Linsley, assayer and mineralogist, known as Colonel Linsley because of his Civil War career; and

²⁸ A. A. Smith. "The Olympics," *Steel Points*, vol. 1, no.4, (July, 1907): 143-44.

²⁹ Louis F. Henderson. "Early Experiences of a Botanist in the Northwest: The O'Neil Olympic Expedition, 1890," (Unpublished manuscript, University of Oregon Library, 1932): 1. Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 48.

³⁰ Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 51.

Bernard J. Bretherton, naturalist.³¹ The expedition established a camp at Lake Cushman and began to scout a route along the Skokomish River for the mule trail. Most of the soldiers worked on the trail, while smaller parties sought out the best route in advance of the trail work and explored the resources of large tracts of the southern Olympic Peninsula.

The ruggedness of the terrain made progress difficult. In a talk given in 1932 to the Oregon Audubon Society, Louis Henderson, the expedition botanist, recalled that the mineral expert accompanying the expedition, Colonel Linsley, grew increasingly frustrated by the operation. Henderson quoted him as saying, "Curse this country! I have prospected all the mountains of the United States and I never saw one to equal this in difficulty of progression and at the same time in lack of any valuable minerals."³²

On July 23, the O'Neil party met the Wickersham *Banner* expedition, which resembled a family outing more than it did O'Neil's systematic and scientific exploration effort. Wickersham had begun at Lake Cushman and was planning to travel north through the mountains to Port Angeles. The party included several ladies who were delicately dressed for the location and objective, and a couple on their honeymoon. There were no scientific experts. In fact, half the original party had elected to remain at Lake Cushman.³³

On September 22, Bretherton, Linsley, and John Danton, the camp cook, ascended the peak that they had concluded was Mount Olympus. Robert Wood, the closest student of the O'Neil and *Press* expeditions, has concluded that the group actually ascended the Athena Group, four pinnacles that make up the South Peak of Mount Olympus. The party ascended the western slope of the highest peak in the group and placed a copper box on or near the summit. The box contained a lead pencil, a glove belonging to one of the ladies, a deck of cards, two army buttons, a beer check, shoelaces, a visiting card, and three cablegrams.³⁴

The July 1907 issue of *Steel Points*, which carried the only published account of the O'Neil group's climb (it was written by Bretherton and edited by Steel), also carried an article by George H. Himes asserting that the first persons to climb Mount Olympus were woodsman B. F. Shaw and Col. Michael Simmons. The two were members of a party exploring the Olympics in the summer of 1854. However, Himes offered no

³¹ Henderson. "Early Experiences of a Botanist," 1.

³² *Ibid.*, 2.

³³ Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 127.

³⁴ B. J. Bretherton. "Ascent of Mount Olympus," *Steel Points*, vol. 1, no. 4 (July, 1907): 153.

evidence to support this assertion and, even if he had, the question of whether this party had correctly identified Mount Olympus would remain.³⁵

The significance of the O'Neil expedition is far greater than that of either the *Press* or the Wickersham *Banner* expeditions. The party managed to cut a ninety-three-mile trail up the North Fork of the Skokomish River and down the East Fork of the Quinault, which serves today as part of Olympic National Park's trail system, and enabled experts to conduct a thorough investigation of the resources of much of the interior of the Olympic Mountains, including the North Fork of the Quinault, the Queets River valley, and the region around Mount Olympus.³⁶

O'Neil sent a final report to his commanding officer upon completion of the expedition. It concluded that, although the outer slopes contained significant timber resources, the interior of the peninsula contained rare and interesting, but commercially useless, flora and fauna, and that no mineral resource of commercial value existed. Virtually all of its conclusions were confirmed by further investigation. O'Neil closed his report by stating that "while the country on the outer slope of these mountains is valuable, the interior is useless for all practicable purposes." For this reason, he wrote, the interior "would...serve admirably as a national park. There are numerous elk...that should be protected."³⁷

Judge Wickersham, leader of the *Banner* expedition, also advocated that a national park be established in the Olympics. He and O'Neil met on July 23, and it is possible that the two discussed the concept of a national park during their meeting. Prior to his meeting with Wickersham, O'Neil had not suggested publicly that a national park should be created, and the concept does not appear in his report until its conclusion. In any case, O'Neil continued to advocate the creation of a national park on the peninsula whenever he gave lectures or presentations on his expedition.³⁸

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 159.

³⁶ Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 387.

³⁷ U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game. Letter from the assistant adjutant general transmitting copy of the report of Lieutenant Joseph O'Neil, Fourteenth Infantry, of his exploration of the Olympic Mountains, Washington, from June to October, 1890. 54th Congress, 1st sess., 1896. S. Doc. 59, 20.

³⁸ Wood. *Men, Mules, and Mountains*, 390.

INLAND SETTLEMENT: 1888 - 1897

During the years that the various expeditions were investigating the resources of the interior of the Olympic Peninsula, other groups of hardy people were attempting to show that the interior possessed the potential to develop as a commercially significant agricultural resource. The primary settlement activity during the 19th century on lands within today's park boundaries occurred in the Queets and Quinault river valleys and on the shores of Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault. Settlement on the prairies near Ozette Lake began in the last two decades of the 19th century. The ruggedness of the terrain and the density of the timber presented severe obstacles to those who attempted to settle in the river valleys. The small prairies seem to have been capable of providing only subsistence gardening and grazing.

Queets River Valley Settlement

The first efforts to settle the Queets River valley began during the winter of 1889, about the same time as the *Press* expedition was getting under way. In early December, John J. Banta and S. Price Sharp travelled from Tacoma to explore the possibilities for homesteading west of Port Townsend. They met Charles Gilman and his son, Samuel, at a way place on the Soleduck River. The Gilmans, who were attempting to locate a route for a railroad, offered to cover Banta's and Sharp's expenses if they wished to travel with them to Grays Harbor. On December 23, the party reached a site in the Queets River Valley eight miles upstream from the ocean, which Banta decided to claim as his homestead. The party then continued to Grays Harbor, arriving there on January 4, 1890.³⁹ When Banta and Sharp returned to Tacoma, they began to work to establish a colony in the Queets River valley. By spring of 1890, they had persuaded twenty-one people to claim homesteads in the area.⁴⁰

The Ozette Lake Settlement

Immigrants, most of whom were Scandinavian, attempted to establish an agricultural community around Ozette Lake in the late 1880s. The inclusion of much of their land in the 1897 Olympic Forest Reserve served to discourage further settlement because inclusion in the reserve meant that no roads or other elements of commercial infrastructure could be developed without the approval of the federal government. When this land was removed from the Forest Reserve in 1900, a second attempt to settle

³⁹ Ibid., 399.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

the area was made. However, most of the settlers had to rely on outside work to maintain a sufficient income level to survive.⁴¹

Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault Settlements

Settlement at Lake Crescent had begun three years earlier, when John Hanson settled on the site which would become known as Ovington's Resort after the turn of the century. Settlement along the shores of Lake Quinault was begun by Alfred Noyes during the winter of 1889. John Crumback of the *Press* expedition and William Wiser of O'Neil's 1890 expedition may have been among the early settlers in the Quinault Valley.⁴² A few hotels and summer cabins appeared on the shores of Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault as early as the 1890s.

Settlement efforts on the lands now within Olympic National Park did not result in viable commercial agriculture, although homesteads in some of the river valleys produced subsistence crops and cattle. In any case, early settlers did not fully support themselves by farming. By the 1890s, it became clear that no significant potential for agriculture existed within the present park boundaries.

The reasons for the failure of agricultural homesteads were harsh and numerous. The cost of clearing land was exorbitant because of the size and density of the timber stands and undergrowth. The local market was small and the only access was by river. To a logger, dense stands of large trees are profitable; to a farmer, they are not. To a logger, river access to the market is sufficient; to a farmer, it is not. In short, many of the factors that made exploitation of the peninsula's timber resources profitable made agriculture unprofitable.

Therefore, by the mid-1890s, both inland exploration and inland settlement efforts had demonstrated that the sole resource on the Olympic Peninsula that had the potential for commercial development was timber. Although a thorough geological survey had not been done, early expeditions had not indicated the presence of mineral resources in sufficient quantity to allow for commercial development, and agriculture did not have sufficient potential to be commercially successful. During this same period, the U. S. government had begun to evaluate its timber management practices at the national level. The outcome would be of immense importance to the economy and the history of the peninsula--the creation of the Olympic Forest Reserve.

⁴¹ Gail E. H. Evans. *Historic Resource Study: Olympic National Park, Washington* (Seattle: National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Cultural Resources Division, 1983), 70-73.

⁴² Parratt. *Gods & Goblins*, 139.

CREATION OF THE OLYMPIC FOREST RESERVE: 1870 - 1897

The 1870 Census was the first to compile forestry statistics. These statistics were presented by Dr. Franklin Hough, superintendent of the 1870 Census, in a paper delivered to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1873. They showed an appalling reduction in the American stands of timber. However, neither Hough's paper nor the 1877 recommendation by Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz "that all timberland still belonging to the federal government be withdrawn from entry under the homestead and pre-emption laws" had a dramatic effect on public opinion or the policies of the federal government.⁴³

By 1891, abuse of the nation's timber supply by private corporations had become so rampant and irresponsible that Congress was compelled to act to protect this resource. It enacted the "Act to repeal the timber-culture laws and other purposes" on March 3, 1891. This act, in part, authorized the president of the United States to "set apart and reserve in any State or Territory having public land bearing forests" public reservations by means of proclamation.⁴⁴

In April of 1891, shortly after the enactment of this legislation, Judge Wickersham, who had been trying in vain to persuade publishers to feature his account of the *Banner* expedition, forwarded his maps and papers to Major John Wesley Powell, superintendent of the U.S. Geological Survey.⁴⁵ At this time, the Geological Survey was beginning a reconnaissance to determine what areas might be eligible for reservation under the March 3 act. Wickersham's correspondence in all likelihood raised the level of federal awareness of the resources of the Olympic Peninsula.

However, there was no evidence of concrete presidential action until February 15, 1896, when Secretary of the Interior Hoke Smith wrote to Professor Wolcott Gibbs, president of the National Academy of Sciences. Smith noted that his predecessors in office had been trying for more than twenty years to point out that, because of inadequate and unclear legislation, no coherent national timber management policy existed. He requested that Gibbs provide, through the National Academy, "an investigation and report...upon the inauguration of a rational forest policy for the forested lands of the United States."⁴⁶

⁴³ Carsten Lien. "The Olympic Boundary Struggle," *The Mountaineer*, vol. 52, (1 March 1959): 18.

⁴⁴ *U. S. Statutes At Large*, vol. 26, 1103.

⁴⁵ James Wickersham. "A National Park in the Olympics ... 1890," *The Living Wilderness*, no. 77 (Summer-Fall 1961): 3.

⁴⁶ Secretary Smith to Wolcott Gibbs. 15 February 1896. Records of the U.S. Geological Survey, Record Group 57, Hague Papers, File 8 "Forest Reserves, 1890-97," National Archives, Washington, D.C.

On June 11, 1896, Congress appropriated \$25,000 to support the writing of the report, and Gibbs appointed the National Forestry Commission to conduct the necessary research. Professor Charles Sargent, director of Harvard's Arnold Arboretum, served as commission chairman. The remaining members were Brig. Gen. Henry L. Abbott, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Professor William Brewer of Yale; Mr. Arnold Hague, U.S. Geological Survey; Mr. Alexander Agassiz, curator of Harvard's Museum of Comparative Zoology; and Mr. Gifford Pinchot, professional forester.

The commission appointed Hague and Pinchot to a special committee to obtain forestry information from government documents. The two men gathered correspondence from the various federal agencies whose missions included management of public domain timber and interviewed government employees to identify potential forest reserves.

As part of this fact-gathering process, Hague and Pinchot obtained a list of reserves proposed by the General Land Office. This list may have served as the basis for selecting the reserves proclaimed by President Grover Cleveland on February 22, 1897, although the General Land Office's list of proposed reserves did not include any in the state of Washington. Hague and Pinchot reported to the full committee that, "information at hand indicates large areas in this State [Washington] suitable for reservations." They then noted that the Mazamas, "an alpine club already very active in the cause of forest preservation on the Pacific slope," were preparing a detailed statement for the commission's consideration.⁴⁷

President Cleveland was sufficiently interested in this project to give time for an interview with either Hague or Pinchot. The president urged that the report be completed in time for him to refer to it in his annual message to Congress. In response to questions concerning the scope of the final report, Cleveland advised the commission to "take up the organization of a forest service first, and then the question of more reserves. Let the plan be one that looks small, and at first costs little, and yet has in it the elements of growth."⁴⁸

In its final, full report on May 1, 1897, the commission heeded President Cleveland's advice. However, on February 1, 1897, when Cleveland was beginning the last month of his presidency, Chairman Sargent reported the commission's forest reserve recommendations to the academy. Gibbs forwarded these recommendations to David Francis, the new secretary of the Interior, who in turn forwarded them to the president with a recommendation that he sign them. The ninth entry on the recommendation list

⁴⁷ *Report of the Special Committee Appointed To Obtain Information From Official Sources: Information From Maps and Documents*, 16 May 1896, Records of the Geological Survey, RG 57, Hague Papers, File 8, "Forest Reserves, 1890-97," 6, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

was the Olympic Forest Reserve. The commission offered the following description of the proposed reserve:

This proposed reserve occupies the high and broken Olympic Mountains region in northwestern Washington, and contains an estimated area of 2,188,800 acres. This is a region of steep and jagged mountains, their highest peaks clothed with glaciers and with perpetual snow. The forests here, watered by more copious rains than fall on any other part of the United States, are composed of enormous spruces, firs, and cedars, and in productiveness are surpassed in the world only by the redwood forests of the California coast region...This proposed reserve no doubt contains for its area the largest and most valuable body of timber belonging to the nation; and here is the only part of the United States where the forest unmarked by fire or the axe still exists over a great area in its primeval splendor.⁴⁹

Cleveland followed the secretary's suggestion on February 22, 1897, establishing thirteen forest reserves by presidential proclamation ten days before the end of his term. The consequent uproar in Congress was so great that Cleveland had to block outright repeal of the proclamation by pocket veto. In the June 4, 1897 Interior Department Appropriation Bill, Congress postponed the effective date of the proclamation to March 1, 1898 to allow for final entry on the lands included in the reserves.

The Cleveland proclamation was one of the most significant events in the history of the Olympic Peninsula because it established a large, permanent, active federal presence on the peninsula. The congressional suspension of the proclamation until March 1, 1898 had little effect on the Olympic Forest Reserve, because there were not many entry claims. After March 1, 1898, the federal government no longer served merely as title caretaker of land on the Olympic Peninsula. Rather, the federal government had limited the access of private interests to the peninsula's sole natural resource with the potential for commercial development. It became by far the largest single owner and manager of those lands and resources. This presence was initially denounced by local economic interests, and subsequent reductions in the size of the reserve changed the extent of federal ownership. But its endurance gradually served to reshape the issue, which, as the next two chapters show, changed from whether the federal government should be a dominant presence on the peninsula to what form that presence would take.

⁴⁹ Secretary D. R. Francis to President Cleveland. 2 February 1897. Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, Lands and Railroads Division, RG 48, File 1415, 9-10, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3

FEDERAL PRESENCE ON THE OLYMPIC PENINSULA:

THE UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, 1897-1933

This chapter discusses the events during the years in which the U.S. Forest Service was the dominant federal agency on the Olympic Peninsula. It describes the efforts to reduce the forest reserve established by President Cleveland in 1897, the early management practices of the Forest Service and its predecessor agency in the General Land Office, the creation and reduction of Mount Olympus National Monument, and the evolution of Forest Service management practices in the 1920s. It concludes with a discussion of the transfer of jurisdiction over Mount Olympus National Monument from the Forest Service to the National Park Service in the winter of 1933-34.

REDUCTION OF THE OLYMPIC FOREST RESERVE: 1897-1901

The reduction in the size of the Olympic Forest Reserve resulted from local opposition to the size--and in many cases to the existence--of the reserve. Another contributing factor was the fact that the federal agency with the most direct responsibility for managing the reserve shared the perspective of those who were opposed to the reserve. Some disagreement between federal agencies slowed the process, but the reserve was reduced after the disagreement was resolved.

The Olympic Forest Reserve was formally established in March 1898 in accordance with the provisions of the 1897 Interior Appropriation Bill. Perhaps because of the congressional postponement of the effective date of the proclamation, reaction to the creation of the reserve developed slowly on the peninsula. However, when the local population began expressing opinions to federal officials, the opinions were negative. For the most part, political officials and local business organizations contended that the reserve was too large and contained a significant amount of agricultural land.

J.W. Cloes, Olympic Forest Reserve

A September 22, 1898 letter to Commissioner J. W. Cloes of the Olympic Forest Reserve from Thomas Aldwell, Clallam County auditor, enumerated most of the local arguments against the size of the reserve. Aldwell enclosed statistics which showed that the reserve included all but 240,000 acres of Clallam County's 1.47 million acres. He also indicated that 450,000 acres of good farmland and precincts containing 358 people who had voted in the last election were included in the reserve. Aldwell said that the proclamation inhibited the economic growth of "one of the heretofore most progressive and ambitious Counties in this rapidly advancing State" because it had forced innocent and presumably

successful settlers to abandon their claims to land within the reserve and prevented further settlement on forest reserve acreage.¹ In short, Aldwell argued that agricultural growth within Clallam County was inhibited by the creation of the forest reserve.

Other inquiries or comments seem to have reached the commissioner of the General Land Office earlier than Aldwell's letter. On August 3, 1898, he instructed Commissioner Cloes to investigate the problems in Clallam County and report on the question of what lands might be removed from the reserve. Cloes completed his investigation and reported to the commissioner on November 2, 1898. His report supported Aldwell's contentions.

Cloes reported that he had begun his inspection tour "on a good country road constructed at an immense cost to the entire county," which would be overgrown unless it were removed from the reserve. The road took him through Beaver and Sappho, "once prosperous communities, but now about deserted," to Tyee.² Cloes found that both Beaver and Tyee were located on or near prairies which has great agricultural potential, as did Forks Prairie, which he visited the next day.

Continuing south, Cloes reached the Bogachiel River, the southern boundary of Clallam County. He found no agricultural land south of the Bogachiel and recommended that all land below the Bogachiel be kept in the reserve. However, he found that, in general, the creation of the Olympic Forest Reserve had caused great hardship to certain agricultural areas of Clallam County and that the interests of the local communities and the federal government would best be served by removing those lands from the reserve. He concluded his report by asserting that the scientific commission that made the recommendation setting aside the Olympic Forest Reserve had travelled only from Port Crescent to Lake Crescent to the Hot Springs and back, leaving much of the potential reserve unexplored and thereby failing to determine the number of people attempting to settle within the area.³

¹ Aldwell to Cloes. 22 September 1898. RG 49, Div. R National Forests - Olympic, File 102458, 1, National Archives, Washington, D.C. (Hereinafter cited as NA).

² Cloes to commissioner, General Land Office. 2 November 1898. RG 49, Div. R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, File 117631, 1-2, NA.

³ Ibid., 5-6.

U.S. Geological Survey

Officials in Jefferson County, which borders Clallam County on the south, also requested that the federal government reduce the size of the reserve. J. B. Hogg, Jefferson County treasurer, wrote to the director of the Geological Survey requesting the exclusion of eleven townships in Jefferson County. The director assigned Harry Gannett, a survey geographer, to investigate the request. Gannett reported that the lands in question were all heavily timbered, and remote from and inaccessible to markets for agricultural products. He concluded that "in this request for the relinquishment of lands from the forest reserve the presumption is clearly that the land is wanted, not by the settler for agricultural use, but by the lumberman" and recommended that the land be retained in the reserve.⁴

Gifford Pinchot, Department of Agriculture

Gannett's conclusion did not contradict Cloes's position because the land in question was south of the Bogachiel. However, the secretary of the Interior circulated Cloes's report throughout the department for review and evaluation. The director of the Geological Survey in turn requested the opinion of Gifford Pinchot, who was working with the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture. Pinchot's reply flatly contradicted Cloes's conclusions concerning the nature of the land and the impact of the creation of the forest reserve on settlers in the area.

Pinchot noted that he had been a member of the committee which had visited the peninsula and identified the area to be reserved. He stated that settlers were abandoning their claims, and had been for some time, because the cost of clearing the land was greater than the potential return from agriculture. "The cost of this clearing is in the neighborhood of \$200.00 per acre, and the cleared land is worth less than a fourth of that sum." While he agreed with Cloes that the prairies might have agricultural value, he concluded that, except for the prairies, "I saw no land of any extent so well suited for agriculture as for forestry."⁵ Pinchot also observed that the terms of the reservation permitted the president to exclude any lands clearly shown to be more valuable for agriculture than timber and that the rights of settlers were fully protected by the language of the reservation.⁶

⁴ Commissioner, General Land Office to the secretary of the Interior. 6 March 1899. RG 48, Lands and Railroads Division, File 1415, 2, NA.

⁵ Pinchot to Walcott. 13 March 1899. RG 49, Division R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, File 1154, 1-2, NA.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

Henry Gannett was also asked to evaluate Cloes's report, and he confirmed Pinchot's conclusions. He observed that the land to be excluded from the reserve "embraces practically all the land containing merchantable timber, leaving only the high mountains, upon which timber is inferior in quality and stand." He pointed out that the area of 450,000 acres in question contained almost 7 billion board feet of timber, 25 percent of which was tideland spruce, "probably the finest body of timber of this valuable species in the country" and 50 percent of which was cedar, "of much value for the manufacture of shingles." Gannett also offered an alternative remedy to the removal of the land from the reserve to solve the problem:

I would suggest...that instead of reducing the area of the reserve, it be provided that all lands which can be shown to be more valuable for agriculture than for other purposes, be opened to entry, wherever found, the purpose of the government being to retain the timber lands in its own hands.⁷

In evaluating the merit of the requests for the reduction of the Olympic Forest Reserve, the secretary of the Interior was faced with two conflicting agency opinions. The Forestry Division of the General Land Office had concluded that the settlers were being harmed and compelled to abandon their efforts to settle on land of genuine agricultural potential because of the reserve. The Geological Survey, and Pinchot, argued that agricultural development was not possible, and that the primary beneficiaries of any reduction of the reserve would be the timber interests.

Binger Hermann, General Land Office

The director of the Geological Survey stated his agency's position in a March 31, 1899 letter to Binger Hermann, commissioner of the General Land Office. He stated that the reason for requests for reduction of the reserve was "not to make available for settlement, agricultural lands, but to obtain for the benefit of the lumber companies and the men employed by them the timber upon these lands, which is precisely what the government wishes to prevent in setting them off as reserves." He pointed out that, in the case of the requests for reduction of the southern portion of the reserve, "lumber companies are now cutting at Matlock and at other points just south of the present south line of the reserve, and shipping their lumber into Shelton by rail. It is not improbable that these companies have originated this movement."⁸

The department accepted the Geological Survey position in the spring and summer of 1899, despite the repeated requests of local officials and settlers to reduce the reserve. On May 2, the secretary instructed Commissioner Hermann "to defer making

⁷ Gannett to Walcott. 11 March 1899. RG 49, Division R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, File 1154, 1-2, NA.

⁸ Walcott to Hermann. 31 March 1899. RG 49, Division R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, File 49312, 1-2, NA.

recommendations for changes of boundaries of existing forest reserves" until the Geological Survey could complete on-the-ground investigations.⁹ Hermann accepted the departmental position. However, on September 16, he asked the Geological Survey to assign special priority status to its investigation of the Olympic Forest Reserve and ordered Forest Superintendent D. B. Sheller, Cloes's successor in office, to "make a careful, personal examination of the territory included in this reserve, and to submit a report showing what lands, if any, should, in his opinion, be eliminated from or added to the reserve."¹⁰

D.B. Sheller, U.S. Forest Service

Sheller completed his report on November 23, 1899. He stated that he had examined all major river valleys along the western slope of the Olympics as well as the settlements around Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault. He found that the largest numbers of settlers were in the Queets and Quinault river valleys--twenty-three in the Quinault and ten in the Queets - and that both valleys contained good agricultural land. He found four settlers in the Hoh Valley and eleven in the Bogachiel, and concluded that those valleys contained good agricultural land, "if cleared."¹¹

Sheller's evaluation of the quality of the timber in the areas he investigated differed from that of most other observers. He concluded that little of the timber had commercial value and for that reason should be excluded from the forest reserve. His view was that:

The average of the whole of the Western part of the Olympic reserve which I examined can be termed comparatively level and in my opinion better adapted to farming and grazing than for the timber. The timber is principally hemlock and spruce, but of a knotty and unmerchantable nature, and at present of no commercial value, and when this land is taken up and farmed, the timber removed there from, the future benefits derived, will be of a greater value than the timber value at the present time. Of the spruce there is very little that can be considered first class. In certain spots it is good, but not of sufficient quantity to be of especial value.¹²

In formulating his evaluation of the potential for the land he was examining, Sheller was guided by the slope of the land. If the land was level or relatively level, he assumed that

⁹ Hermann to the secretary of the Interior. 27 September 1899. RG 48, Lands and Railroads Division, File 1415-97, 4, NA.

¹⁰ Ibid., 3.

¹¹ Sheller to commissioner, General Land Office. 23 November 1899. RG 49, Division R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, 3, NA.

¹² Ibid., 5.

the best use of the land would be agricultural. Theodore Rixon and Arthur Dodwell, who had been ordered by Henry Gannett to investigate conditions within the Olympic Forest Reserve for the Geological Survey, shared that assumption. Their final report, which was completed one day earlier than Sheller's, recommended that 773 square miles consisting of 455 square miles in Clallam County and 318 in Jefferson County, be eliminated from the reserve and that the eastern boundary of the forest reserve be moved two miles eastward. Such an action would not increase the number of settlers within the reserve and would still include "a well timbered and mountainous district" which had not yet been surveyed.¹³

Summary

In his letter of transmittal to Hermann, Gannett pointed out that the 773 square miles that Dodwell and Rixon suggested be removed from the reserve contained more than 7.2 billion feet, B.M., of timber. Gannett objected to the assumption that all level land should be considered agricultural land. He pointed out that the Dodwell-Rixon report showed the cost of clearing much of the land in question was three times what the cleared land would be worth, and that at present there was no way to get agricultural products to market. In response to Gannett's protest, Hermann asked for a second opinion from Sheller, who reaffirmed his earlier conclusions.¹⁴

The U.S. Geological Survey and the General Land Office had now agreed that a reduction in the size of the forest reserve was needed. State officials and the congressional delegation also expressed their growing support for a reduction in the size of the reserve. On January 31, 1900, Commissioner Hermann reported to the secretary, "The requests and petitions for a modification of the boundaries of this reserve have been most urgent and insistent from, not only individuals, but such bodies as the Commissioners of Clallam and Jefferson counties...and the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle; and the same are urgently endorsed by Honorable A.G. Foster (U.S. Senate), Honorable W.L. Jones, (M.C.), and Honorable F.W. Cushman (M.C.)."¹⁵ For these reasons, Hermann endorsed Sheller's recommendation that the reserve be reduced by 715,000 acres.¹⁶

On April 7, 1900, the president issued a proclamation restoring land included within the Olympic Forest Reserve to the public domain. However, because of Gannett's

¹³ Rixon & Dodwell to Gannett. 22 November 1899. RG 49, Division R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, 8, NA.

¹⁴ Hermann to Sheller. 13 February 1900. RG 48, Lands and Railroad Division, File 1415-97, 1, 5, NA.

¹⁵ Hermann to the Secretary of the Interior. 31 January 1900. RG 48, Land and Railroads Division, File 1415-97, 2, NA.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 7.

objections, the proclamation did not remove the land in Jefferson County from the reserve. The proclamation, in effect, accepted the original Cloes recommendation that land south of the Bogachiel should not be excluded from the reserve.¹⁷

Because of the limited area restored to the public domain by the April 7 proclamation, pressure for the removal of more land continued. On June 29, 1901, Commissioner Hermann again reported to the secretary of the Interior that further reductions in the size of the reserve were required. He pointed out that since the April 7 proclamation, "petitions and requests have been received from the Washington Delegation in Congress and the county officers of Clallam and Jefferson Counties and from others for yet further eliminations" from the reserve. He enclosed a new report from the Geological Survey which supported the recommended removals in Clallam, Jefferson, and Chehalis counties.¹⁸ President William McKinley signed a proclamation embodying Hermann's recommendations on July 15, 1901.¹⁹

The combined effect of the proclamations was to reduce the Olympic Forest Reserve by approximately a third, from 2.18 million acres to 1.46 million. The fact that these lands are not used for large-scale farming today is one indication that the plight of the settlers was not the major motive behind efforts to reduce the reserve. Another indication was the refusal of the General Land Office to remove the lands of settlers already within the reserve. In 1902, the application of John Ewell and forty-one other settlers in the Quinault Valley for removal of their lands from the Olympic Forest Reserve was denied because, under the terms of the reservation, "all legal rights acquired by settlers will be fully protected and title to claims may be perfected."²⁰

The land in question was level, but it was not arable. It was also heavily timbered. Pinchot said the assertion that the land was being removed from the reserve because it was more suited to agriculture than timber was "utterly imaginary." He said, "Nearly every acre of it passed promptly and fraudulently into the hands of lumbermen."²¹

The creation and reduction of the Olympic Forest Reserve displays a pattern of interaction between local economic interests, national conservation interests, and federal agencies with varying missions that has been repeated throughout the 20th century. The

¹⁷ Notice of Restoration of Lands in The Olympic Forest Reserve to Entry, 22 May 1900, RG 49, Division R, National Forests - Olympic, pt. 1, NA.

¹⁸ Hermann to the Secretary of the Interior. 29 June 1901. RG 48, Land and Railroads Division, File 1415-97, NA.

¹⁹ *Annual Report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office: 1901*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1901. 452.

²⁰ *Annual Report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office: 1902*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1902. 179.

²¹ Carsten Lien. "The Olympic Boundary Struggle," *The Mountaineer*, Vol. 52, March 1, 1959, 21.

balance of power would change, but the four players--a federal agency, local and national conservationists, timber companies, and other local commercial interests--would remain.

EARLY FOREST SERVICE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: 1898-1912

The National Forestry Committee, whose recommendation to establish the Olympic Forest Reserve set off the chain of events described in the previous section, filed a formal report on the state of timber management in the public domain on May 5, 1897. The committee recommended that a permanent forestry management organization be formed within the Department of the Interior. The organization's central office would have a director, an assistant director, a legal adviser, and four forest inspectors. Four regional offices would be established to manage the forest reserves created by President Cleveland's proclamation. They would be staffed by 26 head foresters and a force of two hundred rangers.²² The report also recommended that two more national parks be established to protect the natural beauty and resources of Mount Rainier and the Grand Canyon.²³

The forestry management recommendations were accepted by Congress. As a result, the initial responsibility for managing all national forest reserves, including the Olympic reserve, was assigned to the Forestry Division of the General Land Office, the predecessor to the Bureau of Land Management, by the Interior Department Appropriation Bill of 1897. The General Land Office published a circular on June 30, 1897 "prescribing rules and regulations governing forest reserves." This circular was widely distributed by local land offices.²⁴

Fred Hanson, Superintendent, 1903-1909

The history of administrative practices during the early years of the forest reserve indicates that management activity began at a very low level and grew gradually after 1905, when jurisdiction over the reserve was transferred to the U.S. Forest Service. During the years 1898 to 1905, the main effort focused on protecting the reserved timber from trespass and fire. Fred Hanson, whose office was located at Hoodspport, succeeded Cloes and Sheller as forest supervisor. By 1905, the reserve was divided into two ranger

²² *Report of the Committee Appointed by the National Academy of Sciences upon the Inauguration of a Forest Policy for the Forested Lands of the United States to the Secretary of the Interior: May 1, 1897* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1897), 23-24.

²³ *Ibid.*, 33.

²⁴ *Annual Report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office: 1907* (Washington, D.C.:GPO), 81.

districts, one headed by Paul Laufield, the other by Chris Morgenroth, who had been hired initially as ranger-at-large.²⁵

Supervisor Hanson, who held that position from 1903 to 1909, was required to file monthly fire reports. Most of his work involved handling disputes, such as timber-cutting trespass or when an individual attempted to settle on timber land by claiming that it should be classified as agricultural land. The latter type of claim arose as the result of an act passed on June 11, 1906, which authorized the secretary of Agriculture "to recommend for listing under the homestead laws such lands within the Forest boundary as are in his opinion more valuable for agriculture than for the production of timber." In the Olympic Forest Reserve, sixty-three claims totalling 5,983 acres had been made by 1911.²⁶ Theodore Rixon, who with Arthur Dodwell had surveyed the reserve, noted many years later, "These proposed ranches did not prove a success."²⁷ Parish S. Lovejoy, who served as supervisor for 1911-12, reported to his successor, Rudolph Fromme, that Hanson alleged to have saved 500 million feet of timber as a result of the claims contests.²⁸

The major administrative event during the early years occurred at the national level. On February 1, 1905, Congress transferred responsibility for managing the forest reserves from the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, to the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. The commissioner of the General Land Office endorsed the legislation, which assigned to the Forest Service responsibility for "the execution of all laws affecting public lands in forest reserves, excepting such laws as affect the surveying, prospecting, locating, appropriating, entering, relinquishing, reconveying, certifying, or patenting of any such lands."²⁹ In short, all title decisions were to be made by the General Land Office, but responsibility for the management of the resource was now with the Forest Service.

²⁵ *Historical Data As Seen From The Pen Of Clarence Adams, Administrative Assistant* (Olympic National Park Library), 1, 11.

²⁶ Findley Burns. "The Olympic National Forest: Its Resources and Their Management," *Forest Service Bulletin 89* (Washington, D.C.: GPO), 18.

²⁷ *Historical Data As Seen From the Pen of Clarence Adams, Administrative Assistant* (Olympic National Park Library), 13.

²⁸ P. S. Lovejoy to Rudolph Fromme. Undated. Memo for Fromme, Supervisor's Office, Olympic National Forest, 1, Olympia.

²⁹ *Annual Report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office: 1905* (Washington, D.C.: GPO), 38.

R.E. Benedict, Superintendent, 1909-1912

This change did not have an immediate impact on the management of the Olympic Forest Reserve, because Hanson remained supervisor until 1909, when he was demoted to district ranger and replaced by R. E. Benedict. Benedict began building a staff by appointing Clarence Adams as forest clerk in October of 1909 and by hiring another staff person and an office clerk in 1910. With the larger staff, Benedict used Adams to draft the first map of the reserve. Adams reported in 1946 that a copy was still in the files at the Olympia office.³⁰

Some trail building had begun as early as 1903, when five miles of trail along the south shore of Lake Crescent was built. Chris Morgenroth built the connection between that trail and the Soleduck trail in 1905, creating a thirteen-mile system connecting Lake Crescent with Sappho and with the road that runs from Clallam Bay to Forks.³¹ Additional trail work was done in 1907, perhaps in response to the major fire that occurred that year. The Quinault Road was cleared and the Soleduck-Beaver trail was "bucked through" between 1907 and 1909.³²

However, until Benedict arrived, the reserve did not have an overall design for locating trails in a way that would enhance the capability of the Forest Service to manage the resource for which it was responsible. Benedict attempted to create such a design, but his successor, Parish Lovejoy, wrote, "Benedict seems never to have looked into the country where the trails were to go and never to have gone near them in construction." As a result, trail construction was difficult and expensive work.³³ Nevertheless, by the middle of 1910 the reserve contained 73 miles of trail, 12 miles of road, 9 miles of telephone line, 3 bridges, and 6 cabins.³⁴

³⁰ *Historical Data As Seen From the Pen of Clarence Adams, Administrative Assistant* (Olympic National Park Library), 2.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 1.

³² P. S. Lovejoy to Rudolph Fromme. Undated. Supervisor's Office, Olympic National Forest, Memo to Fromme, Olympia, 5.

³³ *Ibid.*, 7.

³⁴ *Historical Data As Seen From the Pen of Clarence Adams, Administrative Assistant* (Olympic National Park Library), 3.

Parish Lovejoy

Lovejoy's 1912 memorandum of advice to his successor, Rudolph Fromme, contained sections discussing the management areas that were significant to the forest supervisor, and therefore illustrate the administrative tasks and perspective of the Forest Service at that time. After discussing briefly the early history of the reserve, Lovejoy discussed land claims, grazing, trail improvement, land status, trespass, special use permits, reconnaissance, timber sales, and fire protection and prevention.³⁵

The overall conclusion to be drawn from the Lovejoy memo is that the land and resources within the forest reserve were only minimally used. It pointed out that, during Hanson's administration, year-long occupancy of ranger stations, "which was worked out for the busier forests," was established at the reserve. However, although "the Storm King, Interorrem, and other stations were built and occupied" as a result of this policy, it "did not at all fit the local conditions."³⁶

Each topic was given only brief discussion because little was happening. The land claims that had been made prior to 1912 were, except for those in the Quinault, for the most part abandoned. Grazing was limited to nominal grazing at a few points near the roads entering the national forest. Only three or four permits had been issued, with less than ten head of stock per permit. Again, the exception was the Quinault, where the settlers' insistence upon grazing without permit and violation of agency regulations constituted a serious administrative problem.

Improvements to trails have been discussed above. Lovejoy was also responsible for a major increase in the number of miles of phone lines within the reserve and he inherited a good set of maps done by Adams and Rixon. Land status records for lands within and surrounding the forest reserve had been updated in 1911, although the data on cut-over areas outside the reserve still required further updating and mapping. Trespass was minimal, other than the Quinault grazing trespass, and the only special use activity involved resort lots along Lake Quinault and Lake Crescent.

Reconnaissance activities were minimal because "the chance for big sales is not very good yet."³⁷ A few moderately-sized timber sales were made up to 1910 when the market blew up. However, Lovejoy concluded, "These were not very carefully considered and the less said about the way they were administered the better." Almost all had been

³⁵ P. S. Lovejoy to Rudolph Fromme, Undated, Supervisor's Office, Olympic National Forest, Olympia.

³⁶ Ibid., 2.

³⁷ Ibid., 12.

"closed in disgrace" although a few lingered on. By 1912, timber was not being cut within the boundaries of the reserve.³⁸

Lovejoy noted that fire-prevention activities were far more successful than timber-sale administration. He concluded that the proportion of the total acreage burnt over in recent years was not great. However, the risk of fire was greater than his superiors were willing to concede. He acknowledged that the wet climate made the high-risk period shorter than in other forests, but he did not agree with the district forester that all risk was eliminated. He warned Fromme that there was not a "40 acre tract on the whole of the peninsula which will not show big-fire sign...When it comes it comes a terror. The moss in the tops makes each tree a Roman candle."³⁹

Lovejoy suggested a fire protection plan which included: "Trails and trails and trails all looping into one another and into roads so as to allow cross cuts. All main trails and roads, and bye and bye all trails and roads paralleled with phone lines. "

He called for patrol boxes located five miles apart or less and shelters to provide protection for travellers, fire fighters, and fire-fighting tools. He also suggested that Fromme heed the advice of Chris Morgenroth, "who is the best fire fighter in the country if not the world."⁴⁰

Lovejoy's memorandum indicates the state of the administrative mind of the institution managing the Olympic Forest Reserve in 1912. Fromme seems to have deviated little from its perspective during most of his fourteen-year tenure as forest supervisor. However, the memo did not address the major event that had occurred two years earlier and which began the change in the manner in which the federal government would manage the peninsula resources it controlled--the creation of Mount Olympus National Monument.

THE CREATION AND REDUCTION OF MOUNT OLYMPUS NATIONAL MONUMENT

On March 2, 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt signed a proclamation establishing Mount Olympus National Monument. This action was the result of years of concern for the health of the peninsula's Roosevelt elk herds--a concern which many of the local residents shared with emerging national conservation organizations. In many ways, the establishment of the monument paralleled the creation of the Olympic Forest Reserve: the action was taken by a lame-duck president with very little time left in office; it was

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 13-14.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

taken to protect a significant peninsula resource from chaotic exploitation; its implications were not fully understood at the time; and, when those implications became plain, local interests pressed strongly for the elimination of the monument, or a reduction in its size.

Protection of Elk

Expressions of concern for the peninsula's elk appeared as early as 1890, when Lt. Joseph O'Neil urged that a national park be created on the peninsula to protect them. (See chapter 2.) O'Neil may have been influenced by the example of Yellowstone, a national park where elk and other game animals were protected. Appreciation of the elk was heightened in 1897, when Clinton Hart Merriam determined that the elk on the Olympic Peninsula were a separate and distinct species, and named the species after Theodore Roosevelt. Merriam was a noted naturalist and had been chief of the Biological Survey since 1885. Prior to that appointment, he had served as the naturalist on the Hayden Survey of 1872 and worked for the U.S. Fish Commission.⁴¹

At the turn of the century, it was fashionable for men to wear elk teeth on their watch chains. The demand for elk teeth led to a sharp increase in the killing of elk on the peninsula, which brought an outcry against the slaughter from state officials and local social organizations, especially the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elk. In 1904, Congressman Francis W. Cushman of Tacoma introduced a bill "to set apart certain lands in the State of Washington as a public park, to be known as 'The Elk National Park' for the purpose of preserving the elk, game, fish, birds, animals, timber, and curiosities therein."⁴²

Cushman's bill proposed to establish a national park of 615 square miles (393,600 acres) in the center of Olympic National Forest. The bill was supported by the state's deputy game warden, the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, and the Tacoma and Port Angeles Orders of Elk. The commissioner of the General Land Office and the secretary of the Interior reported favorably on the bill with minor technical changes and the Committee on Public Lands recommended enactment to the House of Representatives. However, it failed to be enacted. One reason could have been that the secretary of Agriculture and the Chief Forester did not report on the bill.⁴³ Another reason might be that in 1905 the

⁴¹ *American Biographical Directory: 1908-09* (Washington, D.C.: Potomac Press, 1908), 320.

⁴² House Committee on Public Lands. "Elk National Park" Washington, 58th Cong., 2d Sess., H. Rept. 1874, 2.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

Washington state legislature enacted laws which prohibited elk hunting by anyone but miners for 10 years.⁴⁴

The state action, however, does not seem to have lessened the concern on the peninsula for the safety of the elk. Congressman W. E. Humphrey, whose district included the peninsula, tried a different approach in the next session of Congress. President Roosevelt had requested that Congress give him authority to create game preserves in all the national forests. Early in 1906, Humphrey introduced legislation to authorize the president to establish the Olympic Game Preserve, not to exceed 750,000 acres, "for the protection of game animals, birds, and fishes in the Olympic Forest Reserve."⁴⁵ The House Committee on Public Lands again reported favorably on it to the floor, but no action was taken.

Congressman Humphrey persisted in his efforts to protect the elk. He succeeded in persuading the House to pass his game preserve bill in 1908. However, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce "...wired Senator [Samuel H.] Piles to kill it in the Senate, which he did."⁴⁶ On March 2, 1909, Representative Humphrey persuaded Roosevelt, two days before the end of the president's term, to proclaim a national monument under the authority vested in him by the Antiquities Act of 1906. Roosevelt thus created Mount Olympus National Monument, consisting of 610,560 acres, to protect the elk. The Forest Service retained administrative responsibility for the area.⁴⁷

Opposition to the Monument

Although local opposition to the creation of the monument did not become intense for over a year, within two months of the proclamation at least one Seattle businessman, F. H. Stanard, raised questions. On April 30, 1909, he wrote to Secretary of the Interior R. A. Ballenger, who had been both an attorney and a judge in Seattle, inquiring about the extent of his rights to prospect for and extract minerals within the boundaries of the monument. Secretary Ballenger replied that the terms of the proclamation and the authority of the Antiquities Act barred all mineral exploration and extraction activities within the boundaries of the monument.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Robert W. Kaune, Jr., "The Olympic Controversy: Part I," *Port Angeles Evening News*, 9 February 1966 (Manuscript in ONP Library).

⁴⁵ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Public Lands, *Olympic Forest Game Reserve*, 59th Cong., 1st Sess., 1906, H. Rept. 2744, 1.

⁴⁶ "Opening the Olympics," *Aberdeen Herald*, 23 January 1912.

⁴⁷ Kaune, "The Olympic Controversy," *Port Angeles Evening News*, 3 (See: Note 44).

⁴⁸ R.A. Ballenger to F.H. Stanard, 14 May 1909, RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 1, NA.

Stanard began a campaign to abolish the monument, and by the summer of 1910, he was having some effect. On August 16, 1910, Forest Supervisor Benedict reported to his immediate superior, District Forester George Cecil, "There has been sort of [a] boom in mining and a number of promising prospects have been found." As a result, the Seattle papers were publishing articles criticizing the government for not allowing prospecting within the monument boundaries. Benedict pointed out that "the conditions are propitious to take up the question of its abolishment, which I strongly favor."⁴⁹

Benedict also offered his opinion that the monument could be abolished because it was ineffective in protecting the elk. He noted that the monument contained no winter range, much of which was also outside the national forest boundaries. "Practically all of the danger of illegal killing of elk occurs during the winter time and since the elk range is outside the monument, little protection is given."⁵⁰

Benedict also argued that the game commission recently appointed by the governor would consider the question of protecting the elk and would assuredly arrive at a better method for doing so. He informed Cecil that "if Governor Hay was informed this monument would be abolished if the State passed legislation which would afford complete protection to the elk and received assurance that the monument would be abolished as soon as such legislation was passed, he would have little difficulty in securing such legislation" and requested that the department take a formal position on this question.⁵¹

Benedict's report was circulated through the Forest Service and forwarded by the chief forester to T. S. Palmer, acting director of the Biological Survey. Palmer took issue with Benedict's contention that the monument was not effective in protecting the elk herd. He pointed out that while the monument did not contain a winter range, it contained virtually all of the herd's summer range, which also served as the herd's breeding ground. He concluded that "under no circumstances should anything be done to interfere with the protection now accorded on the breeding grounds."⁵² Chief Forester Graves quickly assured Palmer that nothing would be done without his agency's involvement.⁵³

⁴⁹ R.E. Benedict to District Forester. 16 August 1910. RG 22, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, NA.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² T. S. Palmer to A. F. Potter. 15 September 1910. RG 22, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, 2, NA.

⁵³ H. S. Graves to T. S. Palmer. 6 October 1910. Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, NA.

Timber and Mineral Industry Opposition

The reasons for the mineral "boom" in 1910 and Benedict's opposition to the existence of the monument can be identified. As Benedict's successor noted, the bottom fell out of the timber market in 1910. Local businessmen would increasingly seek alternative resources to exploit to free themselves from the boom-and-bust cycle of the timber market. Although the mineralogist on the O'Neil expedition had determined that the Olympics had little if any mineral wealth, this report was either unknown or ignored. Stanard and others alleged that the potential for mineral wealth existed and that federal government prohibition of exploitation of that wealth was unfair.

Benedict's opposition to the monument was in sympathy with local sentiment. While the local business community was united in the conclusion that the monument prevented the development of mineral wealth on the peninsula, the business community was divided on the method to be used to correct this situation. Some, like Benedict, favored outright abolition of the monument. Others, including Congressman Humphrey, were more concerned about preserving the elk. They favored making the entire national forest a national park, which would prevent hunting, but allow mineral exploitation. To the extent that national park status might place more stringent restrictions on the use of peninsula resources, it would diminish the control and influence of the Forest Service over those same resources. Benedict had concluded that elimination of the monument would lessen the threat of a national park and offered the best method for preserving Forest Service hegemony on the peninsula.

By the fall of 1911, the issue had become a major topic of debate. On October 6, 1911, the Bremerton *Searchlight* reported on the third quarterly meeting of the Olympic Peninsula Development League. All of the members, including Stanard, attacked the present monument situation. Stanard argued that some type of compromise could be worked out with proponents of a national park, but others shared the sentiments of M. J. Carrigan, a Seattle tax commissioner, who argued that the national monument and the national park idea should both be abolished. He observed, "We who have given years to pioneering in the work of developing the resources of the Olympic peninsula would be fools to let a lot of foolish sentimentalists tie up the resources of the Olympic peninsula in order to preserve its scenery." He assured the meeting that he had travelled through the monument and knew "that it contains mineral wealth that will startle the world."⁵⁴

A compromise of sorts was developed by a three-person committee appointed by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce to analyze the issues and present a report. The committee consisted of Stanard, representing the mineral interests; D. J. Kelley, representing the Seattle Commercial Club; and Asahel Curtis, of the chamber. Their report, which was endorsed by both the chamber and the Commercial Club, called for

⁵⁴ "Leaguers Make Assault on Monument," Bremerton *Searchlight*, 6 October 1911.

changes in a bill authorizing the creation of "Olympus national park" that would remove all the land containing valuable timber from the southern portion of the monument. It would also add language authorizing the extraction and transport of minerals within the reduced boundaries of the proposed park. The report and the endorsements were forwarded to Congressman Humphrey, who sponsored the bill.

The efforts of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce to forge a compromise among members of the business community on the mining ban in Mount Olympus National Monument met with limited success. There were still divisions between those who wished to create a national park to protect the elk and those who wanted to remove all restrictions on the exploitation of resources within the national forest by abolishing the monument. In 1914, Governor Earnest Lister sided with those who wanted to do away with the monument. He wrote to President Woodrow Wilson endorsing a proposal from the Southwest Washington Development Association requesting that the monument be abolished by executive order.⁵⁵

The Forester S. Graves Report

Lister's letter was sent by the White House to the secretary of the Interior who, in turn, forwarded it to the secretary of Agriculture, who refused to take a position on the issue "until a careful study of the problem has been made on the ground."⁵⁶ The responsibility for conducting that study was assigned to the head of the U.S. Forest Service, Chief Forester H. S. Graves.

Graves made an investigative trip to the peninsula in late September 1914. He discussed the situation with all interested parties, including the local business interests opposed to the monument and the creation of a national park, and members of the Mountaineers, who favored the park. He made two field trips, one over the southern area of the monument and another to the more rugged northern portion. He held public meetings at Hoquiam, Port Angeles, and Seattle, listening carefully to all who chose to meet with him. On his return to Washington, D.C., he had further discussions with central office personnel of the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior.⁵⁷

Graves completed his report to the secretary of Agriculture on January 20, 1915. It was a comprehensive and sound report which addressed each interest he had heard on the peninsula. In general, he concluded that the designation of any national monument was

⁵⁵ Governor Lester to President Wilson. 26 February 1914. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

⁵⁶ Secretary of Agriculture to Secretary of the Interior. 1 April, 1914. RG 79, Olympic, File 000, General, pt. 2, NA.

⁵⁷ Henry S. Graves. Memorandum on the Mount Olympus National Monument, 20 January 1915, RG 79, Olympic, File 000, General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

inherently a temporary measure until the government could determine, based on best use, what the permanent status of the area would be and he argued that the time had come for the Mount Olympus National Monument. He also asserted that the multiple-use resource management practices of the Forest Service, which developed "the various resources side by side," justified the abolition of the monument and the return of the land to the national forest. However, he agreed that there was a need for recreational areas on the peninsula and that the monument's more rugged areas might best serve that need by being made a national park.⁵⁸

With regard to the resources of the monument, he developed specific recommendations for the permanent status of timber, mining, agriculture, elk protection, and recreation. He concluded that the southern half of the monument, which was heavily timbered, should be returned to the Olympic National Forest. He conceded that there was no market for the timber at that time, but he asserted that demand would develop in the future and therefore the timber should not remain in the monument where it was "locked up from use." He also concluded that the Forest Service's multiple-use management approach would protect the elk and pointed out that virtually all the mining claims within the monument were in the heavily timbered area. Therefore, removal of that area from the monument would resolve the timber and mining problems while not weakening the protection of the elk.⁵⁹

Graves also addressed the question of the monument's negative impact on agriculture. He pointed out, "Some attempts were made in the hearings to show that the Monument is interfering with agricultural development." However, he found that proponents of this argument could not sustain it: "This argument was, however, soon admitted to be without ground. Such land in the Monument as has soil capable of raising crops is very limited and nearly all of it under very heavy timber. There is no demand for it, except as a part of the demand that exists among some to secure a timber stake from the Government."⁶⁰

Graves agreed with former Forest Supervisor Benedict's position on the role of the monument in protecting the elk herd. He pointed out that the state had extended its law banning elk hunting for another ten years, to 1925. He also concluded that the summer breeding grounds were sufficiently high in the monument to limit or eliminate access to the herd during the breeding season. He concluded that the Forest Service could protect the summer range equally well without the existence of a national monument. He said, "So far as the question of the calving grounds is concerned, the secretary of Agriculture has authority to afford the necessary protection under the National Forest laws." The

⁵⁸ Ibid., 2-3.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 4-7.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 7.

secretary could protect the herd simply by not "listing any lands for agriculture at the upper reaches of the rivers where such action is necessary to protect the Olympic elk."⁶¹

Graves acknowledged that the upper reaches of the monument had "distinctive and unique" scenic features and that its recreational resources were one of the greatest assets of the region. He concluded that this resource should be developed, just as all the other resources he had discussed, by the Forest Service in accordance with its multiple-use philosophy. However, he said he was open to discussing the creation of a national park "to comprise the main mass of more rugged peaks centering about Mount Olympus...In any case a full opportunity should be afforded the Park authorities to make a recommendation on this point."⁶²

Graves presented three recommendations to the secretary of Agriculture. First, the southern half of the monument, which was heavily timbered, should be returned to the Olympic National Forest. Second, the northern half should retain monument status until "National Park authorities of the Interior Department" reported on the desirability of making the area a national park. Third, that the Forest Service, with the cooperation of the Biological Survey, develop a complete working plan for the protection of the elk, which would specify "the procedure necessary to safeguard the breeding grounds."⁶³

Graves had discussed his findings both before and after the completion of his report with Mark Daniels, who was the general superintendent and landscape engineer of national parks, based in San Francisco. As a result, Daniels's views were included in the report. He recommended that the secretary of the Interior accept the report's recommendations. However, perhaps during the process of developing an executive order to reduce the size of the monument in accordance with Graves's first recommendation, two legal questions arose: "(1) Has the President the power without specific legislation from Congress to reduce the area of a national monument; (2), should the eliminations be made, will the lands so excluded from the national monument be part of the public domain or remain within the Olympic National Forest."⁶⁴

Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane forwarded these questions to Preston C. West, the department's solicitor, on April 8, 1915, noting that he would agree to the modification of the monument's boundaries proposed by the secretary of Agriculture only if the land were to revert to the National Forest Service. West responded by finding that the president did have the authority to restore land to the public domain without express

⁶¹ Ibid., 8-9.

⁶² Ibid., 10.

⁶³ Ibid., 12-13.

⁶⁴ Preston West to secretary of the Interior. 20 April, 1915. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

Congressional consent. He also said that, because the lands within the monument had been previously included in the Olympic National Forest, "the revocation of their reservation as a national monument does not affect their status as national forest lands, and such revocation does not restore them to the public domain."⁶⁵ When all policy and legal problems had been considered and resolved, President Woodrow Wilson signed an executive order on May 11, 1915 encompassing the boundary changes recommended in Graves's report and thereby reducing the size of the Mount Olympus National Monument from 610,000 acres to approximately 300,000 acres.

The first and third recommendations in Graves's report were accepted because Graves managed to meld the conflicting and competing interests in a way that partially satisfied them all. His primary accomplishment was to obtain Interior Department consent to his boundary changes and to future Forest Service management practices by assuring the Biological Survey, the Department of the Interior agency responsible for the health and safety of the elk herd, that it would be allowed to define, or at least review and evaluate, the Forest Service's elk management plan. This fact also reassured the local interests who were concerned about the elk herd's condition. To a considerable degree, Forest Service management practices on the peninsula would be judged by the extent to which the service demonstrated to the Department of the Interior and the local conservation interests that it intended to keep the elk herd safe and healthy, and that it had the administrative capability to do so.

The second recommendation, that Department of the Interior park authorities evaluate the area to determine whether it could be accepted as a national park, resulted from the correspondence and meetings between Graves and Mark Daniels. The Department of Agriculture seemed willing to favor legislation creating a park which contained little or no timber. During the weeks between December 10, 1914, and January 23, 1915, the period during which Graves was preparing and formally presenting his report, negotiations were underway between the two departments to define acceptable boundaries for the proposed park. Secretary of Agriculture D. F. Houston outlined his position in a letter to Secretary of the Interior Lane on December 10. He proposed that the monument be reduced by 298,760 acres, that the remaining lands retain the designation of national monument until Lane could make recommendations to Congress "relative to the establishment of a National Park," and that, if Lane found that the remaining lands were not of park caliber, then they should revert to the Olympic National Forest.⁶⁶

Lane informed his personal secretary that he was going to take the matter up with Daniels and that he and Secretary Houston would undoubtedly make a joint

⁶⁵ Ibid., 2-3.

⁶⁶ Secretary of Agriculture to Secretary of the Interior, 10 December 1914. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

recommendation on the future of the remaining monument lands. On December 26, Lane, relying on Daniels, replied to Houston. He agreed to the size of the monument proposed by the Department of Agriculture, but expressed concern that it would lack "control of strategical points for entry and exit to and from the park." He requested a topographical map displaying the proposed boundary changes so that a determination of the location of strategic access points could be made. Daniels's primary concern was that no monopoly be created which would control all land available for hotel sites and possible villages.⁶⁷

On January 23, 1915, Secretary Houston reported to Lane that Daniels and Graves had met again to discuss these concerns. Graves evidently satisfied Daniels by assuring him that, in making any small adjustments in the monument boundaries to include strategic access points, the Forest Service would not oppose including small amounts of its land in the final area of the national park or, at least, that the Forest Service controlled all the land surrounding the proposed park and would not permit such development.⁶⁸

Agreement and Resolution 1916

An interdepartmental agreement was reached on the creation of a national park including the upper reaches of Mount Olympus National Monument. The agreement was significant because, during this period, agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior was a prerequisite to congressional action on any issue affecting the interests of both departments. Each department could veto the other's requests to Congress.

On January 4, 1916, Congressman Albert Johnson introduced a bill to convert Mount Olympus National Monument to "a public park or pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States" and to change its name to Olympic National Park. Senator A. A. Jones introduced a bill with identical language to the Senate on January 13. No evidence has been found to show that the introduction of this legislation resulted from informal discussions with the executive branch. Because the purpose of the park was recreational and the lands included were those described in President Wilson's May 11, 1915 proclamation, it seems likely that this legislation was introduced to fulfill an agreement reached between Lane and Houston. However, both bills were referred to the appropriate committee and no further action was taken. At the last minute, Secretary Houston eliminated any chance of the bill passing by informing Congressman A. F. Lever, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, that he

⁶⁷ Secretary of the Interior to secretary of Agriculture. 26 December 1914. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

⁶⁸ Secretary of Agriculture to Secretary of the Interior. 23 January 1915. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, N.

now opposed enactment because certain questions concerning the relationship between the Forest Service and the newly-created National Park Service had not yet been resolved.⁶⁹

FOREST SERVICE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: 1915-1933

Chief Forester Graves pointed to the Forest Service's multiple-use management approach as the best method to manage the entire area within Olympic National Forest. That approach consisted of defining the principal value of the land resource and managing it primarily to exploit its highest use. If land were heavily timbered, then timber harvesting would be the primary management goal. However, if timber harvesting interfered with some other resource's primary use, then the extent of the cutting operation would have to be evaluated and weighed against other uses. For instance, harvesting timber might take place in most of the river valleys on the western slopes of the Olympics, but it was possible that a strip of timber might be left along the river for recreational use.

Forest personnel developed a management plan for Olympic National Forest. Despite Graves's advocacy of a multiple-use management approach, this plan, which was completed on March 18, 1916, asserted that "the chief function of the National Forests is the furnishing of a continuous supply of timber." It called for a sustained yield management approach based on the assumption that all the forest's timber would eventually be cut.⁷⁰

Forest Supervisor Rudolph Fromme completed his own timber management plan in 1923. His plan did not recognize the existence of Mount Olympus National Monument and called for timber harvest in every river valley. His plan was revised in 1924 to take into account the existence of the monument, but the timber harvest provisions were not changed.⁷¹

Graves had foreseen the dangers of the Forest Service being seen as too narrowly interested in cutting timber on the Olympic Peninsula. Local conservationists were upset by the management plans discussed above and, in response to their complaints, a management plan which applied the multiple-use philosophy to the resources of Olympic National Forest was developed by F. W. Cleator, a Forest Service recreation examiner and engineer in the Portland district office. This management plan, completed by 1927,

⁶⁹ Twight, Ben W. *Organizational Values and Political Power: The Forest Service Versus the Olympic National Park* (University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983), 40.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 39.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 42.

assigned higher priorities than timber harvest to certain areas of the forest. The priority of use was determined by the service's evaluation of the best use of that area.⁷²

Cleator divided the forest into resource units which included the Snow Peaks Recreation Area, which contained 316,960 acres including Mount Olympus, the other snow peaks, and the subalpine meadows and watersheds above the timber line; several other recreational areas, including the shores of Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault; and timber strips in the western slope river valleys "containing [the] finest big tree specimens." These strips were to be preserved for future generations. Except for these riverside strips, all heavily timbered areas were to be sold and cut.⁷³ The Olympic Primitive Area, which contained 134,240 acres, was created in 1930 to the south and east of Snow Peaks.⁷⁴

The Cleator Plan was adopted in 1927 as National Forest Service policy in administering both the monument and the forest. The various resource units that Cleator had designated were dedicated to particular uses. The Snow Peaks Recreation Area was to be managed to maximize its recreational potential: "Summer homes, hotels, and resorts will be permitted under a carefully worked out recreation plan." The other areas designated as recreational areas were to be managed the same way. The Olympic Primitive Area was to be managed to preserve "as far as possible, the original natural conditions of this rugged wilderness" by limiting access to foot and horse trails.⁷⁵

However, despite the Forest Service's espousal of multi-resource management techniques, the Cleator Plan could not fully mask the fact that the Forest Service viewed its primary mission to be providing timber for cutting on a sustained yield basis. Every action the service took on the peninsula, from Graves's success at removing the heavily-timbered areas from Mount Olympus National Monument to the Cleator Plan, did nothing to revise or even camouflage this perspective.

The contradictions between the multi-resource management philosophy and the service's view of its primary mission were pointed out by Willard Van Name in his 1928 book, *Vanishing Forest Reserves*.⁷⁶ Van Name, who was director of the American Museum of

⁷² Ibid., 46.

⁷³ U.S. Forest Service. "Olympic National Forest, Washington: Its Purposes and Resources," RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 3, 7-10; U.S. Forest Service. "Report on the Olympic Primitive Area," RG 79, Olympic, File 601, 4, NA.

⁷⁴ Twight. *Organizational Values and Political Power*, 49.

⁷⁵ Forest Service. "Olympic National Forest," RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 3, 7-10, NA.

⁷⁶ Willard G. Van Name. *Vanishing Forest Reserves: Problems of the National Forests and National Parks* (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1928).

Natural History in New York City, raised the question of the role of conservation of virgin timber stands in the Forest Service's management of the national forest. Van Name said that the service had cut every tree it owned for which there was a demand, and had given no indication that it would change this practice.

Van Name's book had a larger impact on national conservation groups than on local ones. The local groups were interested in preserving some of the forests for recreational purposes, but they seem to have accepted that fairly extensive cutting would occur at some point. The economy of the peninsula depended on it. However, the fact that the Forest Service seemed intent on leaving only a few small areas for recreation did not enhance its hegemony on the peninsula. In its rather high-handed attitude toward local groups interested in recreation, such as the Mountaineers, the Forest Service generated local support for a national park on the peninsula.⁷⁷

EROSION OF FOREST SERVICE CONTROL: 1915-1933

During the negotiations to reduce Mount Olympus National Monument, it is clear that the Forest Service accepted the proposition that the land remaining in the monument might be of park caliber. However, that position soon changed.

During the negotiations that followed the Graves report, park personnel did not actually visit the area to determine whether it merited park status. However, on April 22, 1918, Robert S. Yard, a high-ranking Park Service official, addressed a letter to the forester of the United States, inquiring in part about the special features of Mount Olympus National Monument.

Acting Forester A. F. Potter replied on May 1. He informed Yard that the only unique feature of the monument was that it was created to protect elk. He described the land within the monument as "one of the wildest and most inaccessible portions of the United States." Potter also told Yard that no roads or trails had been built within the present boundaries of the monument because of the high construction costs and "because of the need of opening up National Forest regions of greater beauty and utility." He concluded by advising Yard that "the Monument possesses no outstanding features, and there is little or nothing in our files here that would be of use to you."⁷⁸

The Park Service seemed to have accepted this evaluation throughout the 1920s and early 1930s. No evidence has been found to show that the Park Service favored the creation of a national park on the peninsula in the 1920s. Further, the 1923 Annual Report of National Park Service Director Stephen T. Mather contained a statement opposing the creation of such a park. Mather argued against the establishment of parks

⁷⁷ Twight. *Organizational Values and Political Power*, 56-57.

⁷⁸ A. F. Potter to Robert S. Yard. 1 May 1918. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

in the Olympics or in the Cascades because of the popularity of Mount Rainier National Park. He noted that the "creation of other areas in the State containing mountains of less impressiveness have been proposed, such as Mount Baker, Mount Adams, and Mount Olympus," but the service had not supported these proposals because "their establishment as national parks would at once lower the dignity of position and prestige of Mount Rainier as the noblest glacier-bearing peak of the Americas."⁷⁹

Protection vs. Hunting of Elk

While the Park Service itself did not present a formidable obstacle to Forest Service hegemony on the peninsula, protection of the elk herd did. During the time immediately after the reduction of the monument, the Forest Service paid close attention to the protection of the elk. On June 2, 1915, Assistant District Forest Thomas MacKenzie sent a letter to Forest Supervisor Rudolph Fromme, which raised the question of illegal elk kills in Olympic National Forest. Mackenzie informed Fromme that Joseph Hunter of the Biological Survey had investigated the question of illegal interstate shipments of game and had concluded that someone was killing 300 elk a year in Mount Olympus National Monument. Mackenzie instructed Fromme to report on the suspected violations, his efforts to prevent poaching, and the efforts and attitudes of state game officials.⁸⁰

Fromme replied on January 28, 1916. He reported, "During the past summer and fall, we on the Olympic have been giving a little more attention than usual to the points brought up in your letter with a view to assisting as far as convenient in the apprehending of violators of the elk protection law, and also endeavoring to work up more definite cooperation with the State Game Commissioner and his deputies." Fromme then summarized reports from his rangers which indicated that elk were being killed by local residents, but not in the numbers estimated by Hunter. Fromme also reported that state game commission personnel were in favor of preventing hunting in the monument.⁸¹

By June 1916, Fromme's suggestion that the elk population was growing too large for its food supply was being published in local newspapers. By the fall of 1917, Fromme, or someone on his staff, was suggesting that the overgrazing of the elk's winter range could be remedied most easily by a controlled hunting season. On November 5, 1917, Acting Supervisor J. Roy Harvey reported to the district forester that certain areas of winter and

⁷⁹ Van Name. *Vanishing Forest Reserves*, 172.

⁸⁰ Thomas MacKenzie to Forest Supervisor. 2 July 1915. RG 22, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, 1-2, NA.

⁸¹ R. L. Fromme to District Forester. 28 January 1916. RG 22, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, NA.

summer range had been overgrazed during the past year. However, he was uncertain whether the cause was an increased number of elk or the severity of the past two winters. He then noted that, if the overgrazing was the result of an increase in the number of elk, the best method for preventing future overgrazing would be an open season. He informed the district forester that the state legislature had been contemplating such a move for the past two years. He concluded by recommending that the Forest Service take no action until the Biological Survey could make an on-site evaluation.⁸²

Chief Forester Potter requested that the Biological Survey conduct an investigation in the spring of 1918. During that time, Vernon Bailey inspected the eastern half of the forest. In September, G. W. Field inspected the western half, where most of the problems existed. Field found that more illegal elk hunting was occurring than Forest Service personnel had reported. Indians from La Push were killing fifty to sixty per year and selling the meat to non-Indians. He also determined that the elk were not fully utilizing either the winter range outside the monument or the forest, presumably because they were remaining within the forest and monument boundaries in the winter to avoid hunters. Field wrote that "immediate steps should be taken to set aside a winter elk range and a game reserve within the Olympic Forest, supplemented by a state game preserve in the lower valleys" to encourage the elk to fully utilize their winter range. If this were not done, he said, conditions "similar to that at the Yellowstone Park" could occur.⁸³

Despite Field's recommendations, no action was taken by the Forest Service and by 1920, Fromme was again publicly discussing the possibility of a limited hunt in the western valleys of the forest. E. B. Webster, a local newspaper publisher and staunch conservationist, objected to Fromme's assertions that the elk population had become too large to live off the resources within the forest. According to Fromme's memoirs, he took Webster on a trip to see the suffering and starvation of the elk. He recorded that the experience reduced Webster to tears. However, Fromme did not indicate that Webster changed his position as a result of the trip.⁸⁴

By 1926, dissatisfaction among local conservationists with the efforts of the Forest Service to protect the elk had grown sharply. On June 9, 1926, F. W. Mathias, secretary of the Hoquiam Chamber of Commerce, sent a letter to Congressman Albert Johnson

⁸² J. Roy Harvey to District Forester. 5 November 1917. RG 22, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, NA.

⁸³ G. W. Field to Chief, Biological Survey. 25 September 1918. RG 22, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, NA.

⁸⁴ Rudo L. Fromme. "Random Recollections Regarding the Old, Origina (sic), Opulent, Often Cozy, Olympic National Forest ..." (Olympic National Park Library), 109.

that discussed conditions on the peninsula in general and contained a letter from the Quinault Commercial Club endorsing the creation of a national park to protect the elk. Mathias informed Johnson that "the need of protection of the game in the Olympic National Forest and especially within the Olympic National Monument is receiving a great deal of attention at the present time." Mathias further informed Johnson that he personally knew of cases where elk had been killed within the monument's boundaries and that "poachers are continuously killing elk, birds, and even marmot," because neither the state nor the two counties in which the monument was located had money to spend on game protection.⁸⁵

Mathias also said, "Travel is increasing over the Forest Service trails and now that the Olympic Chalet Company has been formed a great many people will go into the Olympic Mountains." Most of the entrants carried rifles for their own protection. Mathias held that the argument of self-defense was groundless and that the rifles were used to kill wildlife. He concluded, "Unless proper game protection is given and game preserves created, our wild life [sic] is going to disappear."⁸⁶

Johnson acknowledged receipt of Mathias' letter and promised to consult with Stephen Mather, the director of the National Park Service, because "if Congress acts, it will be on his recommendation." He also advised Mathias that several obstacles existed to the creation of a national park on the peninsula. He said a substantial number of Congressmen, including westerners, were opposed to the establishment of a large number of parks, and, when he had discussed the matter earlier, he had been told "that steps cannot go forward in re Olympic National Park until Congress has acted in re the proposal, which has the right of way, for making Mt. Baker into a National Park."⁸⁷

Johnson forwarded Mathias' letter to the Park Service and requested comment. Acting Director Arno Cammerer replied on June 19. He informed Johnson, "Before availability of any area for National Park purposes can be passed on by the National Park Service and the Department an investigation of the area in question has to be made by the Service and this can not be made until a bill has been introduced in Congress for such purpose and referred to the Department and the Service for report." Cammerer advised Johnson that if he felt the question was sufficiently urgent, he should introduce a bill in Congress.⁸⁸ Accordingly, on June 26, 1926, Johnson introduced a bill to convert Mount

⁸⁵ F. W. Mathias to Congressman Albert Johnson. 9 June 1926. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 2.

⁸⁷ Congressman Johnson to F. W. Mathias. 16 June 1926. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

⁸⁸ Acting Director Cammerer to Congressman Johnson. 19 June 1926. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

Olympus National Monument into Olympic National Park and to give the National Park Service the responsibility for managing the area.⁸⁹

Despite Cammerer's assurance, no evidence has been found that the service responded to Johnson's bill by investigating the monument to evaluate its potential as a park. By 1928, national conservation organizations' interest in the peninsula's resources had increased considerably. On October 22, 1928, Madison Grant, the president of the Boone and Crockett Club, a group of New York City conservationists, wrote to Director Mather to ask "whether any attempt has ever been made to set aside a national park in the Olympic peninsula." Mather replied four days later. He cited some of the early efforts by Congressman Humphrey and Senator Jones (discussed in chapter 2). Mather acknowledged that the "area consists of perhaps one of the greatest untouched mountain and forest areas in the United States" but concluded,

While it may have many of the characteristics of national park caliber, the fact that it contains approximately twenty-four thousand acres of alienated lands would make its establishment as a national park undesirable unless those lands could be acquired and conveyed to the Government at the time of establishment.⁹⁰

It is unclear what area Mather was discussing, but it could not have been all within the monument boundaries at the time. It is unlikely that 24,000 acres of alienated land would have been found within the boundaries of Olympic National Forest. In any case, the correspondence indicates that Grant was interested in creating a national park larger than the reduced Mount Olympus National Monument. Mather and Grant met near the end of October 1928, but no record of the discussion has been found in the official files.⁹¹

In addition to challenging the verity of the Forest Service's conversation practices, Willard Van Name also focused attention on the potential of the Olympic Peninsula for a national park in his 1928 book, *Vanishing Forest Reserves*. He wrote, "Mount Olympus...would seem to offer an exceptionally important opportunity for a national park, not because the mountain is in any danger, but because it would probably be possible to include a great deal of fine forest of kinds not at all well represented in any of the present parks."⁹²

⁸⁹ U.S. Congress. House. H. R. 13069, "A Bill To establish the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington," 69th Cong., 1st Sess.

⁹⁰ Director Mather to Madison Grant. 26 October 1928. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

⁹¹ Madison Grant to Director Mather. 29 October 1928. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

⁹² Van Name. *Vanishing Forest Reserves*, 173.

Doubts among local and national conservationists concerning the ability of the Forest Service to protect the elk herds persisted throughout the early 1930s. The real weakness of the service's position--that it did not have jurisdiction over hunting activity within the boundaries of Olympic National Forest--was exposed by the Washington State Game Commission in 1933, when, perhaps in response to the fact that the Park Service might soon assume jurisdiction over Mount Olympus National Monument, it authorized a four-day open season on elk within the boundaries of both the monument and the forest.

Local conservationists were outraged. Even such pro-Forest Service groups as the Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce denounced the decision. Both the Forest Service and the Biological Survey sent observers to evaluate the outcome. The Boone and Crockett Club financed a trip by Milton P. Skinner, a former naturalist with the Yellowstone National Park, who was to observe the open season events and report to the club. The Park Service assigned David Madsen to observe.

Four hundred and forty-eight permits were sold for the hunt, which lasted from October 19 to October 22 and undoubtedly drew some freeloaders.⁹³ Opinions on the damage to the herds varied. Federal agency observers Leo Couch of the Biological Survey and Foster Steele of the Forest Service found that no "general slaughter" had occurred and that there were some benefits, including the weeding out of old bulls and the scattering of the herds to more remote food sources. They also concluded that a detailed study of the elk was needed to develop a better basis for future management decisions.⁹⁴

Skinner found that no benefits resulted from the hunt. He contradicted the assertion that only old bulls had been killed. He said that the bulls killed were not old but constituted the prime breeding stock of the herd, which had been reduced by 20 percent. He also found that the scattering had been, at best, short-lived, because most of the elk had returned to their habitual grazing area within weeks after the open season had ended. Skinner agreed that further research was required and urged that a three-year study be initiated.⁹⁵

However divided expert opinion on the outcome of the hunt might have been, a consensus emerged on the peninsula favoring the development of better methods of protecting the elk. After he had become known on the peninsula, Skinner was besieged by local residents and civic organizations who asked him to speak and offered him money to continue his study. He reported, "There is now in process of formation over

⁹³ Milton P. Skinner to H.E. Anthony. 21 November 1933. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

⁹⁴ Extracts from "Report on the Elk Hunting Season in the Olympic Mountains," made by Leo K. Couch for the U.S. Biological Survey and Foster Steele, Observer for the U.S. Forest Service, 31 October 1933, RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

⁹⁵ Milton P. Skinner to H. E. Anthony. 21 November 1933. RG 79, Olympic, File 000-General, pt. 2, NA.

the whole Peninsula, a new organization of sportsmen and others for the express purpose of protecting and saving the elk." He also reported that Port Angeles and Aberdeen civic and business groups were looking for ways to finance a continuation of his research and that he had been assured by a prominent state legislator that money for the research would be forthcoming.⁹⁶

The failure of the Forest Service to work with the State Game Commission to protect the elk resulted in the 1933 open season, which, in turn, resulted in an increase in sentiment favoring protection of the elk herds. This sequence of events made the possibility of the creation of a national park more acceptable locally, and occurred just at the time the Department of the Interior was establishing the Park Service's presence on the peninsula.

THE END OF FOREST SERVICE JURISDICTION OVER MOUNT OLYMPUS NATIONAL MONUMENT

On June 10, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 6166, which assigned responsibility for the management of all national monuments to the National Park Service. The order allowed sixty days before it became final and provided that "any public building or reservation which is chiefly employed as a facility in the work of a particular agency" would not be transferred.

Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Department of the Interior took any action under this order until September 29, 1933, when Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes informed Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace that he would be ready to assume jurisdiction over all national monuments presently under Forest Service control on October 1. He advised Wallace to make an official request for the retention by the Forest Service of those agencies which fell within the exclusionary clause.⁹⁷

Wallace replied that all national monuments under Forest Service control fell within the terms of the exclusionary clause and therefore were not subject to a transfer of jurisdiction. Wallace also argued that such a change in administration would duplicate ongoing efforts, thereby decreasing governmental efficiency, and that the lands reserved as national monuments were also reserved as national forests and thus had a dual title status.

To resolve the differences between the two agencies, Ickes requested that Nathan Margold, the Department of the Interior solicitor, provide a legal opinion on the issues. Margold responded on October 24. He found that the question of efficiency was an

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Secretary of the Interior to Secretary of Agriculture. 29 September 1933. RG 48, File 12-1, Administrative, pt. 1, NA.

administrative and policy question rather than a legal one, and that the dual status of the monuments did not "from a legal standpoint make their administration for national monument purposes by the Interior Department impossible or impracticable." He pointed out that Bandelier National Monument was presently being administered by Interior.⁹⁸

Margold concluded that, as a matter of law, the inclusion of the sixty-day implementation period in the order meant that "the President intended that any exceptions to be made under the excepting clause should be agreed to between the Departments involved within the 60-day period." Because the Department of Agriculture did not reach an agreement with the Department of the Interior within the sixty-day period, it could no longer do so. As a result, "these national monuments were transferred to the Office of National Parks, Buildings and Reservations, on August 10, the date on which the Executive Order became effective."⁹⁹

The Forest Service chose not to strenuously contest Margold's opinion. On February 1, 1934, Chief Forester Silcox recommended to Rexford Tugwell, who was serving as assistant secretary of Agriculture, that the service be allowed to retain jurisdiction over its monuments. In response, Ickes pointed out that the monuments were not chiefly employed as a facility by the Forest Service and, in fact, for the most part had no timber on them. He noted, "Only in the case of Mount Olympus National Monument...is timber involved."¹⁰⁰ Ickes then went on to refute every argument the Forest Service had raised in the past concerning the problems attendant to transfer of jurisdiction.

The Ickes letter seems to have ended the controversy. It is probable that Tugwell, who was very close to the president, did not aggressively push the Forest Service position. Ben Twight, in his study of the Forest Service management philosophy, suggested that the Forest Service did not wish to be seen as challenging a newly-elected president. Twight also underscored the fact that Ickes had been named by Roosevelt as the administrator of the Public Works Program and, as such, he controlled the funds of many Agriculture Department projects.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Nathan Margold to Secretary of the Interior. 24 October 1933. RG 48, File 12-1, Administrative, pt. 1, 1-2, NA.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 3.

¹⁰⁰ Secretary of the Interior to Rexford G. Tugwell. 19 February 1934. RG 48, File 12-1, Administrative, pt. 1, 1.

¹⁰¹ Twight. *Organizational Values and Political Power*, 60.

CONCLUSION

By 1933, local concern for the elk herd and the Forest Service's demonstrated inability to protect it, had led to greater local support for the creation of a national park on the peninsula. National conservation organizations had long been in favor of a park. By the time the Park Service was present on the peninsula, the question was no longer whether a park would be established on the peninsula--the question of Chief Forester Graves's generation--but how large the park might be. The fact that Ickes and Tugwell were making interdepartmental decisions on the initial issues concerning establishment of the Park Service presence on the peninsula suggest that the president was involved very early in the discussions. The final resolution of that question would be the direct result of presidential leadership.

CHAPTER 4

Chapter 4

THE FEDERAL PERIOD PHASE 2: THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The initial appearance of the National Park Service on the Olympic Peninsula came with its jurisdiction over Mount Olympus National Monument. Throughout the Roosevelt, and Truman presidencies, the Forest Service and the local timber industry opposed the presence of the Park Service. However, in large part because Franklin D. Roosevelt was determined that a large park be established on the Olympic Peninsula to preserve nature for future generations, the presence of the Park Service was expanded during this period. Roosevelt was supported by national conservation organizations and to some extent by local conservationists and outdoor groups. But without his direct personal involvement, Olympic National Park might have been much smaller.

This chapter covers early Park Service efforts to establish a park, the impact of national conservationists on local and Park Service opinion, the creation of Olympic National Park, its expansion by President Roosevelt in 1940, the acquisition of additional acreage by Public Works Administration funds in the 1940s, and the final major expansion of the park in 1953 and the significance of that expansion. For the most part, day-to-day management problems are discussed in the succeeding chapters which are devoted to specific management concerns, such as ranger activities and resource management. This chapter focuses on the series of events over a twenty-year period that led to the establishment of Olympic National Park as a "big park."

The 1933 open season on elk created local support for the Park Service's presence on the peninsula because it was assumed that a national park would provide better protection for the elk. At the same time, at the national level, the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the presidency in March of 1933 led to the inclusion of conservationists within the New Deal coalition. Roosevelt was a strong proponent of the ideas articulated by conservationists. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in his biography of Roosevelt, observed that he "cared deeply about nature--about land, water and trees" from his childhood onward.¹ As a result, conservationists acquired increased influence within the executive branch.

Roosevelt was particularly concerned for the nation's timber stands. He had seen the timber in the state of New York decimated by lumber companies and, as early as 1922, proposed that a private syndicate purchase a tract of timber within 100 miles of New York City for use "as a park, as private interests operated forests for recreation in

¹ Robert A. Caro. *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York* (New York: Vintage Books, 1975), 288.

Europe."² With the newly-elected president's support, the amount of land in the National Park System more than doubled during his term in office, the greatest increase to occur before World War II. As will be discussed in greater detail below, Roosevelt was personally interested in the creation of Olympic National Park. Given his perspective and background, his position in any dispute between conservationists and timber users could be easily predicted.

Early Activities 1933-1938

The October 1933 open season on elk persuaded many peninsula residents that more protection for the elk was required. David Madsen, a Park Service wildlife biologist who observed the hunt and who subsequently served as the Park Service's first custodian of the monument, reported the shift in public opinion to Assistant Director Dr. Harold C. Bryant, who notified Director Arno B. Cammerer. Cammerer noted, "Certainly it looks as if we had a marvelous opportunity to better conditions that have existed, and make a real name for ourselves."³

Cammerer's assessment was soon justified. On November 11, 1933, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes sent Cammerer a memorandum with the inquiry, "What do you suggest as a means to afford better protection to the elk herd on the Olympic Peninsula in the State of Washington?"⁴ Cammerer suggested that jurisdiction over the national monument be transferred to the Park Service in accordance with the June 10 executive order and that adequate "funds for protective rangers" be provided.⁵

These comments reflected the increased concern of national conservationists for the safety of elk on the peninsula. The first call to develop a program to increase elk protection was the publication by the Emergency Conservation Committee (ECC), a group of New York City conservationists headed by Rosalie Edge, of a pamphlet entitled, "The Proposed Olympic National Park," in April of 1934.

The pamphlet called for the establishment of a national park which would incorporate the present Mount Olympus National Monument and the lands eliminated during the Wilson administration. It raised the issues of both elk protection and the preservation of some of the last old-growth timber stands in the Pacific Northwest. The proposed park's

² Ibid.

³ Cammerer to Bryant. 3 November 1933. RG 79 Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000, General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

⁴ Ickes to Cammerer. 11 November 1933. RG 79 Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000, General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

⁵ Cammerer to Ickes. 14 November 1933. RG 79 Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000, General, pt. 2, 1, NA.

boundaries were to include the entire Quinault River valley above Lake Quinault, Lake Quinault and Lake Crescent with sufficient land surrounding them to assure their ecological protection, and considerable segments of the Queets, Hoh, and Bogachiel river valleys.⁶ Thus, the preservation of old-growth timber became linked to the preservation of the elk herd early in the process of the creation of Olympic National Park.

The publication of this pamphlet led the Park Service to re-evaluate its official view of the importance of the resources of the Olympic peninsula. Prior to the election of Roosevelt, the service had maintained that the peninsula did not contain any significant areas worthy of inclusion within a national park. The ECC pamphlet raised questions concerning this position within the service.

In response to the pamphlet, Director Cammerer asked Assistant Director Conrad Wirth whether or not "Mt. Olympus was one of our park projects that we are pushing." Wirth responded by presenting a November 8, 1929 memo by Director Mather which concluded that the area should not be included in the system because of the large number of private property owners within the area and because it would, to a large extent, duplicate Mt. Rainier National Park.⁷

Both Assistant Director Hillory Tolson and Associate Director A. E. Demaray reviewed this memo before passing it on to Cammerer, and both recommended that this position be reconsidered.⁸ After receiving a May 25, 1934 report on conditions on the peninsula from Major Owen A. Tomlinson, superintendent of Mount Rainier National Park, Cammerer again asked Demaray and Wirth whether the past position should be changed. Cammerer observed, "I see no reason at this time for diverting from this old decision but if additional evidence is adduced in favor of the park project we ought to be free to consider it." Demaray returned the memo with a handwritten note encouraging further investigation. No evidence of Wirth's response has been found.⁹

In his May 25 report, Major Tomlinson, who was to become midwife to Olympic National Park, provided considerable information concerning the reactions of various local entities to the ECC pamphlet. He reported that public interest had been "aroused to a keen pitch in regard to the proposal of the Emergency Conservation Committee of New York to extend the boundaries of the Monument to its original limits and have it

⁶ Emergency Conservation Committee. *The Proposed Olympic National Park*, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 2, NA.

⁷ Wirth to Cammerer. 26 May 1933. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 1, NA.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Cammerer to Demaray and Wirth. 1 June 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 1, NA.

created a National Park...The elk problem is also of keen interest in practically every community."¹⁰

However, he also reported that most businesses and commercial associations would oppose both the expansion of the monument and the creation of a national park. He concluded that "most of the Chambers of Commerce and other commercial organizations will oppose the park proposal, especially any plan that will extend existing boundaries of the Monument." This conclusion was based Forest Service opposition to expansion of the monument. Tomlinson reported that, on a lunch time radio broadcast, Regional Forester C. J. Buck had stated that the economic loss to the federal government and local communities would exceed \$150 million if the ECC proposals were adopted. Tomlinson pointed out, "Considering that the Chamber of Commerce membership is made up entirely of business men connected in one way or another with the lumber industry, Mr. Buck's talk was very effective indeed in creating opposition to the national park proposal."¹¹

Tomlinson's memo identified the economic interests at the federal and local level that would continue to oppose the creation of a large park until the visit of President Roosevelt in 1937. However, concern for the safety of the elk remained high. It remained uncertain whether a small park that would be acceptable to the local business interests and the Forest Service could be established.

During the summer of 1934, then, two questions required investigation before the service could formulate a position on the ECC pamphlet. The first was whether or not the area met the high standards for inclusion within the park system. The second was the size of the park. It would have to be large enough to satisfy conservationists interested in the protection of the elk and rain forests but at the same time be acceptable to the local business community.

Willard Van Name, author of the ECC pamphlet, left no doubt as to where national conservationists stood. On May 15, he wrote to President Roosevelt urging him to use the power which "the laws unquestionably give you" to completely restore the lands removed from the monument in 1915. Unless this was done, he said, the monument could not serve as "an effective all-year elk refuge."¹²

¹⁰ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 25 May 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 1, NA.

¹¹ Ibid., 1-2.

¹² Van Name to Roosevelt. 12 May 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 2, NA.

Tomlinson began the process of developing answers to both these questions during the summer and fall of 1934. He was instructed to report on the administrative problems posed by the transfer of jurisdiction of the monument and on the nature of the resources within the monument. David Madsen, supervisor of Wild Life Resources, Salt Lake City; George Grant, chief photographer, National Park Service; and Preston Macy, assistant ranger of Mount Rainier, were detailed to the peninsula for an on-site inspection.

Macy, Grant, and Madsen presented their first report on July 28, 1934. They pointed out that the purpose of the report was to develop recommendations for managing the monument in its present form. It did not directly address the question of whether the monument resources were of park caliber. However, the descriptions in the report of the glaciers, the river systems fed by the glaciers, and the rain forests of the western slopes, left no doubt that the area contained resources of park caliber. The group was especially impressed with the Hoh River Valley. It reported that "the forests of the Hoh River are outstanding and constitute one of the chief attractions of the Peninsula. In no other park do we have a forest of this character."¹³

The group also inspected the alpine area of today's park. It found that "the Olympic Mountains contained within the National Monument are of unusual beauty. They differ from most of our mountains in that there is no continuous mountain range. It is a vast area of high peaks and ridges, for the most part, standing out alone."¹⁴

Given these descriptions, the decision that a national park be established on the peninsula became inevitable. However, the group identified some problems pertaining to the administration of the monument. It reported that the elk herd was being damaged by poachers, but not irreparably. In general, game protection was inadequate because the "responsibilities for protecting this game has been shared by so many agents and individuals" in the past. "With proper protection there is no doubt but what the herd will perpetuate itself and also probably furnish a surplus during most years."¹⁵

The report concluded with the observation that "the present boundaries of the Mt. Olympus National Monument do not contain a complete biological unit such as we should have in order to preserve for posterity a true primitive area." The group made tentative boundary suggestions, being careful to point out that these were intended to

¹³ Macy, Grant, and Madsen to Cammerer. 28 July 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 2, NA.

¹⁴ Ibid., 3.

¹⁵ Ibid., 3-4.

provide a starting point for further study, adding that it could "furnish the basis for such study."¹⁶

The group recommended that the boundaries of the monument be "squared up" by including some timbered areas on the western side (presumably in the Hoh Valley) to provide for "the establishment and maintenance of a true biological unit in this area" and to provide for better game protection. Although a large number of private owners lived in the area, Lake Crescent should be included in the park. "Crescent Lake is one of the most beautiful bodies of water to be found anywhere in the United States." In order to protect its drainage, "no further timber operations should be permitted."¹⁷

On August 11, 1934, Major Tomlinson forwarded an inquiry from Harry Myers, secretary of the Mountaineers, a Seattle outdoor club, to Director Cammerer. This inquiry was concerned with the differences between a national park and a national monument, and which status the proposed park would receive. Tomlinson left the decision as to whether or not to respond up to Cammerer, adding that if he chose to respond,

I think it will be entirely proper if you feel like stating that the National Park Service believes that the Mount Olympus National Monument should be made a national park. All of us who have any knowledge of the area, which includes Madsen, Grant, Ben Thompson, myself, and I believe Dr. Bryant are willing to go on record as recommending national park status.¹⁸

By September 26, Cammerer had accepted Tomlinson's assertion that the area was of park caliber. On that date, Assistant Director Bryant prepared a memo for Director Cammerer which listed points to emphasize at a meeting with Chief Forester Silcox. One point was that "the National Park Service maintains that the area has national recreational significance and meets national park standards."¹⁹

Therefore, by the fall of 1934, the first of the two questions had been answered. The Park Service had reversed its long-standing position that the Olympic Peninsula did not contain areas that merited inclusion in the park system, thus taking the first major step toward the creation of Olympic National Park. However, the second question, the size of the area to include, was the subject of intense debate and remained so for the next three years.

¹⁶ Ibid., 5.

¹⁷ Ibid., 5-6.

¹⁸ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 11 August 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1, NA.

¹⁹ Bryant to Cammerer. 26 September 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1, NA.

The first effort to define the size of the park was the work of the same Park Service committee that had prepared the July study of the administrative problems presented by Mount Olympus National Monument and was probably done in response to the recommendations of that study. The report containing the boundary recommendations was completed on October 5 and, except for the formal boundary recommendations, repeated the language of the July study.

Macy, Grant, and Madsen, joined this time by Major Tomlinson, disagreed with the Emergency Conservation Committee's call for a restoration of the original monument. They felt that this area included "much valuable timber on areas that are not National Park calibre." Instead, they recommended that approximately 110,000 acres be added to the present monument. The recommended area contained Olympic Hot Springs and Sol Duc Hot Springs, Lake Crescent, and several miles of forest along the Hoh River.²⁰ In short, the group tentatively recommended that the proposed alpine park of 1915 be established with the addition of Lake Crescent and a portion of the Hoh River valley. In all, the proposed park contained approximately 410,0000 acres.

These recommendations were publicized on the peninsula in addresses by group members to civic and business associations and in press releases to the Seattle and local papers. The initial response of most local entities was positive. Five days after the completion of the study Tomlinson reported, "Recent contacts on the Olympic Peninsula and throughout the western part of the State indicate a very friendly attitude towards the National Park Service." He urged Director Cammerer to announce an official Park Service position as soon as possible to take advantage of this good will.

Tomlinson also reported that the Washington State Planning Council desired to act quickly on this issue. The Planning Council was the arm of the Washington state government charged with managing resources owned by the state. Ben Kizer was council chairman and Ross K. Tiffany served as executive officer. Tomlinson noted that at an October 9, 1934 meeting of the Grays Harbor, Aberdeen, and Hoquiam Chambers of Commerce, which both he and Tiffany attended, all parties "appeared very friendly toward the National Park Service and a proposal to create a national park on the Peninsula."²¹ In a later memo, he expressed confidence that the Council would accept his boundary recommendations.

Not all groups on the peninsula accepted the boundary recommendations. At an October 23 meeting of the Olympic Peninsula Development League held at the Mork Hotel in Aberdeen, members expressed differing opinions. Some accepted Tomlinson's

²⁰ Madsen to Cammerer. 6 October 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1, NA.

²¹ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 10 October 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1, NA.

recommendations, some opposed further expansion of the monument but accepted the conversion of the present monument to a national park, and still others argued that the monument should be returned to the Forest Service. This meeting was attended by sixteen members, including Forest Supervisor H. L. Plumb; the collective group can be considered to be representative of the commercial population of the peninsula.²²

The largest park acceptable to any segment of the commercial community was that recommended by Tomlinson. However, local conservation organizations found Tomlinson's recommendations too limited. At a December meeting of the State Planning Council in Seattle, Irving Clark, chairman of the National Parks Committee of the Mountaineers, stated that his organization felt that at least 300,000 acres should be added to the present monument, and, as Tomlinson reported to Cammerer, that "it should contain a large block of the very best timber on the peninsula."²³

Despite Tomlinson's advice, the central office did not move quickly to accept his boundary recommendations. It was awaiting further study of elk migration habits to determine whether the proposed boundaries would provide adequate protection for the herd. In addition, Ben Thompson, acting chief of the Wildlife Division of the central office, agreed with the Mountaineers. On December 14, he responded to a letter from Adolph Murie of the University of California, Berkeley, who was a noted naturalist and whose brother had monitored the elk open season on the peninsula in 1933. Murie had evidently written to inform Thompson that he was going to conduct a field investigation on the peninsula.

Thompson indicated in his response that, "since the wildlife of the area is so important, boundaries, particularly on the west, should be drawn according to wildlife requirements," including elk-predator requirements. He then asked Murie to conduct field investigations on the peninsula with the boundary question in mind, adding, "I have shown this letter to Associate Director Demaray and he suggests that efforts should be made to exclude as much valuable timber as would be possible and still delineate boundaries suitable to a national park."²⁴

Reactions to the Tomlinson boundary recommendations showed that three attitudes toward the potential park existed. The first, and most negative, position was that of the Forest Service and the lumber industry. The presence of the Park Service on the

²² Tomlinson to Cammerer. 24 October 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1-4, NA.

²³ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 18 December 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1, NA.

²⁴ Thompson to Murie. 14 December 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1, NA.

peninsula in any form was unacceptable to these groups. The second, and significantly more positive position, which was shared by most other commercial interests on the peninsula, was that the Park Service should have a presence on the peninsula, but that the only suitable park would be a small, alpine park for recreational purposes. Most local Park Service officials seemed to accept this position as the predominant local position and felt that local attitudes would determine the final park boundaries. The third position, shared by local and national conservation interests, was that a large park was required to preserve both the Roosevelt elk and as much virgin timber as possible. The central office of the Park Service seemed to share this view, although it manifested a healthy respect for local opinion.

Both Tomlinson and Madsen were aware by the beginning of 1935 that their boundary recommendations might not be acceptable to the central office. On January 22, 1935, Madsen sent a memo to Cammerer confirming receipt of his notice of termination as custodian of Mount Olympus National Monument. That notice must have also included Cammerer's expressions of concern over the absence of an elk winter range, the small amount of old-growth forest, and the possibility of creating a balanced faunal system within the proposed boundaries, because Madsen addressed all three of these issues in his response. He agreed that "this boundary must not be accepted as perfect, either from the standpoint of game administration or the inclusion of all the fine scenery." He implicitly warned against the inclusion of a large stand of old-growth timber by strongly endorsing the idea that whatever its final size:

our proposed enlargement should be on the basis of giving fair consideration to the interests of the communities--as regards timber and hunting areas--and with fair consideration of the Forest Service and the State Game Commission as partners in game management.

He dismissed the idea that "a complete faunal family can be established whereby a natural balance of species will result."²⁵

Cammerer must have also asked Madsen about the possibility of completing a study of elk migratory habits quickly. Madsen replied in the negative, concluding that, because of the heavy timber and rough terrain, "it would require at least a year to make a survey of the areas used by the large game animals and thus arrive at the best possible boundary from the standpoint of game." He then pointed out that "no such delay can well be justified at present in making public our plans."²⁶

²⁵ Madsen to Cammerer. 22 January 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 4, 1-2, NA.

²⁶ Ibid., 1.

Congressman Mon Wallgren shared Madsen's conclusion that the public had a right to know what the Park Service was planning to recommend on the peninsula. On January 31, 1935, Cammerer wrote to Tomlinson, enclosing a map of proposed boundaries which varied considerably from what Tomlinson had recommended. Cammerer explained that Wallgren had requested information concerning the condition of the elk "for the preparation of a bill which he may introduce to establish the Mount Olympus National Park." Cammerer noted that he had hoped to delay the introduction of any legislation pending the completion of a winter elk study, "but it now seems that a stand may have to be taken without the benefit of this work."²⁷

The park boundaries shown on the map were the result of a meeting between Ickes, Cammerer, and Van Name to determine the Park Service's response to Wallgren's request for boundary suggestions. Cammerer argued that the Tomlinson boundaries should be recommended to Wallgren, whose district included much of the Olympic Peninsula. Van Name urged that considerably more land be included within the park than the Tomlinson boundaries encompassed. Specifically, he recommended that the heavily-timbered lands removed from the monument during the Wilson administration be made part of the park along with some heavily-timbered areas on the western slopes to assure the integrity of the elk winter range. Ickes accepted Van Name's position and directed Cammerer to recommend the boundaries he had outlined to Wallgren.²⁸

Cammerer's map probably made Tomlinson uncomfortable. His original recommendation, which he had circulated and defended throughout the peninsula, had called for a park of approximately 400,000 acres. Cammerer's map showed a park of almost 730,000 acres and included large stands of valuable timber. It included the entire Bogachiel watershed as well as the Hoh from the South Fork upward. The lower Hoh was excluded to allow for the control of the size of the elk herd by hunting. The area between the Bogachiel watershed and the state-owned land was also included.²⁹

On February 18, Cammerer forwarded the same map to Secretary Ickes recommending that "to crystallize public sentiment, necessary legislation be drawn up, subject to your approval, for the establishment of this area as a national park." He reported that this recommendation resulted from the need to preserve "the finest remnant of the rapidly disappearing Pacific-Northwest forest" which also was the winter range of the Roosevelt elk. He predicted that "due to the high timber values" of the lands to be included within

²⁷ Cammerer to Tomlinson. 31 January 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

²⁸ Cammerer to Ickes. 8 May 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 12, 1, NA.

²⁹ Ibid.

the proposed park, the Forest Service and local timber interests would oppose the creation of such a park. Ickes approved the memo on February 20.³⁰

Congressman Wallgren introduced legislation to establish Mount Olympus National Park in accordance with the recommendations approved by Ickes on March 28. Upon introduction of the Wallgren bill, which became H.R. 7086, Ickes issued a press release describing "the many benefits which would accrue--now and in the future--from the establishment of such a park."³¹ The principal benefits were the increased protection of the elk's winter range and the preservation of a significant segment of virgin forest.

Local opposition to Tomlinson's original proposal came primarily from lumber companies and the Forest Service. Tomlinson noted that Forest Supervisor Plumb maintained publicly and frequently that the area was not of park caliber.³² Prior to the introduction of the Wallgren bill, Tomlinson reported that "the Port Angeles people are unanimously in favor of national park status and an overwhelming majority want the boundaries extended to include a reasonable block of timber along the Bogachiel and Hoh Rivers."³³ However, when the provisions of the Wallgren bill became known on the peninsula, those who had favored a small park joined the opposition. Most community governments and their civic and commercial organizations opposed the creation of a large park.

Congressman Martin F. Smith, whose district included the southern segment of the peninsula below Lake Quinault, wrote to Ickes summarizing local reaction to the Wallgren bill. He reported, "I am receiving numerous letters and resolutions pertaining to this legislation, all voicing vigorous opposition to same." As a result, Smith concluded that enactment of the Wallgren bill "would be a serious detriment to my district, and I know that my constituents are practically 100-per cent opposed to it."³⁴

The introduction of the Wallgren bill served the purpose of crystallizing public opinion. The Forest Service and the local lumbermen, who were opposed to any park, increased the level of their opposition because of the size of the Wallgren park. Former supporters of the Park Service on the peninsula, such as Asahel Curtis and Chris

³⁰ Cammerer to Ickes. 18 February 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

³¹ Ickes to the press. 3 April 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

³² Tomlinson to Cammerer. 24 January 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 2, NA.

³³ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 24 January 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

³⁴ Smith to Ickes. 9 April 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1 NA.

Morgenroth, and possibly the State Resources Planning Board, which advocated a small recreational alpine park, severely criticized the Wallgren bill. Local conservationists supported the Wallgren bill as did national conservationists and the Department of the Interior.

The Forest Service and the local timber industry opposed the park on economic grounds. They argued that the harvest of timber on a sustained-yield basis was worth more economically than creating a national park containing extensive timber stands. The Forest Service position was stated by the Olympic Peninsula Conservation Committee in a pamphlet it developed in response to the Wallgren bill. It argued that under Forest Service management the area in question would provide recreation, preserve scenic beauty and wildlife, offer sustained yield timber harvest, and perpetuate forest industry payrolls. Under Park Service management, the latter two would be lost. It predicted that if the Wallgren bill were enacted, 7,500 jobs worth eight to ten million dollars in income would be lost along with \$85,000 per year for the school and road funds of the counties which contained National Forest land.³⁵

The pamphlet also espoused the Forest Service multiple-use management approach used by Graves to forge the 1915 coalition which led to the reduction of the monument. It pointed out that the Cleator Plan applied multiple-use principles to the Olympic National Forest, providing for all possible uses of the area--recreational, scenic, and industrial. The Cleator Plan obviated the need for a national park on the peninsula because it benefited "the greatest number in the long run."³⁶

While the Forest Service had not developed any new rationale for its own presence on the Peninsula since 1915, it was nonetheless a formidable opponent. Tomlinson pointed out the strength of the Forest Service early on. On April 24, 1935, about a month after the introduction of the original Wallgren bill, he detailed the nature of the local opponents of the Park Service to Director Cammerer, stating, "There are six national forests in the State of Washington, each with a thoroughly trained permanent personnel, experienced in public contact work." This group was supported by the Portland Regional Office, "which has the reputation of being the most efficient regional personnel of the entire forest system."³⁷

The opposition was not confined to the National Forest Service. The state forester and his staff, the State Conservation Department, and the State Fire Fighting Association, "with a highly organized personnel of supervisors and district wardens," also opposed the

³⁵ Preston Macy Papers. Box 1, Folder 46, University of Washington Library, 4.

³⁶ Ibid., 2.

³⁷ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 24 April, 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

Park Service. Finally, the University of Washington's College of Forestry, the most influential college within the University system, also opposed Park Service presence on the peninsula.³⁸ The tactics of these opponents and their day-to-day institutional relationships with the Park Service are discussed in chapter 12. For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to note that the opposition to the presence of the Park Service on the Olympic Peninsula was formidable.

Despite the nature of this opposition, many residents of the Olympic Peninsula were proponents of a national park as long as it was a small recreational park. Most people and local business and civic organizations accepted the economic arguments of the Forest Service and timber industry. Their own livelihood was so interwoven with the peninsula's timber-based economy that they had little choice. Such proponents included Asahel Curtis and Chris Morgenroth. Curtis, who had a long association with the National Park Committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and who was chairman of the Rainier National Park Advisory Board as well as an avid photographer of the Olympics, argued that timber on the western slopes should not be included in the park but that the eastern boundary should be extended to include the peaks visible from Seattle.³⁹ Morgenroth, a former Forest Service ranger, also envisioned an alpine recreational park, but accepted the need to include small stands of western slope timber.⁴⁰

In justifying a large park, the National Park Service and national and local conservation organizations disputed the Forest Service assertions that sustained-yield management was possible. They argued that the long-term economic impact of the park would be positive and would at least mitigate any-short term economic loss. They also disputed Forest Service figures showing the volume of harvestable timber included in the proposed park by arguing that much of the timber was inaccessible or too expensive to reach to be harvested profitably. They also argued that a large park was necessary to protect the elk herd.

Van Name sent a letter in support of the Wallgren bill to Secretary Ickes. However, he warned that any lessening of the boundaries, especially in the Bogachiel and Queets valleys, would materially reduce the quantity of winter range available to the elk within the park.⁴¹ The Mountaineers supported the first Wallgren bill and they did so

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 10 April 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

⁴⁰ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Public Lands. *Hearing on a Bill to Establish the Mount Olympus National Park In the State of Washington and For Other Purposes*, 74 Cong 2d Sess, 54.

⁴¹ Van Name to Ickes. 30 April 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

enthusiastically. They offered to "organize educational work on this bill in an effective way," in part by corresponding with other outdoor and recreation clubs.⁴²

By the end of 1935, another group of prominent local citizens formed in support of the creation of a national park on the Olympic Peninsula. This group did not oppose the Wallgren boundaries. On December 23, 1935, twenty-four peninsula businessmen, mostly from Port Angeles, met at noon at the Lee Hotel "at the call of Chris Morgenroth" to form an association to support the establishment of a park on the peninsula. They named themselves the Mount Olympus National Park Association. Membership was restricted to those persons who favored the park. They also agreed to "support the Wallgren bill or any other bill in lieu thereof which may be advocated by the National Park Service," thereby obviating the need for debate over the proper location of boundaries. (Although he continued to publicly argue for a smaller park than that contemplated by the first Wallgren bill, Morgenroth had evidently decided by this time that the establishment of a park larger than he preferred was better than no park at all.)

The group elected Joseph Johnson as president, Claude Melchoir as vice president, and Arthur Vollmer as secretary-treasurer. They also elected Chris Morgenroth, M.J. Schmidt, John Wilson, and Tom Mansfield to be on the Executive Committee. Membership fees were also set at \$10 for a charter membership, \$5 for a sustaining membership, and \$1 for a membership. Among the members was Acting Custodian Macy.⁴³

The arguments supporting the various positions continued throughout 1935 and into 1936 with no change in position on the part of any of the advocates. In early 1936, both Ickes and Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace reported to Congress on the Wallgren bill. Ickes recommended passage, Wallace did not. The House Committee on Public Lands, under the chairmanship of Congressman Rene L. DeRouen of Louisiana, held hearings in Washington, D.C. from April 25 through May 1, 1936.

These hearings gave the members of the House Committee on Public Lands accurate insight into the arguments and complexities of the issue. National conservationists, including Robert Marshall of the Wilderness Society, Rosalie Edge, and Willard Van Name testified in favor of the Wallgren bill. The Park Service also testified on behalf of the bill, and Ickes testified forcefully and effectively for the bill on the last day of the

⁴² Clark to Cammerer. 6 April 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

⁴³ Macy to Tomlinson. 24 December 1935. (Enclosure), Olympic National Park Library.

hearings.⁴⁴ The Forest Service, represented by Assistant Forester I. F. Kneipp and Assistant Regional Forester H. L. Plumb of the Portland region, testified that the Cleator Plan eliminated the need for the presence of the Park Service on the peninsula.⁴⁵

The local peninsula organizations sent four representatives: Joseph Johnston, Arthur Vollmer, Chris Morgenroth, and Asahel Curtis. Morgenroth and Curtis repeated their long-standing positions favoring a smaller alpine park. Johnston and Vollmer were in favor of the provisions of the Wallgren bill and Johnston was sharply critical of timber operators' manipulation of their land ownership to evade county taxes.⁴⁶

The local Congressional delegation was also divided. Congressman Wallgren had sponsored the bill and Congressman Marion Zioncheck, whose district included Seattle, testified in favor of the bill. However, Wallgren announced during the proceedings that an amendment would be offered to eliminate "a heavy stand of fir and hemlock" from the western boundary. Congressman Martin Smith, whose district included Lake Quinault and the area to the south, was the chief antagonist of those who testified in favor of the park and was adamantly opposed to the bill.⁴⁷

By a two-vote margin, the House Committee on Public Lands reported the bill to the whole House on May 8, 1936, recommending that it be enacted unamended. However, Wallgren indicated that the amount of land within the park would be reduced during the discussion on the House floor. Senator Horace Bone announced that he would file a similar bill in the Senate. Congress took no further action during this session, presumably because Wallgren's commitment to delete certain heavily-timbered lands from the boundaries proposed in the bill, which he had made during the hearings and reaffirmed upon the reporting out of the bill, could not be negotiated within the time left for the session.⁴⁸

During the summer and fall of 1936, there was little change in the various positions. The Forest Service remained actively opposed to the presence of the Park Service on the peninsula and took several steps to preempt that presence, including the enhancement of

⁴⁴ U.S. Congress. House Committee on the Public Lands. *Hearing on H.R. 7086, A Bill To Establish The Mount Olympus National Park In The State Of Washington and For Other Purposes*, 74th Cong., 2d Sess., 1936, GPO, 76-93;96-105;274-76.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 204-12, 229-50.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 41-75.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 8-41, 105-16.

⁴⁸ Tomlinson to Thomson. 12 May 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 9, 1, NA.

their recreational portion of the forest and the setting aside of 238,000 acres surrounding the monument as a perpetual wilderness reservation.⁴⁹ Small park advocates remained basically unmoved, as did the Park Service and the large park advocates.

By the end of September, however, Tomlinson reported that some type of compromise seemed possible because the State Planning Council's Olympic Park Committee had accepted the Forest Service's perpetual wilderness designation, despite the fact that it was based only on a Secretarial Order which could easily be amended or repealed. As Tomlinson pointed out in a September 28 memo to Acting Director Demaray, this acceptance by the committee meant that the difference between the area contemplated in the original Wallgren proposal and that of the combined acreage of the monument and the area designated as perpetual wilderness was only 67,500 acres. He observed that the small difference in acreage offered "convincing proof that the real basis for the controversy is which agency shall administer it." He concluded that a compromise could be easily reached if the Park Service was willing to eliminate from the proposed park a considerable area surrounding Lake Quinault.⁵⁰

Hope for a compromise agreement with the State Planning Council was also expressed in a November 28, 1936 letter to Secretary Ickes, by Margaret Thompson, who had recently founded the Northwest Conservation League. She informed Ickes that she had worked carefully with Tomlinson and other Park Service personnel and with local residents to redefine the proposed boundaries. She recommended that the western boundary be modified to exclude a portion of the Bogachiel which contained a large amount of privately owned timber. Land on the shores of Lake Quinault and the private property which extended up the Quinault River should be left out of the park.⁵¹

Thompson believed that the proposed changes would satisfy most local objections to the creation of a large park. However, she also advised Ickes, "In our judgement these boundaries represent maximum concessions which should be made to the lumber industry."⁵² Ickes replied on December 9. He assured Thompson that the Park Service agreed with her boundary recommendations. However, he pointed out that "the

⁴⁹ Demaray to Ickes. 6 August 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 10, 1.

⁵⁰ Tomlinson to Demaray. 28 September 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 10, 2, NA.

⁵¹ Thompson to Ickes. 28 November 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 10, 2, NA.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 3.

legislation is in the hands of Mr. Wallgren" and therefore the department was not in a position to dictate boundaries.⁵³

The events of early 1937 showed the unlikelihood of compromise among the differing local factions on the peninsula. On January 23, 1937, Acting Director Demaray sent a memo to Secretary Ickes detailing the outcome of his conference with Congressman Wallgren. He reported that Wallgren had concluded that the size of the proposed park should be reduced and that he had insisted that as much of the reduction of the park as possible be done in Jefferson County to minimize the loss of revenue to that county. Wallgren had also specifically stated that the whole of Lake Quinault should be removed from the park because of the volume of commercial timber available in that area.

Demaray enclosed two maps illustrating the proposed changes. He pointed out that, along with the removal of a nine-square-mile section on the lower Bogachiel which was privately-owned, the west and southwest boundaries excluded both "in the Hoh River region and in the vicinity of Lake Quinault" thereby returning to the national forest "the great volume of commercial timber in those areas." Demaray noted that the exclusions were within Jefferson County and that they restored approximately five billion feet of commercial timber to the Forest Service. He concluded that this reduction would result in "reducing the opposition of the Gray's Harbor interest." Ickes approved the boundary changes on February 4.⁵⁴

Congressman Wallgren introduced H.R. 4724 on February 15, 1937. Advocates for the boundaries contained in the bill, including local and central office Park Service personnel, believed that the exclusions would reduce the opposition of the State Planning Council and other small park advocates and thereby isolate the Forest Service in opposition to the park. However, by spring of 1937, it was clear that the bill had not succeeded in this. The Forest Service and the State Planning Council opposed the second Wallgren bill as vigorously as they had the first, and other small park advocates were not won over.

However, the bill divided local and national conservation organizations. The local organizations who supported a large park--the Mount Olympus National Park Association and the Northwest Conservation League--supported the bill.⁵⁵ National

⁵³ Ickes to Thompson. 9 December 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 10, 1, NA.

⁵⁴ Demaray to Ickes. 23 January 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, Legislative File H.R. 4724, 1-2, NA.

⁵⁵ Thompson to Demaray. 21 February 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 11; Macy to Tomlinson. 21 February 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, File 000 General, pt. 11, NA.

conservation organizations were strongly opposed. Van Name wrote to Ickes to protest.⁵⁶ Robert Marshall, another prominent conservationist, also protested.⁵⁷ By the end of March, Rosalie Edge and the Emergency Conservation Committee had issued publication No. 63 entitled "Double-Crossing the Project for the Proposed Mount Olympus National Park," a pamphlet that sharply criticized the second Wallgren bill.⁵⁸

The second Wallgren bill crystallized opinion just as the first one had, but the restructuring did not occur as anticipated. The Forest Service and local lumbermen remained opposed to the presence of the Park Service on the peninsula and therefore opposed the second Wallgren bill. Local small park advocates remained allied with the Forest Service in opposition to the second Wallgren bill because they believed that the proposed park still contained too much commercial timber. Local conservation organizations and the national conservation organizations continued to support the presence of the Park Service on the peninsula and a large park, but disagreed over the merits of the second Wallgren bill. Ironically, the bill allied the national conservationists and the Forest Service in opposition to its provisions.

As in 1935 and 1936, these positions changed little throughout the spring and summer of 1937. Edge and the other national conservation organizations continued to criticize the bill and the Park Service defended its position accordingly. The state government perhaps became favorably disposed to the presence of the Park Service on the peninsula and a small park which included some small stands of timber on the western slope as a result of the growing acceptance of Chris Morgenroth's position by Governor Clarence D. Martin. Preston Macy, custodian of Mount Olympus National Monument, reported to Tomlinson on April 16, 1937, that Morgenroth had "won the Governor over to his lines, to a great extent" during meetings with the Forest Service and the Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce.⁵⁹

This slight change in position did not end the opposition of the state to both Wallgren bills. In fact, as Tomlinson noted in forwarding Macy's report to the director, "It is unfortunate that we are unable to obtain agreement on boundaries by all of the various groups who favor a national park."⁶⁰ This statement confirmed that the second Wallgren bill did not remove enough timber from the original bill to attract support from

⁵⁶ Van Name to Ickes. 15 February 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000, pt. 11, 1, NA.

⁵⁷ Marshall to Ickes. 13 February 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 11, NA.

⁵⁸ Edge to Ickes. 31 March 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, File 000 General, pt. 11, NA.

⁵⁹ Macy to Tomlinson. 16 April 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 pt. 12, 1, NA.

⁶⁰ Tomlinson to Demaray. 20 April 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 12, NA.

small park advocates, which was the reason for the service's support of the second bill, and thus is an admission of the failure to attain that objective.

Perhaps because of the concessions made to the local lumber interests and small park advocates by the second Wallgren bill, pressure for even more concessions grew. As early as May 5, 1937, Tomlinson reported, "The controversy over the proposed Mount Olympus National Park has reached a point where, in our opinion, an indication of the National Administration's views should be announced."⁶¹

The response to Tomlinson's request for a definitive statement by the national administration and to the criticism of the second Wallgren bill by national conservation organizations was President Franklin D. Roosevelt's visit to the Olympic Peninsula during the fall of 1937. As a result of this presidential visit, the matrix of opinion which resulted from the introduction of the second Wallgren bill was altered for a third and final time.

Roosevelt arrived at Port Angeles on September 30, 1937, on board a destroyer. During his opening remarks to the citizens of Port Angeles, he noticed a sign on the local schoolhouse reading "Please Mr. President, we need your help. Give us an Olympic National Park." He responded by saying,

"Mr. Mayor and friends of Port Angeles, that sign on the school house is the appealingist appeal that I have seen in all my travels. I am inclined to think it means more to have the children want that park than all the rest of us put together, so, you boys and girls, I think you can count on my help in getting that national park."⁶²

The president supported the presence of the Park Service on the peninsula and, in a more direct expression of his position, called for a large park or no park at all.

The conferences held that evening at Lake Crescent Tavern with President Roosevelt and Park Service and Forest Service officials also made it plain that the president favored the creation of a large park. Tomlinson was present for much of the evening and reported the events to Director Cammerer. Presidential comments include: "The Olympic Peninsula will in the future be as popular as Yellowstone is now and we must provide for the generations to come...The western hemlock is a beautiful tree; and eastern people want to see it" and, perhaps in response to the sign of the school children he had seen earlier in the day, "Why not call it 'The Olympic National Park'? This title

⁶¹ Tomlinson and Macy to Cammerer. 5 May 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 12, 1, NA.

⁶² Tomlinson to Cammerer. 6 October 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 13, 1, NA.

would tie in with the Olympic Peninsula and mean something. Mount Olympus is too hard to say."⁶³ Tomlinson also noted that

during the entire discussion the President left no doubt in the mind of any one present that he favored a large national park and that he especially desires the preservation of typical stands of timber. He emphasized the need for saving the western hemlock.⁶⁴

Roosevelt's visit forced changes in the public positions of most of the entities involved in the debate over the park. The opponents of a national park and the various proponents of small park options could no longer publicly advocate their positions without being seen as opposing the president of the United States. As Irving Brant, editor of the *St. Louis Star Times*, pointed out to Acting Director A. E. Demaray, "With President Roosevelt publicly advocating the park, there no longer seems any danger of being confronted with a 'this or nothing' choice dictated by the Forest Service and lumber interests."⁶⁵

Tomlinson also quickly grasped the impact of the presidential visit. He reported that the presidential visit "has done more to convince the people of the State of Washington of the importance of establishing a large national park" than all combined previous efforts.⁶⁶ The president's public commitment to support a large park also ended the criticism of the national conservation organizations. And, it provided the Park Service with a justification for working toward attaining the largest possible park.⁶⁷

Finally, the visit removed the debate over the size and nature of the park from the peninsula to the nation's capital, where the final decisions would be made and where the president would be directly involved. On October 28, less than a month after the presidential visit to the peninsula, Chief Forester W. H. Horning of the Park Service, responded negatively to a request for his evaluation of some proposed park boundaries by noting that "the matter is really out of our hands since the President undertook to settle it by direct negotiation with the Senators and Congressmen" and he recommended

⁶³ Ibid., 2.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 1.

⁶⁵ Brant to Demaray. 5 October 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, File 000 General, pt. 13, NA.

⁶⁶ Tomlinson to Demaray. Op. cit., 1.

⁶⁷ Horning to Demaray. 21 October 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 13, NA.

that "we should lie low until we learn the nature of the President's position and Congressman Wallgren's position."⁶⁸

The meeting that completed the direct negotiations took place at the White House on February 8, 1938. Director Cammerer attended along with Senators Bone and Schwollenbach, Congressmen Wallgren and Smith, and Chief Forester Silcox. Roosevelt initiated the proceedings by stating that he wanted a national park on the Olympic Peninsula and that the park should include the entire area declared by the secretary of Agriculture as permanent wilderness, all other areas "absolutely necessary for the park," and the entire valleys of two main rivers which flowed to the ocean.⁶⁹

No one protested the area to be included within the park, although some procedural differences between Wallgren and Smith were aired. Roosevelt instructed them to set up a separate meeting to resolve those differences. The agreement on a large park on the peninsula was reflected in the Department of the Interior report to the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 4724, which noted that the bill had been amended to enlarge the park in accordance with the president's wishes and to authorize the president to add to the park lands, "which may in the future be acquired by the United States by donation or otherwise..."⁷⁰

The secretary of Agriculture notified the Bureau of the Budget that he would not oppose a large park on the peninsula. The Bureau then approved the Department of the Interior report and forwarded it to Congress on March 28. On the same day, Wallgren introduced H.R. 10024, which became the legislative vehicle for the establishment of the park. This third Wallgren bill included most of the provisions in the amended second Wallgren bill, except that it excluded Lake Ozette. However, it did not authorize the president to add land to the park.⁷¹

Washington state officials, led by Governor Martin, continued to object privately to the amount of timber to be included in the large park. In April, Martin led a state delegation to Washington, D.C. to testify before the House Public Lands Committee and to meet with Roosevelt. At the meeting, which was also attended by the Washington congressional delegation and Ickes, Roosevelt suggested that if language were inserted into the legislation allowing the president to add any land from the National Forest to

⁶⁸ Horning to Demaray. 28 October 1937. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 13, NA.

⁶⁹ Cammerer to Demaray, Wirth, and Files. 8 February 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Legislative H.R. 4724, 1, NA.

⁷⁰ Ickes to Bell. 14 March 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Legislative H.R. 4724, NA.

⁷¹ Speck to Margold. 30 April 1938; Bell to Ickes. 28 March 1938. RG 48 12-34, Olympic, Legislation, NA.

the park after consultation with the state, this might resolve the impasse between the Forest Service and the Park Service.

Martin, perhaps believing that he was being given the right to veto any expansion he did not approve of, agreed to support the park bill containing such language. When he returned to the state he asserted this position in the press. Ickes responded in a May 17 speech from Spokane that the words "after consultation with" meant "after consultation with and nothing more."⁷² In all likelihood, Martin did not believe that he possessed a veto over a discretionary presidential activity, but in politics it is often better to seem mistaken than to seem to back down.

During May and early June, the final flurry of congressional activity that led to the enactment of the legislation which established Olympic National Park took place. By May 10, the House Committee on Public Lands had reported the bill favorably to the floor, but had amended it to exclude the Coastal Strip and river corridor additions. Wallgren failed to secure a rule to allow a vote on that date.⁷³ On May 16, Wallgren secured a rule for consideration of the bill and it passed the House of Representatives. It was sent to the Senate, where it was referred to the Senate Lands and Survey Committee. The two senators from Washington put a hold on the bill in an effort to retain for the state jurisdiction over the fish and game within the park. The Park Service refused to concede jurisdiction, however,⁷⁴ and on June 8, Irving Brant reported that the senators had agreed to attach the provisions of the amended second Wallgren bill to the third Wallgren bill, thereby restoring the president's discretionary authority to add land to the park after appropriate consultation.⁷⁵

Two days later, Tomlinson, who had been brought in to oversee the congressional enactment of the bill, reported to Demaray that Senator Bone and Congressman Smith were still resorting to delay in an effort to prevent enactment. Roosevelt intervened at this point, writing to Senators Bone and Schwollenbach asking them to work for passage of the bill. Finally, on June 16, the final day of the Congressional session, Congress authorized the creation of Olympic National Park. The bill passed the Senate by one vote at 1:30 p.m. and the House adopted it at 6:30 the same day.⁷⁶ In its final form, the bill abolished Mount Olympus National Monument and established a park of

⁷² Ickes to Press. 19 May 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, 6, NA.

⁷³ Demaray to Ickes. 13 May 1938. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 1, File 12-34 Legislation, NA.

⁷⁴ Burlew to Bone. 3 June 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, 1, NA.

⁷⁵ Tomlinson to Demaray. 8 June 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, NA.

⁷⁶ Tomlinson to Demaray. 17 June 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Legislative H.R. 4724, NA.

approximately 634,000 acres. It also authorized the president to add land to the park up to an acreage limitation of 898,220 acres.⁷⁷

President Roosevelt signed the legislation on June 29, 1938. On July 5, Director Cammerer wrote a letter of thanks to Rosalie Edge describing the conditions during the final days of enactment. "One day we were in the depths of despair over new adverse developments, and the next on the heights of exuberation. Finally, it worked out all right."⁷⁸

Although the bill created a relatively large park, the president was authorized to add significant acreage to it. Therefore, the process of establishing a large park on the peninsula was not yet complete. Two further presidential actions, the 1940 proclamation by Franklin D. Roosevelt and the January 6, 1953 executive order signed by Harry S. Truman, completed the process of establishing a large park. The proclamation boundary expansion based on the recommendations of Irving Brant, and the acquisition of the coastal strip and Queets corridor with Public Works Administration (PWA) funds in 1942, along with some other parcels, were finally made part the park by the outgoing President Truman.

BRANT ADDITION 1938-40

The enactment of legislation authorizing the park did not define the park in its final form. Section 1 of the bill identified and set aside only 634,000 acres for the park. Section 6 authorized the president to add lands to the park eight months after the date of enactment. After March 1, 1939, therefore, Roosevelt was allowed to include other land within the park up to the Congressional limit of 898,220 acres.

The administration moved quickly to begin to identify the lands to be included by the president. On July 14, Director Cammerer informed Frank Kittredge, director of the San Francisco Regional Office, that Secretary Ickes had appointed Irving Brant to serve as "sort of a Special Consultant in connection with some of our western park problems, particularly with the Olympic National Park extension problems."⁷⁹ Brant was an ardent conservationist who had played a significant role in managing the enactment of the park bill, and, as a result, was aware of Roosevelt's objectives on the peninsula.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ 52 *U.S. Statutes at Large*, 1241.

⁷⁸ Cammerer to Edge. 5 July 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, 1, NA.

⁷⁹ Cammerer to Kittredge. 14 July 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, NA.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

Brant left for the Olympic Peninsula on July 29, one month after the president had signed the park bill. He was accompanied on his inspection tour by Tomlinson, Madsen, and Macy, three of the four Park Service personnel who had recommended that a small alpine park be created four years earlier, and by Regional Landscape Architect E. A. Davidson and Regional Wildlife Technician Lowell Sumner. Ickes and his wife arrived during the tour and travelled with the group for several days. Brant completed his initial review on August 9.

Brant finished his report on the proposed additions and submitted it to Ickes in late August or early September. The report recommended that ten areas totalling 226,656 acres be added to the park. The areas included Lake Crescent, the administrative site adjacent to Port Angeles, the former Forest Service recreational area at Deer Park, Hurricane Ridge and Obstruction Point, and heavily timbered valleys of the Elwha, Bogachiel, Queets, and Quinault Rivers. The recommendations corresponded roughly to the desires expressed by Roosevelt during his 1937 visit, except for the inclusion of river corridors running to the ocean and a coastal strip. Congress had specified in the park bill that privately owned lands could only be acquired by gift or purchase, and Brant evidently believed that a sufficient amount of land within those areas was privately owned to prevent their addition by presidential action.⁸¹

Congress had also included in the park bill a provision that required the president to "consult with the Governor of the State of Washington, the secretary of the Interior, and the secretary of Agriculture and advise them of the lands which he proposes to add to such park" and to allow a reasonable time for discussion after so informing them before formally adding the land to the park. After Brant submitted his preliminary report, the governor's office raised some objections, and Regional Director Kittredge was selected as the Park Service representative to exchange ideas with Washington State Planning Council representatives Ross Tiffany and Ben Kizer. Associate Director Demaray informed Kittredge of his appointment on September 2, and instructed that he not agree to any diminishment of the proposed Brant additions during the negotiation process.

The negotiations between Kittredge and Tiffany began a process which lasted more than a year. However, before the end of October 1938, they reached an agreement to disagree. The original Brant recommendations, which became known as the Brant-Tomlinson boundaries, called for the addition of 226,656 acres, 39,360 of which were in the heavily timbered western slope river valleys. Kittredge supported the entire Brant recommendation, but Tiffany, Governor Martin, and most state government officials opposed the inclusion of any more western slope timber acreage. They

⁸¹ *Report On The Enlargement of Olympic National Park*, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, 1-2, NA.

recommended in return that a larger area than Brant's recommendation be added to the park on the other three sides.⁸²

During the spring of 1939, the Brant-Tomlinson lines were revised by the Department of the Interior, increasing the acreage to be added to the western slopes to 50,625 acres and reducing the amount of acreage added to the remainder of the park to 136,786 acres. This change was made, as Brant reported, "to meet the desire of the President for additional protection to western rivers and ultimate inclusion of a sea-shore strip" and corrected the only serious deficiency in Brant's original report.⁸³

The state continued to press for no further additions to the park's western boundaries. However, on June 19, 1939, Secretary Ickes wrote to Secretary Wallace requesting that he advise Ickes on his position on the spring revisions. Wallace replied on June 30, offering no objections to the proposed additions. Therefore, from June 30 onward, the state was the sole opponent to the additions sought by Roosevelt.⁸⁴

On August 25, George Yantis, a state delegate who had become involved in the negotiations, agreed to all the proposed boundary lines except the western additions. In October, Yantis raised the potential for developing manganese deposits to justify his opposition to a further extension of the western boundaries.⁸⁵ Irving Brant made a strong case against the mineral argument by pointing out that every site identified by a recent Geological Survey investigation as sufficient potential for commercial development was already claimed, and that "one-third of all the deposits reported by the Geological Survey to be worth further exploration are in the 97,000 acres not recommended for the park by the secretary of the Interior" but supported for inclusion by Yantis prior to August 25.⁸⁶

The impasse was not broken until December, when Department of the Interior Solicitor Nathan Margold issued an opinion concluding that the clause in the park bill requiring consultation did not mean that the approval of the entities to be consulted was required before the president could exercise his authority to add to the park.⁸⁷ Also, in early December, a final meeting to discuss the proposed extensions was held with Roosevelt,

⁸² Brant to Ickes. 6 December 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, Olympic - Lands, pt. 1, 3-4, NA.

⁸³ Ibid., 4.

⁸⁴ Wallace to Ickes. 30 June 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 602, pt. 2, 1, NA.

⁸⁵ Brant to Ickes. 6 December 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47, Lands, pt. 1, 5, NA.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁷ Margold to Ickes. 7 December 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47, Lands, pt. 1, 1, NA.

Ickes, Governor Martin, and Chief Forester Silcox in attendance. In addition to this meeting, representatives of the interested parties met the entire weekend.

The prime source of disagreement was the inclusion of 50,000 acres in the lower Bogachiel. The state representatives argued that the area was not of park caliber, although they admitted its relative economic value was limited. Department of the Interior officials argued that it was a rain forest and therefore ecologically valuable.⁸⁸ On December 14, Roosevelt sent Acting Secretary of the Interior E.K. Burlew a personal note instructing him to "telegraph to one of your park service men to take photographs" in the floor of the lower Bogachiel. The photographer was to start two or three miles inside the present boundary and take a photograph every half mile until he had reached three to four miles west of the present boundary to provide the evidence for determining whether the area was a rain forest.⁸⁹ Roosevelt signed the proclamation on January 2, 1940. It included the enlarged Bogachiel.

On January 3, 1940, Roosevelt held a press conference to present the contents of the proclamation. Using a letter opener, he pointed out the various additions on a large map, and he released a letter he had addressed to Governor Martin. The letter stated, in part, that his decision to include the lower Bogachiel in the park was based on the photographs he had requested which clearly showed that the area did contain a rain forest. Because Martin had agreed that the area should be included in the park if it did contain a rain forest, the president could see no further basis for objection to its inclusion.⁹⁰

PWA ACQUISITION

The third Wallgren bill, which legislatively authorized the establishment of Olympic National Park and defined the process by which it would be enlarged, did not include a coastal segment or a river corridor to the sea. It further barred the president from adding non-federal land to the park except by gift or acquisition. Therefore, the final outcome of the Brant addition negotiations also lacked provision for the inclusion of such areas.

This exclusion resulted from a decision by the president and by Secretary Ickes to acquire these areas with PWA funds and add them to the park at a later date. Roosevelt had noted as early as December 10, 1938 that some other way had to be

⁸⁸ Burlew to Roosevelt. 12 December 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47, Lands, pt. 1, 1-2, NA.

⁸⁹ Roosevelt to Burlew. 14 December 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, 12-47, Lands, pt. 1, NA.

⁹⁰ Clipping. 5 January 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 501-03, pt. 1, NA.

found to add a Hoh-Bogachiel corridor and a Queets corridor to the park as well as a coastal strip. He initially instructed Ickes to begin work with the Washington State Congressional delegation to draft legislation to authorize these additions.⁹¹ However, efforts at securing legislation were soon abandoned and the decision to acquire the lands in question through condemnation was made.

Several sources, including Irving Brant, indicate that this decision was made in the spring of 1939. However, the idea of using PWA funds to acquire land for the park was raised in a different context in November 1938, when Tomlinson asked whether such funds could be used to acquire the present administrative site of the park. He was anxious to begin PWA work on the site and it could not be made part of the park until after March 1939 because of the eight-month time limit established by the original park bill.⁹² (See chapter 5 for a detailed discussion of the acquisition of the administrative site.)

The basis for using PWA funds was the proposed construction of a parkway along the Queets Corridor and Coastal Strip and by July 15, 1939, the decision to condemn the lands required for such a project had been made. On that date, Acting Director Demaray forwarded to Ickes a memorandum transmitting a draft of a letter to the attorney general requesting that he begin condemnation proceedings. Ickes approved the draft on July 20, but formal transmittal to the Department of Justice did not occur until August 29. On that date, Assistant Secretary Oscar Chapman informed Attorney General Robert Jackson, whom Roosevelt would later appoint to the Supreme Court, that "pursuant to the provisions of Title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), as amended, I have determined that certain lands...embracing approximately 49,177.44 acres, situated in Jefferson and Clallam Counties, in the State of Washington, are suitable and necessary for public work purposes."⁹³ In October, the department further requested that the attorney general file a declaration of taking as part of the condemnation proceedings so that the U.S. could attain immediate ownership of much of the area.⁹⁴ By May 14, 1940, the Land Acquisition Office had identified 41,956.97 acres out of the total of 49,177 that were to be included in the declaration of taking.⁹⁵

⁹¹ Roosevelt to Ickes. 10 December 1938. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, Olympic, 12-34 Lands, pt. 1, NA.

⁹² Tomlinson to Cammerer. 28 November 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 601, pt. 1, NA.

⁹³ Chapman to Jackson. 29 August 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, Olympic, File 12-34 Lands, pt. 1, NA.

⁹⁴ Finch to Jackson. 9 October 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 602, pt. 2, NA.

⁹⁵ Myers to Chief Counsel. 14 May 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610 - Aaker, pt. 1, NA.

Some of the residents in the Queets Corridor mounted a protest to the condemnation proceedings (see chapter 12), but the administrative process of acquisition by condemnation and declaration of taking went smoothly, although it turned out to be underfunded. The process required formal identification of the location of the land to be taken, the appraisal of the land in question, and the provision of notice to the property owner of the government's intent and evaluation of the said property. The property owner then had the option of accepting the government's price or asking a jury to review the appraisal.

To meet these administrative requirements, the Park Service, in conjunction with the Justice Department, set up a land acquisition office in Seattle in early 1940. The structure of the office was based on the joint recommendation of Regional Director Kittredge and Assistant Chief Counsel Donald Lee. Seattle office personnel consisted of an acquisition coordinator, who was responsible for the negotiations with property owners, the group of appraisers, who would evaluate each tract for its agricultural, timber, mineral, recreational, and residential value, and a support staff. The coordinator would arrive at the maximum negotiable amount in consultation with the appraisal staff. When negotiation failed, U.S. Attorney Joseph Taylor and his assistants would oversee trial preparation and the actual litigation.⁹⁶

The lawsuit by which the process of negotiation and litigation was undertaken to perfect the transfer of title to the United States was *U.S. v. John B. Aaker, et. al.*, Aaker being the alphabetical leader of the group of property owners. Members of the group who opposed condemnation challenged the right of the U.S. to engage in this type of legal action. The case was heard on March 21 and 22, 1941 and dismissed by the District Court judge on April 2. An appeal was announced, but it evidently failed because the land acquisition process continued to a relatively satisfactory conclusion.⁹⁷

On January 12, 1942, Newton Drury, the new director of the National Park Service, reported to Ickes that the first set of jury trials to determine the value to be paid to the owners of lands taken under the declaration had been completed, and that the jury had for the most part awarded more money than the government experts had calculated to be the worth of the properties. As a result, Drury predicted a shortfall in the PWA fund established to acquire the lands taken. He pointed out that the jury's decisions had reduced the incentive of land owners to resolve their claims through negotiation.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Lee to Kittredge. 21 February 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 2301.06, pt. 1, 1-4, NA.

⁹⁷ Taylor to Cammerer. 22 March 1941. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610 - Aaker, pt. 2, 1, NA.

⁹⁸ Drury to Ickes. 12 January 1942. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 603, pt. 1, 1-2, NA.

By the end of January, Drury reported that the upcoming March trials would involve 23,653 acres and that the amount of funds on hand was not sufficient to cover the anticipated awards in full. He recommended a dismissal of the cases condemning 5,700 acres within the Coastal Strip which were not necessary to assure that the strip be contiguous.⁹⁹

MORSE CREEK ADDITION

The addition of the Morse Creek drainage to the park on June 1, 1943 further complicated the acquisition of the Queets Corridor and Coastal Strip. It included 20,000 acres not anticipated in the original expansion. Evidence of interest in adding the Morse Creek watershed can be found as early as September 1941, when President Roosevelt sent Secretary of Agriculture Wallace a personal note directing him to hold up the Forest Service effort to allow a private lumber company to begin cutting on the Morse Creek watershed "until cleared by me, and let me see on the map just where the proposed cutting is to be."¹⁰⁰

On March 2, 1943, Irving Brant reported to Roosevelt that he had learned from Charles Webster, publisher of the Port Angeles *Evening News*, that "the plywood interests of that city have dropped their attempt to secure timber from the Morse Creek watershed, source of the Port Angeles water supply." Brant also reported that "all local interests are now agreed that it should be included in the Olympic National Park."¹⁰¹ Accordingly, in mid-May, Ickes forwarded a letter to the president recommending that he sign a proclamation including the Morse Creek watershed within the park "to round out the north boundary of the park." Roosevelt signed the proclamation on June 1.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Drury to Ickes. 28 January 1942. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47 Olympic, Lands, pt. 3, 1-2, NA.

¹⁰⁰ Roosevelt to Wallace. 3 September 1941. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47 Olympic, Lands, NA.

¹⁰¹ Brant to Roosevelt. 2 March 1943. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47 Olympic, Lands, pt. 4, NA.

¹⁰² Ickes to Roosevelt. 19 May 1943. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47 Olympic, Lands, pt. 4, NA.

THE TRUMAN EXECUTIVE ORDER

The outcome of the PWA acquisition project was reported to Congressman Walt Horan by Assistant Secretary C. Girard Davidson in November 1947. In all, 43,730 acres had been acquired before funds had run out, leaving 2,000 acres of the original area unacquired. The status of the properties acquired remained uncertain, because they were not formally included in the park. Davidson noted that "authority exists for their addition to the park under the act of June 29, 1938, to the extent that the 898,292 acreage limitation is not exceeded" and that "the National Park Service is now making further studies relating to the development and eventual status of the lands, in the corridor and along the Pacific" to determine their best recreational use.¹⁰³

By January 10, 1949, those studies were completed. Director Drury reported to Davidson that the plans for developing the coastal strip called for possibly three recreational areas, "the most prominent of these probably would be in the area around La Push near the mouth of the Quillayute River and Rialto Beach." The others would be located at or near Ruby Beach at the southern end of the strip and Ozette Lake at the northern edge. The plan also called for the construction of a road from Ozette Lake to La Push where it would connect with existing roads. Drury did not discuss the service's plans for the Queets Corridor.

However, by October 1949, some consideration had been given to the issuance of a presidential proclamation including the coastal strip, the Queets Corridor, and the nine sections of land along the Bogachiel which had been acquired by the Forest Service. Drury recommended that the problem of exceeding the acreage limitation of the original park bill if all 46,000 acres were added to the park be solved by eliminating from inclusion within the park the area "which lies between the Queets Corridor and Ocean Strip in the vicinity of the Clearwater River" and other smaller scattered parcels. Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman approved Drury's recommendation on April 4, 1950.¹⁰⁴

The proposal was not presented to President Truman until August 27, 1952, however, "in order that as much as possible of the land within the proposed extension might be acquired by exchange before the Proclamation is put into effect." On that date, Acting Secretary R. D. Searles forwarded the requested extension to Truman, with a request that he consult with the secretary of Agriculture and the governor of Washington in

¹⁰³ Davidson to Horan. 6 November 1947. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610, NA.

¹⁰⁴ Drury to Chapman. 18 October 1949. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47 Olympic, Lands, pt. 5, 5, NA.

accordance with the provisions of the original park bill.¹⁰⁵ By the end of 1952, both parties had received notice of Truman's intention. On January 6, 1953, he signed the proclamation completing the creation of the "big park" called for by President Roosevelt and enacted by Congress more than fifteen years earlier.

On January 15, 1953, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Joel Wolfsohn responded to a letter from the Hoquiam Chamber of Commerce protesting any further enlargement of the park. He pointed out that Truman had already signed the proclamation "thus completing the Park as originally intended and authorized by the Congress."¹⁰⁶ Further boundary disputes would arise (discussed in chapter 12). However, almost fifteen years after its creation, the fact that Olympic would be a "big park" was realized. In the process, the National Park Service was established as the largest federal landholder on the Olympic Peninsula.

¹⁰⁵ Searles to Truman. 27 August 1952. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-47 Olympic, Lands, pt. 6, NA.

¹⁰⁶ Wolfsohn to Halpin. 15 January 1953. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, File 12-47 Olympic, Lands, pt. 6, NA.

CHAPTER 5

Chapter 5

THE FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS: PRESTON MACY AND FRED OVERLY, 1938-1958

The establishment of the presence of the Park Service on the Olympic Peninsula occurred concurrently with the emergence of a wilderness philosophy that newly-elected President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes would use to evaluate resource management decisions of the Service. Ickes in particular accepted the emerging wilderness-management concepts of the day and attempted to integrate those practices into the Park Service's administrative decision-making apparatus. Olympic was one of several parks established by the Roosevelt administration which were to be managed differently than older parks had been managed.

The most significant aspect of the 1916 act establishing the Park Service and defining its mission, is the inherent potential for conflict between the goals of the conservation of park resources and the exposure of those resources to visitors. As Dr. C. S. Piggott observed during a 1948 visit to Olympic, "One is faced with a dilemma established by the desire to make such a virgin area accessible to the enjoyment and education of the greatest possible number of citizens and the knowledge that arrangements for doing this will destroy much that is the essence of the park."¹

The Organic Act of 1916 stated that the purpose of the National Park Service was "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."² However, the document that defined the service's mission in detail was a May 13, 1918 directive from Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane to Director Stephen T. Mather. The directive provided guidelines for most aspects of park management, including concessions, natural resources management, and appropriate maintenance practices. These aspects are discussed in their respective chapters. For the purposes of this chapter, Lane's letter established two management goals which were potentially contradictory. First he stated, "Every activity of the Service is subordinate to the duties imposed upon it to faithfully preserve the parks for posterity in essentially their natural state." However, he then went on to direct that parks be managed in such a way that "every opportunity should be afforded the public, wherever possible, to enjoy the national parks in the manner that best satisfies

¹ OLYM, File 1, 1, NPS Washington, D.C. History Office Library.

² *U.S. Statutes at Large*, 39(1916): 535.

the individual taste. Automobiles and motorcycles will be permitted in all of the national parks; in fact, the parks will be kept accessible by any means practicable."³

From these two documents, several forces can be seen at work. On the one hand, the national conservation organizations insisted on preservation of resources. On the other, access to those resources, which could be detrimental to their preservation, was also given a high operational priority. In the context of the times, visitor access to all parks by whatever means was a major step toward protecting the parks from private commercial manipulation by railroads and hotel syndicates, and in that sense, the Organic Act and Lane's directive are both moderately progressive in philosophy. However, they did not resolve the potential conflict between resource protection and visitor access and convenience.

As a result, superintendents could potentially make contradictory choices as they addressed each specific management decision at hand. However, superintendents, like most managers, attempt to be consistent and, as a result, management decision-making patterns emerge. These patterns are based in part on the philosophy and background of the individual superintendents and their administrative superiors, and in part on the spirit of the times. The philosophies of the persons who served as superintendent of Olympic National Park and the conditions in which they operated are covered in chapters 5 and 6. This chapter addresses the philosophies of the first two superintendents, Preston Macy and Fred Overly, whose combined tenure at Olympic was twenty-five years. Chapter 6 discusses their successors within in the same analytical context.

The Emergence of Early Wilderness Concepts 1900-1933

The oldest guiding tenets of the National Park Service management philosophy were formed prior to the formal creation of the Service itself. As Alfred Runte has shown in *National Parks: The American Experience*, by the first decade of the twentieth century the criteria for inclusion of land within a national park were: (1) that the area under consideration contain spectacular scenery, and (2) that it contain no resource of economic significance.⁴ As a result, early parks did not include sufficient territory to provide for their ecological integrity.

The creation of the National Park Service was justified by the rationale developed during the second decade of the twentieth century that areas of scenic beauty containing no other exploitable resources could pay for their management by attracting a large number of visitors. In an article in the April 1915 issue of *American Review of Reviews*, Stephen

³ National Park Service. *Compilation of the Administrative Policies for the National Parks and National Monuments of Scientific Significance* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1970), 68-69.

⁴ Alfred Runte. *National Parks: The American Experience* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 81.

Mather, who would become the first director of the National Park Service, stated that his management philosophy was to "develop to the highest possible degree of efficiency the resources of the national parks both for the pleasure and the profit of their owners, the people." He expressed the hope that the number of people who would "play in them every summer" would grow from the present one hundred thousand into millions.⁵

Because the areas within its system were perceived to be commercially worthless and the significance of their ecological relationships was not considered, early Park Service management perspective tended to resolve the potential conflict between visitor use and resource protection in favor of visitor access. This was the perspective of Horace Albright, who was present at the creation of the service in 1916 and succeeded Mather as director. In the spring of 1956, in response to an inquiry by Max Gilstrap, the chief of the *Christian Science Monitor* central news bureau, Albright stated that he had been guided by congressional mandate in the 1916 act establishing the service. Albright noted that throughout his career in the Park Service and in private business he had "always been a firm believer in preservation of the natural and wilderness values of the national parks. As an official directing their operation, I necessarily had to keep in mind that Congress set two standards for park use, first, making them available for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, and second, preserving them in their natural condition."⁶

Albright also noted, "Ever since national park administration started about 80 years ago, the park administrator has been confronted with the necessity for harmonizing these objectives and it will always be a basic consideration for him in planning developments." Albright did not state precisely his own position on this issue. However, he did say, "Any person who is going to accomplish anything of benefit to the people, who own the parks, cannot take his stand with the extremists on either side."⁷

In the early 1930s, during Albright's last years as director, new ideas concerning the role of the Park Service in balancing its resource conservation activities with its visitor services were emerging. Some national conservation groups, appalled by conditions at Yellowstone and other older parks, were beginning to call for increased protection of the nation's park resources at the expense of visitor amusement. Such groups included the National Park Association, the National Association of Audubon Societies, and the American Civic Association.⁸ These organizations and other national and local conservation organizations and individuals argued that the preservation of wilderness could be a primary purpose for creating a park.

⁵ Ibid., 103.

⁶ Albright to Gilstrap. 2 April 1956. RG 79, Wirth Papers, Albright File, 1, NA.

⁷ Ibid., 2.

⁸ Runte. *National Parks*, 132-33.

This perspective was adopted by Harold L. Ickes when he became secretary of the Interior. The first successful effort by conservationists to persuade Congress to adopt this position came, perhaps not coincidentally, after the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the resignation of Horace Albright. On May 30, 1934, Congress enacted legislation creating Everglades National Park. Section 4 of that Act stated in part, "The said area or areas shall be permanently reserved as a wilderness."⁹

Virtually identical language was included in the first Olympic bill (see chapter 4), and it is clear that from the beginning of Park Service presence on the Olympic Peninsula, the management approach at Olympic was to be based on the 1930s wilderness concepts embodied in the Everglades legislation. In fact, the creation of Olympic National Park was non-traditional in several ways. First, as a result of the 1940 and 1953 additions, the park took in a valuable economic resource, the old growth timber along its western slope river valleys. The traditional approach of including only scenic high country of no other worth, which was the position of most small park advocates on the peninsula, was not followed. Second, Harold Ickes and national and local conservation organizations intended that, in the management of Olympic National Park, a new relationship between the resources and the visitor would develop.

As early as May 25, 1934, Owen Tomlinson, Superintendent of Mount Rainier, reported that his investigation of the local reaction to the Emergency Conservation Committee pamphlet had included "a considerable number of individuals who are opposed to building roads in the Monument and even more in favor of creating a national park."¹⁰ Cammerer's response revealed the significance of this dual statement and the extent to which convenient access to scenic elements in a park was ingrained in the service's institutional perception. He circulated Tomlinson's report to Demaray and Wirth and noted, "I can't think of a national park as a complete wilderness area without being developed by some roads for public use. I can conceive of a national monument under those conditions."¹¹

By the time the bill creating Olympic was enacted, Cammerer had come to accept the notion of a national park with limited road access. On August 26, 1938, Secretary Ickes announced in a speech delivered to the Northwest Conservation League in Seattle that the preservation of wilderness conditions within the park would be the primary

⁹ Ibid., 135.

¹⁰ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 25 May 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 1, NA.

¹¹ Cammerer to Demaray and Wirth. 1 June 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, NA.

management objective. The contents of the speech were reported by the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* the next day.¹²

On September 19, 1938, Charles Moore, of the Gig Harbor Commission of Fine Arts, sent a letter to Director Cammerer expressing concern over Park Service management intentions at Olympic. Moore pointed out, "There is apprehension over the phrase wilderness park, which is taken to mean exclusion." Moore went on to state, "Of course there is no knowledge as yet of the Park Service purposes." His own recommendation was to adopt "a general plan of slow, systematic development."¹³

Director Cammerer replied to Moore on September 27, acknowledging that "a great deal of apprehension about the nature of the park" existed on the peninsula. He then indicated the goal of the Park Service's management and development practices:

After thorough studies by the various technical branches of the Service, a master plan covering the developments of the park will be drawn up and no developments will be permitted that are not included in the approved master plan. In general, however, it is not our intention to exclude people from enjoyment and use of the park, but, rather, to develop the park in such a way as to retain its wilderness character.¹⁴

The 1930s concept of wilderness was not the same as the more far-reaching concepts that would be developed in the 1960s and 1970s. While the goal of preserving wilderness character did not depart as sharply from the older playground management philosophy as the more recent wilderness management concepts do, it nevertheless did distance itself from the more utilitarian aspects of that philosophy. Preserving wilderness outweighed visitor amusement as a management priority. Local and national conservation groups, along with Ickes, concluded that a park could be maintained without roads. The absence of roads became the main element of their wilderness management concepts. Their wilderness philosophy was summarized in a resolution adopted at the September 1-4, 1934 meeting of western outdoor clubs. This group called for the preservation of the area within the monument as a wilderness area "as defined in the National Plan for American Forestry," which meant that "all roads, settlements and power transportation

¹² *Post-Intelligencer* clipping. 27 August 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Administration General, pt. 1, NA.

¹³ Moore to Cammerer. 19 September 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 17, 2, NA.

¹⁴ Cammerer to Moore. 27 September 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 17, NA.

are barred, but trails and temporary shelters, features such as were common long before the advent of the White Race, are entirely permissible."¹⁵

A document that was either mimeographed or published by either the Park Service or the Department of the Interior prior to 1950 stated the original management principles by which the resources of Olympic National Park were to be managed and the source of these principles. The document noted that "there are three basic reasons for the creation of the park: (1) Preservation of a substantial area of the dense, virgin, Rain Forests of the Northwest Coast type; (2) Protection and preservation of interesting fauna, notably the rare Roosevelt Elk, with sufficient range areas to perpetuate the species under natural conditions; (3) Protection of one of the finest remaining scenic and wilderness areas of the nation, with emphasis on maintenance of wilderness conditions for the benefit of future generations."¹⁶

The persons who were to develop the management principles met in late July and early August of 1938, shortly after Congress established the park. In attendance for at least some of the sessions were Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; Irving Brant, Representative of the Secretary; Owen A. Tomlinson, Superintendent of Mt. Rainier National Park, in charge of administrative organization; Preston P. Macy, Acting Superintendent of the new park; David Madsen, Supervisor of Fish Resources, NPS; E. Lowell Sumner, Regional Wildlife Technician; and E. A. Davidson, Regional Landscape Architect.¹⁷

The policies developed by this group were deemed necessary to fulfill the purposes embodied in the park's establishment. Specific management policies are discussed in later chapters which focus on specific areas of park management. For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to note that the group concluded that management practices followed in older parks to facilitate visitor access were not to be practiced in Olympic. It was to remain a trail park with minimum road construction. In all aspects of its management, the primary consideration was non-interference with natural conditions.¹⁸

The conclusions of the planning group guided the management approach of Preston P. Macy, the first superintendent of Olympic. Macy had received a college degree in biology. He had begun his vocational life raising cattle in Missouri and had some success as a breeder. However, the depression came early to midwestern farm country,

¹⁵ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 22 September 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File OOO General, pt. 4, 2, NA.

¹⁶ Statement of Controlling Development Policies. 1950 ?, File Olympic Box 3, B-1, Harper's Ferry Center Library, NPS.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

and when a friend told him of a seasonal opening at Mount Rainier, he took it. The seasonal position did not lead to full-time employment, so at the end of the season Macy returned home and sold Fuller brushes for awhile. After a year or so, he returned to Seattle and found his seasonal position still open. He rejoined the service and in 1924 became a permanent ranger at Mount Rainier.¹⁹

PRESTON P. MACY: 1938-1951

In 1934, when Mount Olympus National Monument came under the jurisdiction of the Park Service, Macy accompanied Tomlinson and David Madsen, a Service fisheries biologist whose home office seems to have been Salt Lake City, on an inspection of the monument. The primary purpose of this trip was to gather information in order to respond to the Emergency Conservation Committee pamphlet, which called for the creation of a national park on the peninsula. Tomlinson probably chose Macy to be part of the inspection team because the overriding concern for the health of the elk herd made Macy's background in biology useful. Madsen was named as the first custodian of the monument in order to justify extending his detail to the peninsula, but Macy became acting custodian of the monument in December 1934 and custodian in October 1935.

Macy's early management activities consisted primarily of attempting to improve the trail system within the monument (inherited from the Forest Service), and to develop new access trails, locate administrative space, and build a permanent staff. The Forest Service trails had not been maintained to Park Service standards. Therefore, in accordance with the planning group's decision that Olympic would be a trail park, Macy placed his highest priority on expanding and improving the park's trail system. In fact, the only trails in Olympic that were not originally Forest Service trails were built by Macy prior to World War II.²⁰

Also in accordance with the planning group's policies, Macy, throughout his administration, opposed any radical improvement of roads within the park. He related to Herbert Evison, in an oral-history interview, his successful efforts to block Washington State's Bureau of Public Roads from building a larger high speed road up the Hoh Valley. He recalled, "The Bureau of Public Roads wanted to make a 50-mile-an-hour road out of it, and I insisted no, we wouldn't widen it, we would just use the present roadbed and do no cutting on the bank side; there might be a place or two where on a sharp curve we would fill just a little on the lower side, but just use the present road and even if we had to pave the ditch in places so a car could go to the side if necessary."

¹⁹ Macy. Interview by Herb Evison. 10 October 1962. Text at Harper's Ferry Center Library NPS.

²⁰ Glen Gallison. Interview 1.

Macy noted that the Bureau of Public Roads had appealed his decision to the regional and central offices, but to no avail.²¹

Macy's tenure at Olympic was beset by inadequate funds and personnel, and it is therefore difficult to determine the extent to which he believed in or understood the wilderness approach to park management and the extent to which he could do nothing else because he lacked men and money. His desire to get along with people led him to act in ways contrary to the recommendations of the planning group, particularly in the area of concessions management (chap. 9). For the most part, however, Macy generally followed the guidelines established by the 1938 planning group.

Administrative Staff

In addition to the administrative tasks that confront every superintendent, Macy faced an administrative problem that only first superintendents encounter: the establishment of the administrative staff and the selection of the site for the administrative facilities of the park. Macy remained as the only permanent Park Service employee on the peninsula until July 1, 1936 when a permanent ranger position was authorized and Fred Overly was transferred from Glacier National Park to fill it. During the early monument days, Macy supervised "three seasonal rangers located at Heart Lake in the northeast section, Dosemeadows in the eastern part, and the Olympus station in the west central part of the monument." The three seasonal rangers assigned to those areas were Jack Casser, Floyd Dickenson, and Gene Voorhies, respectively.²²

Macy was responsible for overseeing the activities of up to fifty-one seasonal employees, depending on the time of year, with the peak usually coming in July or August. His total budget for managing the monument during 1937, the last full year of monument status, was \$36,600, and contained three categories: Improvement of Trails--\$25,000, Administration--\$9000, and Fire Protection Service--\$2600.²³ For fiscal year 1938, the budget was reduced to \$14,720 and contained three line headings and eleven line items.²⁴

Staff expansion occurred rapidly after the creation of the park, but the staff remained small in relation to the resources they were charged with managing. By September 1940, less than three years after the establishment of the park and less than a year after the

²¹ Evison. Interview text, 11-12.

²² Macy to Tomlinson. 17 July 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 6, 3, NA.

²³ Macy to Tomlinson. *Custodian's Annual Report*, 30 June 1937, 4, Olympic National Park Library.

²⁴ Outline of Work--Mount Olympus National Monument--Fiscal Year 1938, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 13, NA.

Brant additions, the permanent office force had grown to eleven and included the positions of assistant superintendent, filled by Fred Overly, and chief clerk, filled by Gordon Gale. Other staff consisted of assistant clerks and clerk typists. The total payroll was \$22,500.²⁵ During 1941, the positions of chief ranger, filled by William B. Augustine, and assistant chief ranger, filled by Charles Brown, had been added, along with another clerical position, raising the number of permanent staff to fourteen. The payroll grew to \$28,920.²⁶

The onset of World War II ended staff growth and temporarily reversed the trend. However, in 1947, Gunnar Fagerlund arrived from Hawaii to be the park's first chief naturalist and by 1955, during the middle of Fred Overly's tenure, the staff consisted of thirty-one permanent positions, including Jerry B. House as assistant superintendent and Raymond C. Stickler as chief clerk. The number of seasonals remained at approximately fifty and varied with the season.²⁷

Administrative Facilities

It fell to Macy to select a site for headquarters facilities and oversee their construction. To establish administrative space, Macy began at 431 East 12th Street in Port Angeles in a structure he rented as the custodian's residence. He hired trail crews there and monitored their activity within the park with a wireless radio in the attic. On August 1, 1936, he leased a warehouse and office space at 336 East First Street in downtown Port Angeles.²⁸ By 1940, the park offices consisted of four rooms in the Federal Building.²⁹ However, these rooms were not leased directly by the Park Service, but were borrowed from the Forest Service, the Internal Revenue Service, Customs, and the Civil Service.³⁰

Although the administrative space remained temporary through the summer of 1941, selection of a site for a permanent administrative headquarters and superintendent's

²⁵ NPS Senior Auditor Early Brown to Cammerer. 23 September 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 204, pt. 1, 1, NA.

²⁶ NPS Field Auditor Marlow Glen to Cammerer. 13 October 1941. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207, pt. 1, 12, NA.

²⁷ Civil Service Inspector Howard Bursom to Civil Service Regional Director John Young. 21 December 1954. RG 46, Central Classified Files, Olympic, 7, Department of the Interior Records Office.

²⁸ *Custodian's Annual Report*, Mount Olympus National Monument, 30 June 1937, 4, Olympic National Park Library.

²⁹ Brown to Cammerer. 23 September 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 204, pt. 1, 1, NA.

³⁰ Macy to Cammerer. 4 October 1941. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 204, pt. 1, 2, NA.

residence had begun earlier. The earliest Park Service plan called for the site of the permanent headquarters to be located somewhere along the shore of Lake Crescent.³¹ Such a location would have followed the traditional service pattern of locating the superintendent within the park and isolating park management from exterior influences. However, as early as July 1935, it was decided that the headquarters would be located outside the boundaries of the monument and near the community of Port Angeles.³² This decision reflected the Forest Service philosophy of locating its administrative personnel in or near local communities impacted by the existence of a national forest.³³

The site on which the administrative facilities were to be built was acquired by Macy at a tax sale. Macy then conveyed the land to the United States by a deed dated October 24, 1938. However, because of potential defects in the title to the land, the attorney general, who was required to approve all transactions involving land acquisition by the federal government, did not approve the deed, which was rewritten on July 19, 1939. The attorney general approved the second deed on August 29 and the secretary of the Interior formally accepted possession on September 12, 1939.³⁴

The year delay in accepting the title resulted in a year delay in beginning work on the construction of the administrative building and superintendent's residence. By March of 1940, Macy reported that "the Administration Building and Superintendent's Residence were 25% complete"³⁵ and by July, he reported that the buildings were only partially complete but that funds were exhausted.³⁶ The buildings were completed and occupied during October, 1941.³⁷

³¹ Cammerer to Ickes. 20 February 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

³² Macy to Tomlinson. 17 July 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 6, Map, NA.

³³ Sid Malbon, interview; Dwight Rettig, interview.

³⁴ Ickes to Wallgren. 14 September 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, 12-34 Olympic, Lands, pt. 1, NA.

³⁵ Macy to Cammerer. 10 April 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-02.3, pt. 1, 3, NA.

³⁶ Macy to Cammerer. 10 July, 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-02.3, pt. 1, 2, NA.

³⁷ Macy to Cammerer. 4 October 1941. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 204.1, pt. 1, 3, NA.

FRED OVERLY: 1951-58

Fred Overly succeeded Macy as superintendent at Olympic in August, 1951. Overly's background was different from Macy's. Overly had graduated first in his class from the University of Washington School of Forestry. His earliest employment had been with a Seattle bank financing a timber operation on the peninsula and with the Crescent Logging Company. He had learned through his education and vocational experience that resources were to be used.

Overly clearly shared the traditional service perspective that a park should be a showcase for everyone to see and admire and that it should be an economic asset. His first work experience within the Park Service had been at Glacier, which was managed as a recreational playground and had a close relationship with the Great Northern Railroad.³⁸ Overly's guiding administrative motto was "Parks are for People". True to his beliefs and experience, he began almost immediately upon becoming superintendent to move away from the wilderness philosophy and thereby from the park management practices espoused by the 1938 planning group and implemented, with a few exceptions discussed in later chapters, by Macy.

His 1952 Master Plan, completed by Assistant Superintendent Thomas J. Williams on March 12, 1952 and recommended for approval by Overly on March 15, expressly repudiated the wilderness management approach developed by the 1938 management study team. Where the study team had recommended that the wilderness features of the park be preserved at the expense of visitor access, the master plan embraced the visitor playground position. It pointed out that the 1916 act directed the service to promote visitor use of parks, and therefore concluded that at Olympic, "it follows that some change or modification of the area, at least in the periphery may be made--some slight sacrifice of the Wilderness theme in order that full use and enjoyment by the public would be possible."³⁹

The master plan also acknowledged and rejected the study team's concession recommendations. It noted, "Contrary to the hope and belief of the initial policy makers, adequate and modern accommodation for visitors has not been developed outside the park, except at Port Angeles." It then concluded that, despite the study team's recommendation that no concessions be allowed within the park, "to enable the public to fully enjoy the area it will rest with the service to provide housing of a suitable standard in some outer segments of the park and in the Ocean Strip and Queets Corridor by

³⁸ Estelle Overly, interview; Alfred Runte, *National Parks*, 94.

³⁹ Williams to Overly, March 12, 1952. RG 79, Accession 63A-02-31, Box 105, File D18 OLYM, 1-2, NPS Records Office.

encouraging private capital to develop it, or failing that, to finance it with public funds.⁴⁰

In further contradiction of the recommendations of the 1938 study team, Overly was much more aggressive in managing the park's natural resources than Macy had been. He placed greater emphasis on protecting the rain forests from disease and insect infestation and did not hesitate to cut trees which he felt were endangering the rain forests because of the degree to which they were either infected or infested, or were endangering the visitor because of their location (see chapter 8).

Overly also advocated the construction of a much larger road system than the original planning group had envisioned. He envisioned a system of one-way roads running from Hurricane Ridge along the fire protection trail to Obstruction Point and continuing to Deer Park "so that the more adventuresome visitors who want a more intimate look at the high country could enjoy this loop trip." He also wanted to build a one-way road that would be open only in summer to enable the park visitors to view the rain forests. It would run "from the North Fork Quinault River up Big Creek, past Reflection Lake, along Tshletshy Creek Ridge to Sams River" where it would connect with Route 101. Overly did not build these roads because the Bureau of Roads determined that it was not feasible to do so.⁴¹

In short, Overly disagreed with many of the recommendations of the 1938 study team and did not hesitate to act according to his own philosophy in those cases where it conflicted with that group's recommendations. The discussions in chapters 8, 9, and 10 detail the changes Overly implemented in the management of natural resources, concessions, and maintenance, respectively. Given his management philosophy, he could do nothing else.

His efforts to manage Olympic by a more traditional "playground" approach were completely in keeping with the philosophy of Director Conrad Wirth and the oldest traditions of the service. However, they were out of step with the more recent but stronger tradition of the park itself, which was supported by local and national conservation organizations. As a result, Overly was eventually removed from Olympic because his management philosophy came into direct conflict with those groups.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 2.

⁴¹ Overly to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. 30 August 1965. Olympic Box 3, 4, Harpers Ferry Center Library NPS.

CONCLUSION

The contrast between the Macy and Overly administrations are discussed in the topical chapters (7-12) that follow chapter 6. However, the differences in the philosophies of these two men reflect the complicated nature of the service's dual mission and the room for different and even contradictory management practices within that duality. That Macy was visitor-oriented to a certain extent is clear from his efforts to enlarge and maintain the trail system. However, he was willing to manage the park in a less traditional manner that restricted visitor impact on park resources in accordance with the tenets of national and local conservation organizations and Secretary Ickes. Overly believed that traditional management methods should be applied to Olympic and attempted with considerable success to do so.

By the end of Overly's tenure, it was clear that national and local conservation organizations were intent upon assuring that Olympic National Park would be managed in accordance with wilderness principles. However, during Overly's tenure and in the early years of the 1960s, the definition of wilderness changed from that of the 1930s. This change would result in a redefinition of acceptable wilderness management principles, which would in turn redefine acceptable wilderness management practices. Dealing with this change would be one of the major challenges to the successors of Macy and Overly, and eventually would result in an institutional perspective within the Park Service and at Olympic that neither Macy or Overly, despite their own differences, would have anticipated.

CHAPTER 6

Chapter 6

THE SUPERINTENDENTS, 1959 TO THE PRESENT

Superintendents do not function in a vacuum of authority and the decision to initiate certain activities, such as the preparation of master plans or annual reports, is usually made farther up in the Service chain of command. However, in addition to considerable administrative discretion, a superintendent is primarily responsible for implementing administrative decisions made higher up in the chain of command and implementation is in itself a form of discretionary authority.

This chapter discusses the management philosophies of the successors of Preston Macy and Fred Overly: Dan Beard, John Doerr, Bennett Gale, Roger Allin, James Coleman, Roger Contor, and Robert Chandler, and the context within which they attempted to express their philosophies. Specific management practices, such as the use of the ranger cadre and maintenance division, and the management of natural resources and concessions, are discussed in chapters 7 through 11 where appropriate. This chapter deals with each superintendent's overall vision of his administrative agenda and compares that vision to the evolving perception of the mission of the Park Service, as viewed by the public and from within the service itself. This sense of mission was redefined as the 1930s concepts of wilderness management were revised during the late 1950s and early 1960s.

The Emergence of a New Wilderness Philosophy

Throughout the 1950s, the Park Service backed away from the wilderness management philosophy developed during the late 1920s and introduced into the service by Secretary Ickes in the 1930s. In general, the new service orientation was defined by Mission 66, a program developed by Director Conrad Wirth and approved by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This program called for increased funding to provide accommodations for visitors and to display the parks to them as fully as possible. It was, therefore, reminiscent of the earliest service precepts of visitor gratification through the display of spectacular natural phenomena.

However, during the 1950s, a second generation of wilderness advocates began redefining the nature of wilderness, and thereby the management practices associated with wilderness. As early as 1957, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota introduced a bill calling for the management of selected federal lands in accordance with these practices. Throughout this period, Director Wirth consistently opposed the inclusion of any Park Service lands within this and subsequent bills. Wirth argued that the provisions of the various wilderness bills that were introduced until the passage of the Wilderness

Act in 1964 need not be extended to lands administered by the National Park Service because the 1916 Organic Act had already applied those provisions.¹

As shown in chapter 4, one element of the political coalition forged by Franklin Roosevelt was the national conservation organizations. This element remained allied with the Democratic party throughout Eisenhower's presidency. However, a second generation of national conservation leadership, with new ideas on wilderness and conservation in general, had emerged. Therefore, when the election of John F. Kennedy resulted in the appointment of Stewart Udall as secretary of the Interior, Udall, in part because he agreed with their ideas and in part because of political prudence, acknowledged administratively the wilderness management practices espoused by his generation of conservationists just as Ickes had done twenty-five years earlier.

Basically, wilderness concepts of the 1960s differed from those of the 1930s in their more restrictive view of the amount of human intrusion considered acceptable within a wilderness area. The 1930s wilderness concepts accepted the construction of horse trails and the use of horses within a park. The basic measure of the 1930s concepts was the absence of roads. That is, no more roads were to be constructed within those national parks established as wilderness parks. Other forms of intrusion to allow visitor access were, for the most part, acceptable.

By the 1960s, new concepts of wilderness management discouraged the introduction of artificial means of visitor access. Horse trails were less acceptable, and other forms of manipulation of the environment and ecology of the park for the sole purpose of visitor enjoyment were not accepted.

Two major documents reflected this change in wilderness perspective: the Leopold Report (*Wildlife Management in National Parks*), and the Robbins Report (*A Report by the Advisory Committee to the National Park Service On Research*). Congressional endorsement of the emerging redefinition of wilderness appears in the Wilderness Act of 1964.²

The above two reports addressed natural resource management practices. The specific recommendations and conclusions of these reports are discussed in chapter 8. The recommendations of both reports were based on an underlying philosophy that carried implications for every aspect of park management. At Olympic, these changes are best seen in the treatment of fire and of mountain goats.

Under Macy and Overly, and for some years thereafter, fire was to be prevented. Rangers received considerable training in fire prevention, trails sufficient in size and

¹ Polly Dyer. Interview, not on tape.

² P. L. 88-577.

number to assure that fire would be extinguished quickly were built and maintained, fire was perceived and treated as an enemy, and understory flora were managed to lower the risk of a fire starting. Under the more recent perception of fire, the importance of access trails is diminished, in part because severe fires can now be fought by air, the role of fire in the growth and regeneration of forests is emphasized, and the ranger, still highly trained in fire fighting, is also trained in evaluating fires. The most recent fire protection plan, developed under Superintendent Robert Chandler, divides the park into three separate fire zones. The first free-burn fire to occur at Olympic burned itself out over 150 acres in 1987.

During the Macy and Overly years, the presence of non-indigenous mountain goats within the park was perceived as a positive park resource: the goats pleased visitors. However, by 1970, the presence of the goats had become a major administrative problem that has been studied from Roger Allin's administration onward. The first long-range program designed to remedy the goat problem was completed during Superintendent Chandler's administration.

The goat problem also illustrates the conflicting demands of the Leopold-Robbins precepts and the foundations of the Wilderness Act. The Wilderness Act demands non-intrusion into the ecology of areas designated as wilderness. The scientific management principles expounded by Leopold and Robbins require measurement, which often can only be accomplished through intrusion. To artificially isolate certain plots to measure the damage done by goats or to bring goat-capture teams into the backcountry by helicopter is intrusive manipulation. Determining where the line between the two opposing practices is to be drawn is often up to the discretionary authority of a superintendent (see chapter 8).

Wilderness management practices and scientific management practices are the two major factors that eventually impacted the entire administration of Olympic National Park. The principal theme of this chapter is the imposition of both wilderness principles and scientific management principles on the administrative practices at Olympic. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, three different perspectives concerning visitor access existed within the Park Service. The first, the Mather perspective, accepted considerable artificial manipulation of park resources to assure visitor access and appreciation. The second, the wilderness philosophy of the 1930s, accepted less manipulation of park resources and imposed more limited visitor access to those resources. The third, the emerging wilderness philosophy discussed above, opposed artificial manipulation of resources for visitor convenience and argued that the preservation of the integrity of park resources should be paramount.

Dan Beard and John Doerr: 1958-1964

Dan Beard and John Doerr were the first superintendents to confront all three of these perspectives. Fred Overly was succeeded by Dan Beard late in 1958. Beard, who remained at Olympic for less than two years, had been superintendent of Everglades National Park, another "wilderness park" created during the Roosevelt administration. He was therefore familiar with management practices employed in wilderness parks.

Like Macy, Beard had also trained as a biologist and he managed the park in a style similar to Macy's. He reversed Overly's efforts to expand the road system to allow greater access to Olympic by vehicle and ended the major timber salvage operations.

However, he also believed in the need for long range studies of park management. During his brief tenure, studies of the Hoh Developed Area, visitor use at Hurricane Ridge Lodge, and the park's fishery resources were completed.

In early 1960, the Back Country Management Study was also completed. This study was written by Ray Murphy, who had been a back country ranger at Sequoia. It was modelled after an earlier study done by Bill Briggie in Sequoia National Park and reflects the convergence of the three wilderness perspectives.

The guiding principle of this study was Director Conrad Wirth's statement that the management objective of the Park Service was "to preserve the primitive or wilderness character which contains scenery and natural wonders so outstanding in quality that their preservation remain intact for the benefit, enjoyment, and inspiration of the people" as its guiding principle. This statement uses the word "wilderness," but reveals the "scenic wonders" focus of the Mather perspective. The study also states that the management goal was "to have the best administered wilderness area in the National Park Service."³ This statement is a contradiction of terms when viewed from the most recent wilderness perspective, in which wilderness is preserved rather than administered.

Both Wirth's statement and the final management objective contained ideas inconsistent with the philosophy of emerging wilderness management concepts. The study conclusion, that "we accept the idea of man using wilderness for recreation, and we accept a trail, a simple campsite, or even a short fence or fire lookout, so long as the predominant character of wilderness remains" is closer in philosophy to the 1930s concept of wilderness.⁴ In later philosophies, wilderness and recreation, while not incompatible, are also not synonymous. Further, the intrusion of man was becoming unacceptable.

³ Ray Murphy, chairman of the Back Country Study Committee, *Olympic Back Country Study* (Unpublished, 1960): 1-2, Harper's Ferry Center Library, History Collection, Olympic, Box 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.

Thus, during Beard's administration the wilderness perspective of the early 1960s was not adopted. Perhaps Beard's short tenure accounts for this. He stayed only from the fall of 1958 to the early winter of 1960, when he was succeeded by John Doerr. Doerr had trained as a geologist and had served as a park naturalist in Rocky Mountain National Park and in Hawaii before being promoted to chief naturalist for the Service. He was less wilderness-oriented than Beard. For example, he favored a second structure on Hurricane Ridge. He also increased the ease of access to Hurricane Ridge by working with the Washington State Highway Department to acquire the right of way and to construct a new road connection between the Hurricane Ridge road and the administrative/visitor center complex.⁵ Unfortunately, Doerr contracted leukemia during his tenure. He retired early in 1964 and died shortly thereafter.

During Doerr's administration, the 1964 Master Plan was completed. The plan was required to assist in implementing the Mission 66 Program at Olympic⁶ and does not fully reflect the emerging wilderness philosophy. Its six objectives necessarily stressed visitor appeal and service. However, by this time, the emerging wilderness management philosophy was receiving considerable support from Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. On May 2, 1963, Udall forwarded the Leopold report to Director Wirth with a cover letter endorsing its conclusions. He noted, "It emphasizes clearly the ecological principles involved, defines the aesthetic, historical and scientific values of the parks, and sets forth the philosophy of management thus called for." He instructed Wirth "to take such steps as appropriate to incorporate the philosophy and the basic findings into the administration of the National Park System."⁷

The Leopold Report was followed closely by the National Academy of Science report on the research needs of the Park Service. The Academy established a committee to study those needs. The committee chairman was Dr. William Robbins, Associate Director for International Science Activities, National Science Foundation. As a result, the report became known as the Robbins Report. It was submitted to Secretary Udall on August 1, 1963. Its central conclusion was that "the Service should strive first to preserve and conserve the national parks with due consideration for the enjoyment of their owners, the people of the United States, of the aesthetic, spiritual, inspirational, educational, and scientific values which are inherent in natural wonders and nature's creatures."⁸

⁵ Glen Gallison. Interview 1.

⁶ Roger Contor. Interview.

⁷ National Park Service. *Compilation of Administrative Policies for the National Parks and National Monuments of Scientific Significance* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1970), 97.

⁸ National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council. *A Report by the Advisory Committee to the National Park Service on Research* (Unpublished, 1963), ix.

On September 3, 1964, Congress showed its support of the emerging wilderness perspective by enacting legislation creating the National Wilderness Preservation System. This act announced a new congressional policy on wilderness "to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness." To implement this policy, Congress instructed the secretary of the Interior to review and evaluate "every roadless area of five thousand contiguous acres or more in the national parks, monuments and other units of the National Park System" and to recommend areas for wilderness designation to Congress within ten years.⁹

Bennett Gale and Stuer Carlson: 1964-1969

These three documents form the basis for the imposition of wilderness management principles on the National Park Service's administrative system. As noted above, these documents call for both scientific management and the reservation of wilderness areas which were to be roadless, in accordance with 1930s wilderness principles. The Leopold Report expanded the 1930s concepts to include the restoration of original conditions and therefore, species integrity. The first Olympic superintendent to face the problem of applying these concepts was Bennett Gale, who succeeded John Doerr in the spring of 1964.

Prior to becoming superintendent, Gale had earned a graduate degree in geology and joined the Park Service as a naturalist. He had served as principal geologist in the central office and as Regional Chief of Interpretation for the Western Region. Gale's tenure at Olympic was relatively brief and he faced considerable distractions, including an effort by Fred Overly to remove a large part of the lower Bogachiel from the park (see chapter 12). He was also involved in setting up the Pacific Northwest Regional Office and to some extent in the creation of North Cascades National Park.¹⁰

Perhaps because of these activities, Gale did nothing to bring about the scientific resource management called for by the Leopold and Robbins reports to Olympic. However, he accepted the ideas of wilderness management and formulated the first wilderness recommendations for the park. In November 1965, he revised the 1964 Master Plan, by means of a master plan brief, to incorporate wilderness management principles. This brief stated that much of the park met the criteria for wilderness designation and that "it is felt that the Park will serve its highest purpose in future generation by inclusion of much of those areas which now qualify."¹¹

⁹ P.L. 88-577.

¹⁰ Gloria Thompson. Interview.

¹¹ Master Plan Brief for Olympic National Park, 6 November 1965, History Collection, Olympic Box 3, NPS Harper's Ferry Center Library (hereinafter referred to as HFCL).

One year later, almost to the day, Gale submitted a formal wilderness report. It recommended that three parts of the park be designated as wilderness areas: (1) the Olympic Roadless Area, which included approximately 773,600 acres of the backcountry; (2) the North Coast Roadless Area, containing approximately 13,300 acres above Kalaloch; and (3) the South Coast Roadless Area, which contained approximately 5900 acres below Kalaloch. In all, the proposed wilderness area of Olympic National Park would contain 792,800 acres. Soon after they were submitted, Gale's recommendations were approved by Regional Director Edward Hummel and by Sanford Hill, chief of the Western Office of Design and Construction. However, the recommendations were ignored by Directors Wirth and Hartzog.¹²

Gale also prepared a 1966 Master Plan for the creation of "a national seashore" which would remove the coastal lands now within the park, except presumably those designated as wilderness, and combine them with "the Ozette Indian Reservation, Ozette Lake, and all shorelands, beach and tidelands and a northward extension of the area to the Makah Indian Reservation."¹³ This document was decidedly non-wilderness oriented. The purpose of creating such an administrative entity seems to have been a compromise effort to gain control of the beaches by easing regulation of recreational activities on the beach. Such an arrangement would "facilitate gaining control of the beaches and tidelands, not now part of Olympic National Park." It also concluded that such an entity would "permit appropriate beach use not possible under national park regulations."¹⁴ These recommendations were not implemented.

Overall, Gale's administration eliminated the Mather "display-for-visitor-amusement" perspective, but did not mark a radical shift toward the most modern wilderness management perspective. Gale was succeeded in 1967 by Stuer Carlson, who did nothing to accelerate the movement toward park management based on modern definitions of wilderness. Carlson had worked as a forester in Yosemite, the Santa Fe Regional Office, and the central office. Information on his administration, including his management philosophy, is very limited. However, it appears that he followed the moderate Gale position on wilderness.

¹² John Carver. Interview, not taped.

¹³ National Park Service. *Olympic National Seashore: Master Plan for a Proposal* (Washington, D.C.: NPS, 1966), 1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

Roger Allin: 1970-76

While the Gale-Carlson years are marked by moderate movement toward implementing the new wilderness perspectives, Roger Allin, who became superintendent on January 1, 1970, accelerated the process. Allin had trained as a fish biologist and had worked in Alaska for the Fish and Wildlife Service as a pilot-biologist. He transferred to the Park Service as Associate Regional Director for Cooperative Activities in the Santa Fe Regional Office, and was then the superintendent at Everglades.

Through length of tenure and forceful leadership, Allin had a major impact on the administration of Olympic National Park. Allin strongly embraced the ideas of the new wilderness advocates. He stated his position in a letter to Mrs. John A. Dyer on May 23, 1975. In justifying his support for the Park Service decision that the Quinault area should be excluded from the park, he wrote,

My convictions are founded upon the compelling function of parks to serve as eminent natural or wild places, and a strong feeling for the Service's fundamental responsibility to maintain these areas "unimpaired." In short, it is a question of the purity of our parks and the System and our mandate not to permit intrusion, adverse uses, or development from occurring within these precious areas.¹⁵

During Allin's tenure, the final wilderness recommendations for Olympic were completed and a new master plan that incorporated the wilderness management concepts was completed and approved. Allin succeeded in bringing the terms of the Wilderness Act to Olympic. However, although he began the process of bringing scientific practices to the park through interaction with local scientists and other acts of administrative improvisation, his relationship with Regional Director John Rutter prevented him from systematically establishing scientific resource management.¹⁶

In the Wilderness Act, Congress mandated that the development of final wilderness recommendations for all parks be completed by 1974. Inertia in the central office, which opposed the inclusion of Park Service lands under the provisions of the act, hindered progress toward completion of this mandate. Several arguments were raised against designating roadless areas as wilderness. One was the need for an enclave where structures for the protection of visitors were either present or necessary. A variation of that argument urged that any area containing historic structures could not be considered wilderness, because the structures were, in themselves, an intrusion.¹⁷

¹⁵ Allin to Dyer. 23 May 1975. Allin's personal papers.

¹⁶ Roger Allin. Interview.

¹⁷ Reed to Ronald Walker and the director of Bureau of Sport Fisheries. 24 June 1972. in *Olympic National Park Wilderness Recommendation* (Denver: NPS Regional Service Center, 1974) 2, Olympic National Park Library.

On June 24, 1972, Nathaniel Reed, assistant secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, sent a memorandum to the directors of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the National Park Service rebutting these assertions and instructing them to be as liberal as possible in evaluating the potential of any area under consideration for wilderness designation. Basically, he told the directors of both agencies to get on with the job of complying with the Wilderness Act evaluation process as quickly and liberally as possible.¹⁸

In response to this memo, Allin produced a new wilderness study in October, 1972. Like Gale's earlier report, the study determined that three areas within in the park were eligible for wilderness designation. The acreage, however, was increased to 834,890 acres. Further, despite Reed's directions to the contrary, enclaves within the proposed wilderness areas were included at the direction of Regional Director Rutter.¹⁹

Upon publication of the wilderness study, hearings were to be held, a final recommendation to the secretary was to be made, and a master plan was to be prepared for each wilderness area. The study was published in August of 1973 and the hearings were held on November 1 and 3, 1973 at Aberdeen and Port Angeles, respectively. During the two days, John M. Davis, the hearing officer, received 128 oral statements and more than 500 people attended the hearings. Most of the statements approved of the designation of the areas chosen, but urged that the enclave areas also be designated as wilderness.²⁰

Because Regional Director Rutter would not sign a wilderness recommendation that did not include enclaves, the report that Washington received included them. However, Allin accompanied the recommendations to Washington and met with Russell Dickenson, at that time an assistant director of the Park Service, and Reed and urged strongly that the enclave approach be dropped. The final recommendations, signed by Director Ron Walker, added an additional 31,360 acres to the preliminary wilderness recommendations, thereby designating 862,139 acres as wilderness and voiding the enclave approach.²¹

The 1976 Master Plan, which was required as part of the process of wilderness designation, was developed by the Denver Service Center and submitted to Allin in January 1975. Allin must have had some problems with it because he did not recommend approval until August 1976. The plan was approved by Russell Dickenson,

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Roger Allin. Interview.

²⁰ Roger Allin. Interview.

²¹ Roger Allin. Interview.

now director of the Pacific Northwest Region, on October 18, 1976. Specific management practices recommended for each park activity are discussed in their respective chapters. However, the overall management statement, when compared to Gale's, shows that Allin had managed to a considerable extent to bring the principles of wilderness management to the park. The first general management objective was to "manage the mountainous core and the upper valleys of the park in accordance with the wilderness use and management policy." The statement of purpose concluded, "The park's purpose is to preserve, protect, and interpret, for the enjoyment and benefit of the American people, the mountain wilderness phenomenon, which contains the finest remnants of the Pacific Northwest rain forest, seacoast, active glaciers, and the Roosevelt Elk."²²

Although Allin might have urged even stronger language, resource protection was now placed ahead of visitor enlightenment and amusement as the primary management goal at Olympic and resources were to be protected in accordance with wilderness management principles. Allin's administration marks a strong transition from the wilderness philosophy of the 1930s to the wilderness philosophy that emerged in the 1960s.

Under Roger Allin, wilderness management principles came to Olympic. Allin also attempted to bring natural scientists to Olympic and would have done so had the regional director provided more funds for that purpose. Even so, he succeeded in getting much work done by local faculty and visiting scholars. However, the introduction of systematic scientific management would be the work of Roger Contor, who succeeded Allin's successor, James Coleman.

James Coleman: 1977-79

Reed Jarvis served as acting superintendent from January until May 1977, when James Coleman was appointed superintendent. Coleman was a second generation Park Service employee who had received an advanced degree in American History. Prior to his selection as superintendent, he had served in several smaller historical areas as both historian and superintendent before being promoted to director of the Albright Training Center.

For several reasons, Coleman did very little to add to the effort to establish wilderness management in the administration of Olympic. First, Allin had completed the groundwork for wilderness designation at the local level prior to Coleman's arrival. Wilderness designation would continue to be a problem at the national level, but the local work was done. Second, he perceived his immediate mission to be primarily to ease the tensions that Allin had created between the park and the inholders. Therefore,

²² *Master Plan--Olympic National Park*, 18 October 1976, 68, Olympic National Park Library.

he did not focus heavily on wilderness and scientific management (see chapter 12). Third, his tenure was too brief to accomplish the kinds of administrative changes that had to be made in order to bring scientific management capabilities to the park.

In relation to Allin's administration, Coleman's resulted in changes in style rather than substance in most areas of park management. He did not seek to amend Allin's master plan and he did not depart radically from Allin's resource management policies. He did change the tone of leadership and the administrative procedures by which the park was managed and decisions were made. The brevity of his tenure makes it impossible to determine whether he agreed with most of Allin's approach or whether he lacked the time to change directions.

Roger Contor: 1979-1983

Coleman was selected to be deputy director of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office on April 25, 1979. He was succeeded by Roger Contor. Contor, like Allin, had a degree in biology, although he specialized in wildlife biology, and had begun his career with the Park Service as a ranger at Yellowstone. He went on to become deputy regional director at Omaha, the first superintendent at North Cascades National Park, and was serving as an assistant director in the Washington Central office (WASO) at the time of his appointment to Olympic.

Contor's impact on the administration of Olympic was considerable, and his effect on various segments of park management are discussed in their respective chapters. In 1980 he established a new administrative entity at Olympic--the Division of Science and Technology--which institutionally ratified the principles of the Leopold and Robbins reports. His 1980 annual report noted that "a new division of Science and Technology was created within the Park staff in 1980. Its initial staffing consisted of a group chief and five permanent or long term professionals." This division was assigned the mission of maintaining "park research and technology transfer efforts at the highest professional level."²³

Contor also completed a Statement for Management in 1983, which seems to have been formulated to provide more specific management guidelines than the general statements contained in the 1976 Master Plan. Both documents shared one identical resource management goal: "To conserve, maintain or restore, where possible, the primary natural resources of the Park and those ecological relationships and processes that would prevail were it not for the advent of modern civilization."²⁴ This phrase is fairly common

²³ Superintendent's Annual Report--Olympic National Park, 24 March 1981, 1, Olympic National Park Library.

²⁴ Statement for Management--Olympic National Park, 1 April 1983, 25, Olympic National Park Superintendent's File.

language and is based on the conclusions of the Leopold Report. It reflects the sentiments of the 1930s wilderness advocates as well.

Contor's management statement went further than the management objectives of the 1976 Master Plan. It acknowledged the need for visitor protection, institutional acceptance and proper management of cultural resources, the acquisition of scientific knowledge as an important element of park management, and the presentation of that newly acquired information through the interpretive division of the park. It provides more detail and balance between the wilderness philosophy and the scientific management philosophy than the 1976 Master Plan, although both contain a large number of generalizations.²⁵

This balance is made possible because the 1976 Master Plan brought the Wilderness Act management philosophy to Olympic. Contor's Statement for Management builds on this event, and the combination of the two completed the process of implementing at Olympic the management principles enumerated in the Leopold and Robbins reports and the Wilderness Act.

Robert Chandler: 1983-Present

Roger Contor was appointed regional director for the Alaska Region in the spring of 1983. His successor at Olympic was Robert Chandler. Like Allin and Contor, Chandler has a background in biological science, having trained as a horticulturist, and is a veteran of the Park Service. He began his career in Washington, D.C. and came to Olympic from the Santa Monica Mountains Recreation Area, where he presided over the establishment of the area.

The completion of the transition from the 1930s wilderness philosophy to the 1960s wilderness philosophy resulted in the development of scientific management practices and the incorporation of the tenets of the Robbins and Leopold reports and the Wilderness Act into the park's primary administrative documents as well as its structure. The question which Robert Chandler faced was how to reconcile the internal contradictions in these three documents.

Chandler refined, rather than radically altered, Contor's administrative reorganization and acted to increase the role of park scientists in the formulation of resource management policies. He changed the name of the Division of Science and Technology to the Division of Natural Science Studies. This division is engaged in identifying resource management questions that need to be answered and in developing procedures for gathering data in cooperation with the Ranger Division. This mechanism allowed Chandler to increase the level of hands-on management called for by the Leopold

²⁵ Ibid.

Report. In an interview for this study, Chandler noted that some instances of this management approach, such as fencing small plots in the Hoh to measure elk impact on understory plants, "makes wilderness advocates nervous".²⁶

Chandler also believed that the parameters of what Olympic is going to be as a park have been far more clearly defined. President Roosevelt wanted a large park. By now, it is known to a great degree exactly how large it will be. Both Secretary Ickes and Secretary Udall wanted the park to be managed in accordance with the wilderness principles of their day. Until some major changes in perspective occur, the activities of Allin and Contor have assured that Olympic will be managed in accordance with the perspective that Udall accepted and attempted to implement in the service.

In addition, during the later years of Chandler's superintendency, several developments had a stabilizing effect on the park. Legislation in 1986 more narrowly defined the exact boundaries of the park. His aggressive acquisition of private inholdings within the park lessened the demand for any further reductions of the park. Because the exact location of lands to be designated wilderness areas have been defined, areas in which development will be allowed were more precisely defined through a series of development concept plans. The specific details of the impact of this stabilization are discussed in the various management chapters. It is important to note here that, on its 50th Anniversary, Olympic seemed to be entering a new phase of its existence. Chandler's transfer to the superintendency of Everglades National Park left both the challenges and opportunities of this next phase for his successor, Maureen Fumerty

CONCLUSIONS

Superintendents do not operate in a vacuum. As Roger Contor observed in his interview, most park superintendents generate the same types of documentation for the same central office demands. General Management Plans and other more specific planning documents are required throughout the Park Service. Further, superintendents in most national parks are greatly impacted by the decisions of House and Senate Appropriation Committees. The decisions of the secretary of the Interior and his staff directly affect the amount and type of money any superintendent or regional director can spend. Many other examples of external influences affecting the decision-making process of a superintendent can be given.

However, since a large matrix of checks and balances exist within the system and the system itself is hierarchical, each superintendent occupies a position of considerable discretionary authority within that system. To some extent, his use of discretionary authority constitutes a statement of a superintendent's administrative philosophy. The remaining chapters discuss how each superintendent utilized the park's ranger cadre,

²⁶ Robert Chandler. Interview, not taped.

selected natural resource management approaches and techniques, oversaw the day-to-day management of concessions, maintenance, and interpretation within the park, and worked with other governmental and private entities on the Olympic Peninsula in accordance with their individual management philosophy and the institutional framework of checks and balances.

CHAPTER 7

Chapter 7

THE RANGERS OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

The ranger has three basic duties that have remained constant throughout the history of Olympic National Park. They are: (1) to protect the park's resources from damage by visitors or catastrophic events, (2) to protect the visitor from other visitors, and (3) to protect the visitor from dangers inherent in the park environment. The way in which the ranger fulfills these duties has changed through time. The Park Service definition of the role that the ranger is to play has also changed. The service position description for park ranger is influenced by outside events and the administrative philosophy of the director and other persons in the organizational hierarchy.

At the park level, however, ranger activities are determined in large part by three factors. The primary influences on ranger activities have been the growth in the number of visitors to the park and the activities of the visitor population. The emergence of the 1960s wilderness precepts have had some impact on ranger activities as well, primarily by redefining resource damage in more ecologically sensitive terms.

PARK SERVICE PERSONNEL STANDARDS

Prior to 1969, the service classified the ranger and chief ranger positions as caretaker positions. Under the Classification Act of 1923, the ranger and chief ranger positions were placed under the Crafts and Custodial, CR, personnel category. Chief ranger, assistant chief ranger, ranger, and assistant ranger were designated CR 408, 409, 410, and 411, respectively. This personnel category did not carry with it any administrative authority.

However, during the early Park Service days, the ranger was charged with many diverse responsibilities. Horace Albright, in *Oh Ranger*, written in 1928, described them as follows: "The ranger has to see that the water supply is plentiful and pure, that the electric light plant is going, that the wild animals are protected, that the telephone and telegraph lines are working, that the vandals are rounded up and brought to justice, that the roads and the bridges are kept in repair, that the forest fires are put out, that the sanitary system is working, that the fish are planted in the lakes and streams, that the trails are rebuilt, that nobody is lost in the mountains anywhere...that the museum is kept open, that the stages run on time, that the traffic moves in the right direction, and after that--well, there isn't much of anything to do until tomorrow."¹

¹ Horace M. Albright and Frank J. Taylor. *Oh Ranger: A Book about the National Parks* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1928), 135.

Despite the fact that the tasks Albright enumerated reflect the breadth of ranger activity, hiring standards for rangers during the early days, and until 1969, were perhaps overly narrow. A college degree was required and acceptable degrees were restricted to the natural sciences, such as forestry, entomology, or geology, or history or archeology. Prior to World War II, relatively few people attained such degrees. Therefore, the potential labor pool was small and to a great extent shared a common background and perspective.

Perhaps to ease the strictures placed on the hiring of rangers, personnel standards formulated in April of 1948 separated the ranger series, which retained its custodial status, from the naturalist series, which was categorized as professional and scientific. In June 1969, in response to the employment goals of President Lyndon B. Johnson's "Great Society", the ranger, naturalist, historian, and archeologist functions were merged along with the GS-301 General Clerical and Administrative series into a new personnel series, GS-025, which, for the first time in the history of the Park Service, established administrative authority in the ranger/manager position and amended the earlier more specialized hiring standards.

The GS-025 series was based on the "ranger-generalist" concept, which was intended to institutionally embody the broad, multi-functional aspect of ranger activity presented by Albright. A second series, GS-026, park technician, was also created in 1969 as part of the redefinition of ranger personnel standards. This series was to be used to hire local persons familiar with the history and folkways of the park and thereby counterbalance the ranger-generalist with specific knowledge of local conditions. However, because of the desire of a large number of college graduates in the early 1970s to become rangers, most persons hired at the GS-026 level were qualified for the GS-025 level and were not local residents.²

The statement of duties section of the 1969 qualifications statement indicated that park rangers were to "plan, develop, advise on, recommend, perform, and supervise programs or activities to meet existing and future needs for one or more park areas or parks." The activities in which rangers were to be involved included "resources management, recreation, interpretation, law enforcement, accident prevention, concessions management, land use planning, structural restoration, fire control, and others."³

The announcement of the creation of the new position pointed out that "park management involves diverse programs affecting people in all walks of life." These included the protection of wilderness as well as the beautification of urban parks, fire

² Don Jackson. Interview.

³ Park Management, Single Agency Qualification Standard, GS-025, 31 August 1969, 1, Olympic National Park Library (hereinafter referred to as ONP).

and riot control, and interpretation of a wide spectrum of natural and man-made phenomena.⁴

Certain professional series were explicitly excluded from the new series. The announcement stated that the new series "does not include positions that require professional competence in a subject-matter field such as archeology, biology, geology, or history."⁵ It appears, therefore, that the new series was created to give sufficient latitude to the description of those positions which required park-specific knowledge and skills rather than "subject-matter field" knowledge.

The Park Service redefined the ranger/park manager position in November, 1985. The duties assigned fell into 3 basic categories: interpretation, visitor protection and services, and resource management. These duty categories included the tasks of "forest and structural fire control; protection of property from natural or visitor related depredation; dissemination to visitors of general, historical, or scientific information; folk-art and craft demonstrations; control of traffic and visitor use of facilities; enforcement of laws and regulations; investigation of violations, complaints, trespass/encroachment; search and rescue missions" and other sundry management responsibilities. The GS-026 position was abolished.⁶

These various personnel descriptions demonstrate that throughout its history the Park Service has held that the primary duty of the ranger was to provide protection for both the resources and the visitors in the national park system. Hiring standards changed, but the primary mission of protection is included in every ranger personnel standard developed by the service.

Protection includes many activities that are now formally assigned to other administrative entities within the park. For instance, informing visitors of the ecological concerns in the backcountry is an interpretive function, yet rangers often perform that function. Light trail repair and upkeep is a maintenance function that rangers have traditionally performed and continue to do so. Therefore, in the fulfillment of its primary mission of protection, the ranger cadre has always and continues to perform functions that overlap or interconnect with the functions of most of the park's other divisions.

⁴ U.S. Civil Service Commission, Park Management Series, GS-025, 30 June 1969, 2, ONP.

⁵ Ibid., 1.

⁶ Position Classification Standard For Park Ranger Series GS-025, 30 November 1985, 1, 4-5, ONP.

CHIEF RANGERS

Because the chief ranger position lacked administrative authority until 1969, he did not formulate policy or sign documents. Therefore, identifying chief rangers of Olympic has been difficult. Fred Overly served as the first ranger at Olympic National Park and therefore functioned as chief ranger, although he never held that title. He was detailed from Glacier National Park to what was then Mount Olympus National Monument in July 1936.⁷ Overly was promoted to assistant superintendent shortly after the final legislation creating the park was enacted on June 29, 1938.

W. B. Augustine, who was listed as chief ranger in an October 13, 1941, audit report, was the first official chief ranger. He remained chief ranger until at least 1943, when he served on the committee which formulated boundary recommendations.⁸ Augustine was succeeded by Otto Brown, who served as chief ranger in 1947.⁹ Brown was in turn succeeded by John Aiton, who served as chief ranger until 1956, when Stan McComas was selected. McComas was succeeded by Delbert Armstrong, who served from 1965 to 1971, and was therefore the first chief ranger to have line administrative authority. Gordon Boyd succeeded Armstrong and served until 1982, when Chuck Janda was appointed, serving as Chief Ranger until his retirement in 1990.¹⁰

RANGER FUNCTIONS

Most management decisions contain three elements: (1) the formulation of policy to govern management decisions, (2) the specific actions to be undertaken to implement the policy, and (3) the execution of those decisions. In the beginning at Olympic, the ranger was involved in all three phases of park management. This was due as much to the lack of personnel as to the administrative philosophy of Superintendent Macy. Through time, however, ranger involvement has become related primarily to the third management decision element. Policy formulation and the development of action plans in most areas of park management are left to other more specialized personnel.

At the end of World War II, under Macy, the permanent park ranger at Olympic National Park was involved in every aspect of park management. He oversaw the trail and road maintenance work by seasonal rangers, was responsible for the protection of all

⁷ Fred Overly. Interview by Herb Evison. Transcript. 4, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

⁸ Report of Committee on Study of Boundary Extensions, Ozette Area, Olympic Coastal Strip, September 1943, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610 - Indian Lands, 1943-44, 2, NA.

⁹ Superintendent Macy to Regional Director, Region 4. 22 April 1947. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 714, pt. 1, NA.

¹⁰ Glenn Gallison. Interview 2.

the park's natural resources, providing virtually all the information concerning their condition to the superintendent, and he provided interpretation and protection to park visitors.

However, soon after the war ended, ranger involvement in the formulation of policy and the development of action plans began to decline. In 1947, Superintendent Macy hired Gunnar Fagerlund as chief naturalist. By 1949, maintenance, at least in the formal administrative structure, had become a separate entity. In an undated memorandum, which was probably written in late 1949 or 1950, Highway Engineer H. S. Shilko described what happened. "Until the 1949 fiscal year, the maintenance work was under the supervision of the Park Ranger's force. Since the 1949 fiscal year, trails are under the supervision of a mixed gang foreman who reports directly to the Park Engineer."¹¹ Therefore, by 1949, rangers were not the sole operators within the park in the areas of wildlife management, interpretation, and maintenance.

By 1952, permanent ranger personnel had grown to thirteen. The force consisted of one chief park ranger, three assistant chief park rangers, six supervising park rangers and three park rangers. In addition to the permanent personnel, "recurring seasonal personnel" were also employed. This group consisted of fifteen park rangers and eighteen fire control aides. Significantly, the administrative structure in which these personnel served was named the Protection Division, with the chief ranger serving as division head.¹²

By this time, the focus of ranger activity at Olympic was on the protection of visitors and resources. Fred Overly's 1952 Master Plan indicated the park management functions that the rangers executed. "Responsibilities and duties of the ranger force include protection of the public, property, fire suppression and fire control, forest insect and disease control, dissemination of information, wildlife management and protection, restocking of fishing streams, enforcement of laws and regulations, management of campgrounds, and constant inspection of private property and persons of the many resident owners of private in-holdings, and the provision of sanitation inspection and supervision of private and concessioner operated public service units to safeguard the public health."¹³

The Mission 66 Prospectus, prepared on May 11, 1956, indicated that little had changed from the 1952 Master Plan. The number and positions of permanent personnel had remained the same, and no large increase in seasonal rangers and fire control aides had

¹¹ Shilko to regional director. Undated. ONP.

¹² Olympic Master Plan Development Outline, 14 March 1952, 5 of 19, Accession 63A-02-31, File D18 - Olympic, NPS Records Office.

¹³ Ibid., 8 of 19.

occurred. The park was divided into six ranger districts: Kalaloch, Hoh, Quinault, Lake Crescent, Elwha, and Dosewallips. The description of the protection division duties contained in the prospectus also showed no change in the assumption that the rangers' primary role was the protection of visitors and resources. "This division is responsible to the Superintendent for the protection of the entire park and more than 700,000 annual visitors..."¹⁴

One reason for the lack of increase in the size of the ranger division was the increase in manpower in the other divisions. For example, when Gunnar Fagerlund was hired as the park's chief naturalist, he was the only naturalist on the staff and remained so for some time. However, by 1957, although only one other permanent position, assistant park naturalist, had been created, a third permanent position, clerk steno, was pending, and Fagerlund oversaw a staff of eighteen seasonal naturalists.¹⁵ The existence of that number of seasonals meant that rangers played a smaller role in meeting the interpretive needs of the park during the peak season for visitors.

The position of park engineer in 1949 had also expanded to become the Engineering and Maintenance Division by 1957. It consisted of an engineer and an assistant engineer and a staff of nineteen permanent personnel and twenty seasonal employees.¹⁶ Rangers were therefore less integral to the park's maintenance operations as well.

The growth of other divisions and the management philosophy of the service combined to assure that the primary function of the ranger cadre would remain the protection of the park's visitors and resources. Therefore, from 1952 onward, ranger activities and the relationship between the cadre and other administrative divisions within the park would in large part be predicated on the number of park visitors, the nature of visitor activity, and the standards for resource protection.

RESOURCE PROTECTION STANDARDS

The primary purpose of the ranger has always been to protect park resources from natural disaster and human depredation. Early concepts of protection of park resources from natural disaster focused primarily on fire, which was by far the most significant potential natural disaster. Early concepts of protection from human depredation centered around prevention of vandalism and theft by trespass. Elk poaching was a major concern, along with timber trespass. As the new wilderness management policies

¹⁴ Mission 66 Prospectus--Olympic National Park, 11 May 1956, File OLYM 204, 6, 10, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

emerged, however, the perception of appropriate protection activities for both types of protection changed.

The 1960 Olympic Back Country Study accepted the idea, at least in part, that extensive visitor use in itself could damage backcountry resources.¹⁷ The need to protect park resources from simple overuse, as opposed to deliberate misuse, and the potential responses to natural disaster, were more clearly defined by the Leopold Report and the Robbins Report, both in 1963, and the Wilderness Act of 1964, all of which are discussed in detail in chapter 8. The changes these reports caused in the Park Service's natural resource management philosophy had a significant impact on ranger activities. A new definition of resource protection standards required different management practices.

As noted in chapter 6, the principles of the Leopold and Robbins reports and the Wilderness Act were not synonymous, and in fact could be conflicting. The wilderness concept opposes intrusion of any kind. Leopold and Robbins call for intrusion when necessary to re-establish pristine conditions. Although both John Doerr and Bennett Gale developed master plans and wilderness recommendations, the principles implicit in the Wilderness Act were implemented at Olympic in 1976 by Roger Allin. The Leopold/Robbins tenets were institutionalized by Roger Contor in 1980.

The change in resource protection standards that has resulted from these two administrative events is most evident in the treatment of fire. In its compilation of administrative policies in 1968, the National Park Service stated that "The presence or absence of natural fire within a given habitat is recognized as one of the ecological factors contributing to the perpetuation of plants and animals native to that habitat." It then concluded that "fires in vegetation resulting from natural causes are recognized as natural phenomena and may be allowed to run their course when such burning can be contained within predetermined fire management units and when such burning will contribute to the accomplishment of approved vegetation and/or wildlife management objectives."¹⁸ The final fire management plan for Olympic embodying this position was completed and implemented in 1987.

In reshaping resource protection standards in regard to fire, the plan altered the activities required to meet those standards and the skills necessary to complete the activities successfully. Rangers must now be able not only to know how to put out a fire, but also when to do so.

¹⁷ Ray Murphy, Back Country Committee Chairman. "Olympic Back Country Study", OLYM Box 3, 9, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

¹⁸ National Park Service. *Compilation of the Administrative Policies for the National Parks and National Monument of Scientific Significance* (Washington, D.C.:GPO, 1970), 17.

The role of the ranger in implementing the resource protection standards involves interaction with park visitors and is integrated with the ranger's visitor protection mission. Rangers in the back country and on the ocean strip, for instance, provide information on weather conditions and trail conditions to visitors as well as monitor visitor impact on resources. Rangers also provide light maintenance of trails to assure safe passage and they maintain the outdoor interpretive signs.

All superintendents used rangers to enforce the resource protection standards. However, Roger Allin went beyond identification and punishment of violations to an effort to anticipate and modify visitor impact. In 1974, he increased the backcountry ranger force,¹⁹ and, on July 24, 1974, the Port Angeles *Daily News* reported that Allin had announced the beginning of a new park program. "The program called Wilderness Interpretative Living Demonstration (WILD) is a hike with a ranger to learn hiking and camping skills, how to enjoy the wilderness safely and ways to have minimum impact on the natural environment."²⁰

The list of fiscal year 1977 goals for the Division of Resources Management and Visitor Protection offers a good insight into the various duties rangers performed. The chief ranger and the subdistrict rangers were involved in three categories of activity: general, resources management, and visitor protection. Subcategories within the general category included follow-up evaluation of all major emergency operations, the adjustment of manpower assignments to conform with visitor use patterns, and meeting the terms of the cooperative management agreement with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Subcategories within the resources management category of activities included the completion of the Park's fire management plan, the preparation of a "status report of the Park hazard tree program and...a 3-year action plan based on the current approved system of identification and recording," the development of an inventory of all backcountry signs at Quinault, and in general, working closely with the maintenance division on routine maintenance activities. Subcategories of visitor protection included the development and implementation of a crime protection program, the increase of backcountry patrols by 10%, radar surveillance of traffic on Route 101 near Lake Crescent, provision of safety training to seasonals, and maintenance of safety equipment.²¹

The 1981 Annual Report announced that a new administrative relationship between the newly created Science and Technology Branch and the Ranger Division had been

¹⁹ Olympic National Park News Release, 1 July 1974, Olympic, Box 2, NPS HFCLHC.

²⁰ Roger Allin Interview. Port Angeles Daily News. 24 July, 1974.

²¹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1976, Enclosure 1, OLYM Box 2, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

established. Science and Technology "retained planning and technical support of fire management, hazard tree and backcountry restoration programs." The Ranger Division was assigned the "operational elements" of those programs.²² The management plans for these programs were to be developed by the scientists. The rangers were to implement them.

The creation of the Science and Technology Division by Roger Contor led to the transfer of some of the natural resource research and planning functions from the Ranger Division to the new division, while leaving many of the traditional, day-to-day resource protection activities to the rangers. Superintendent Chandler maintained this structure, although he renamed and refined it, continuing to use rangers for multiple purposes. Oversight of visitor activity and search and rescue operations occupy a considerable amount of the ranger's time. The 1984 Annual Report showed that the Olympic National Park ranger was still responsible for monitoring visitors, search and rescue operations, law enforcement, and implementing natural resource management decisions.²³

NUMBER AND ACTIVITIES OF VISITORS

The number of persons visiting Olympic grew steadily from the time the park was created until the mid-1970s, with a sharp increase during the early 1970s. Visitation remained relatively stable until 1980 when it again began to increase. Transportation developments have made Olympic more accessible, and the growth in the nation's affluence and population after World War II resulted in more potential visitors who could afford the trip. By 1956, 700,000 persons visited the park annually.²⁴ By 1976, approximately one million persons visited the park and stayed an average of three days, for a total use of three million visits per year.²⁵ In 1986, the park received almost 3.5 million visitations and last year it received slightly less, approximately 3.3 million.

However, as Roger Contor has pointed out, for the most part, Olympic is not as heavily used as many other natural parks. It is still relatively remote, and its historical wilderness management approach has left the park relatively rugged and wild. Its visitors are, and historically have been, for the most part, affluent, well-educated, and interested in parks in general. It has clearly not become the Winnebago parking lot that several more accessible parks have become.

²² Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1981, 3, ONP.

²³ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1984, 5-6, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

²⁴ Mission 66 Propsectus, Olympic National Park, 11 May 1956, File Olym 204, 28, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

²⁵ Olympic National Park Master Plan, 18 October 1976, 34, ONP.

This was not the case in other parks during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Those years saw visitation by large numbers of high school and college age youth. California parks were particularly hard hit, as flower children from San Francisco flocked to Yosemite and Sequoia. Their activities often did not conform to acceptable park standards of visitor behavior.

In the summer of 1970, the problem reached a head in Stoneman Meadow at Yosemite. Young people tended to congregate there in the evenings and engage in loud, night-long parties. In response, the service posted signs that the meadow was closed at sundown. When the youth ignored the signs, a ranger was sent to publicly inform them that the meadow was closed. The young people stomped his car, with him in it. The ranger cadre and the California State Police then moved in and dispersed the crowd, arresting more than four hundred people.²⁶

The incident at Yosemite led the Service to conclude that the ranger cadre lacked sufficient law enforcement skills to handle such situations. The question then became whether to enhance the skills of the present ranger cadre to include law enforcement capabilities or to add law enforcement specialists to the service. The Service decided in favor of the former option. However, as a temporary measure, members of the Park Police were assigned to certain parks to enhance the law enforcement capabilities of the ranger cadre.²⁷ Sergeant Frank Stevens reported to Olympic National Park during the 1972 high visitation season and "contributed greatly to the law enforcement capability of the Park through his investigations and prosecutions."²⁸

While the decision by the Service to enhance the law enforcement capability of its ranger cadre was a response to events that did not occur at Olympic, Superintendent Roger Allin allocated a considerable amount of ranger time to upgrading the Park's law enforcement capabilities. The Service required that each new ranger trainee receive four hundred hours of training in basic law enforcement precepts. Additionally, at Olympic, in 1973, "six permanent employees received a total of 240 hours of specialized law enforcement training" and "ten permanent employees qualified with hand guns...as required by regulations."²⁹

The increased emphasis on law enforcement continued throughout Allin's tenure. He reported in his 1974 annual report that "fifteen permanent employees received a total of

²⁶ Don Jackson. Interview.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, OLYM Box 2, 6-7, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

²⁹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1973, 1, 6, ONP.

560 hours of specialized law enforcement training" and "one employee attended the consolidated law enforcement training academy in Washington, D.C."³⁰ His 1975 administrative goals called for even more law enforcement training. He intended to send two more people to Washington, D.C. for training at the Law Enforcement Academy and he proposed to "increase the effectiveness of personnel involved in law enforcement through an increase in training from forty hours to fifty hours per man. The fields of instruction will be juvenile procedure, arrest and booking procedures, and will be taught locally."³¹ He also noted that "Sergeant Billy R. Frazier, U.S. Park Policeman, entered on duty for a two-year assignment as the park's criminal investigator."³²

Superintendent Coleman maintained Allin's law enforcement initiatives. By the end of the 1970s, however, law enforcement became a lower priority for the Service and at Olympic. Visitor activities and numbers had begun to stabilize. In 1984 highway realignment along Lake Crescent was completed, greatly enhancing traffic safety, and in general, because of the lessening of the rate of increase of visitation, crime rates also stabilized.³³ As a result, the ranger-generalist concept has again become relevant.

VISITOR PROTECTION

Throughout the history of Olympic, visitor protection is the area in which the overlap of ranger activities with other park division functions is most apparent. Keeping trails clear of hazards is often done by rangers although it is a maintenance function. Keeping interpretive and warning signs repaired is also done by rangers. Oversight of concession health conditions is also done by rangers, in conjunction with the Public Health Service.

Visitor protection consists of two primary elements: protecting the visitor from the natural hazards within the park, and protecting visitors from each other. Prior to 1960, the focus was primarily on protecting the visitor from the hazards inherent to the park's wilderness environment. Law enforcement training was received during the early days, but visitor rescue seems to have been more of a concern than visitor arrest. Law enforcement activities primarily consisted of identifying and apprehending poachers and trespassers.

Despite this perspective, prior to 1960, the ranger cadre at Olympic lacked the capability to perform independent backcountry rescues. This was the conclusion of the 1960 Back

³⁰ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1974, File OLYM Box 2, 6, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

³¹ *Ibid.*, Enclosure 1, 5.

³² *Ibid.*, 6.

³³ Don Jackson. Interview.

Country Study, which recommended that such a capability be established within the park. "The public expects and has a right to expect prompt and efficient search and rescue actions whenever and wherever called for. We must be trained, organized and ready for all such emergencies. We need to develop basic organization on mountain rescue within the Park."³⁴

Another area of concern was accidents on the Park's rivers and lakes.³⁵ Thus, Olympic, now employs rangers trained in scuba diving. Also, by 1972, emergency medical training was provided to rangers at Olympic. "Twenty-nine employees received a total of 976 hours of first aid training" and "two employees attended the Emergency Medical Technician course in Camp Lejune, North Carolina."³⁶

At present, the ranger cadre consists of twenty-four permanent rangers and its capabilities for visitor protection are more diverse than ever before. It has a five-person scuba team, which is used primarily to retrieve victims of auto, boating, and swimming mishaps from Lake Crescent; it continues to possess emergency medical treatment skills; and it can perform relatively small search and rescue operations independently.³⁷

CONCLUSIONS

The three elements that affect ranger activities are number of visitors, visitor activities, and resource management standards. The number of visitors to Olympic has become stable and is likely to remain so if the aging baby boom population and the relatively stable visitation rate of the last twelve years are accurate indicators. Because of the wilderness nature and remoteness of the park visitor activities have never varied widely. Resource management standards are therefore the only factor, other than the administrative philosophy of the superintendent (which is unpredictable and may change) thereby influencing ranger activities.

The most significant question affecting the ranger cadre before an Olympic superintendent today is that of the extent to which rangers should specialize in law enforcement. During the 1970s, as a result of Yosemite's problems, the Service increased the amount of law enforcement training required for rangers. In response, Roger Allin hired the first professional law enforcement officer during his tenure. Allin argued that law enforcement problems should be dealt with to the maximum extent possible by professional law enforcement personnel and should be segregated from

³⁴ Ray Murphy, Backcountry Study Committee Chairman. "Olympic Back Country Study", 31 January 1960, File OLYM Box 3, 18, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

³⁵ Don Jackson. Interview.

³⁶ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, File OLYM, Box 2, 6, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library.

³⁷ Chief Ranger Chuck Janda. Interview.

other ranger activities. James Coleman continued that position, but both Roger Contor and Robert Chandler believe that rangers should be generalists whose training includes law enforcement along with other skills.

Time seems to be on the side of Contor and Chandler for several reasons. First, the level of visitation has stabilized, and therefore the activities of the visitors are more predictable. Further, aside from a small number of professional car crashers, very few felonious acts occur at Olympic. Second, the level of ranger education is higher than that of many professional law enforcement personnel. Despite the efforts of the 1960s to create access to ranger positions for people with less than a college education, virtually all rangers have at least a college degree. Most police departments and other law enforcement operations require only a high school degree. This fact, coupled with the ranger's work experience within the setting of the park, assures that the ranger is likely to provide better law enforcement within that setting than law enforcement specialists who are inexperienced at working within the context of a national park.

CHAPTER 8

Chapter 8

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The natural resources of Olympic National Park include the Roosevelt elk and other wildlife, anadromous and fresh water fish, coniferous rain forests, a large number of glaciers, and a rugged, beautiful coast with its attendant marine life. Its cultural resources include archaeological sites and historic structures, associated with early homesteaders and recreational development, as well as administrative structures used by the Forest Service and the Park Service. The skills required to manage these resources have changed through time, and are in fact, the administrative areas most directly impacted by the 1960s wilderness and ecological management principles. This chapter discusses the change in perception of natural resources in general and then discusses the management practices of each superintendent on a resource-by-resource basis.

MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY OVERVIEW

Most of the principles of natural resource management have evolved from studies that pertained primarily to wildlife management. Therefore, the evolution of Park Service natural resource management principles and practices can be shown most clearly in the management of wildlife resources.

The earliest natural resource management practices of the National Park Service resulted from the park-as-playground philosophy discussed extensively in chapter 5. Basically, this philosophy embodied the premise that people must be enlightened and entertained by the natural resources within national parks. In the definition of entertaining, two major assumptions were made. First, wolves, and predator carnivores in general, were deemed to be neither enlightening nor entertaining. Therefore, the service operated a predator control program in most early parks whose predator population had not already been exterminated by local residents prior to the creation of the park. Second, as noted in chapter 5, the areas deemed eligible for park status were generally alpine regions or other regions containing spectacular scenic resources and little if any commercially exploitable resources. As a result of this eligibility requirement, national parks prior to Olympic did not contain the complete range of habitat necessary to maintain a totally self-sustaining faunal unit. In early parks, the wildlife roamed outside the park for a large part of the year in order to survive.

The first report to address the negative consequences of these assumptions, written by George Wright, Joseph Dixon, and Ben Thompson, was entitled "Fauna of the National Parks of the United States: A Preliminary Survey of Faunal Relations in National Parks." It was completed in 1932 and published in 1933. This book contained a perspective that differed from the earlier playground view of parks. The writers argued that the Park

Service had been created to provide for "the preservation of our country as it was seen by Boone and La Salle, by Coronado, and by Lewis and Clark."¹

They accepted that passive protection of wildlife from poachers and general human encroachment by the creation of national parks had been a necessary first step in the preservation of wildlife in America. However, they argued that the wildlife management goal of the Park Service was "to restore and perpetuate the fauna in its pristine state by combatting the harmful effects of human influence" and thereby concluded that "the need to supplement protection with more constructive wild-life management has become manifest with a steady increase of the problem both as to number and intensity."²

The report identified three basic problems that had to be solved to attain the wildlife management goal of restoring and perpetuating indigenous fauna. The first, and most significant, was the exclusion from most parks of territory required by the fauna of the region to survive. "At present, not one park is large enough to provide year-round sanctuary for adequate populations of all resident species."³ The parks were, in a word, too small. The authors suggested that the problem be solved by making faunal needs a major criterion for boundary enlargement and adjustment.

This suggestion potentially contradicted the earlier Mather position that only those areas of great scenic display and containing no other exploitable resource be considered for inclusion within the national park system. If an area were generating sufficient plant life to support an extensive faunal system, it was possibly sufficiently fertile enough to support agriculture or logging.

The second problem was the destruction of the faunal balance through the extermination of predators within the park and the introduction of exotic species to the area by local inhabitants prior to the creation of the park. The report recommended that wherever possible, predators should be re-introduced to the park to "help to restore the life of the park to its primitive dynamic balance."⁴ It also noted that an effective remedy to solve the problem of exotics that take hold in a park had not been found.⁵

¹ George M. Wright, Joseph S. Dixon, and Ben H. Thompson. "Fauna of the National Parks of the United States: A Preliminary Survey of Faunal Relations in National Parks", *Contribution of Wild Life Survey Fauna Series No. 1* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1933), 1.

² *Ibid.*, 4.

³ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 46.

The third problem was the conflict between visitor demands and faunal requirements within the parks. The authors noted that until the date of the report, visitor needs were valued far more highly than faunal needs in the decision-making process. Former management practices were understandably oriented toward the visitor because during the early years "the principal preoccupations were making the parks accessible, attracting the visitors to them, and making them comfortably at home while there." The report accepted the fact that the presence of visitors would cause "certain faunal complications." It recommended that in the future, these problems, which were "rooted in the conflict of the more fundamental needs of man and animals in the parks," be "dealt with in a farsighted manner."⁶

Visitor demands also caused another type of problem that did not arise from the conflicting physical needs of visitors and park fauna. This problem arose from visitor expectations of a positive park experience. The report offered a floral and a faunal example. It concluded that most park visitors were urban. Upon their initial visit to a park they tended "to approximate in the park the conditions he left behind." For this reason, initially, visitors appreciate a planned flower garden. However, once the visitor is "reeducated to an appreciation of the park's own distinctive wild gardens," the planned garden "becomes a jarring note on the landscape." Similarly, upon their initial visit, visitors tend to appreciate tame bears and other animals because they can relate to tameness. It was to be hoped that the visitor would come to learn that "the unique charm of the animals in a national park lies in their wildness, not their tameness, in their primitive struggle to survive rather than their fat certainty of an easy living."⁷

That this report's perspective did not become the basis for Park Service wildlife management policy is shown by the fact that thirty years later, a new set of reports embodying almost the same perspective were prepared at the request of then Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. The Leopold Report, the Robbins Report, and the Wilderness Act of 1964 restated, with greater ecological sophistication, the wildlife and overall natural resource management goals implicit in the 1932 report, hereinafter referred to as the Wright/Dixon Report.

The Leopold Report, entitled *Wildlife Management in the National Parks*, was completed on March 4, 1963. It reaffirmed the conclusion of the Wright/Dixon Report that early Park Service wildlife management practices focused on passive protection of wildlife resources. It then raised three questions that would form the focal point for its analysis. It asked:

⁶ Ibid., 53.

⁷ Ibid., 54.

- 1) What should be the goals of wildlife management in the national parks?
- 2) What general policies of management are best adapted to achieve the pre-determined goals?
- 3) What are some of the methods suitable for on-the-ground implementation of policies?⁸

In answer to the first question, Leopold reaffirmed the Wright/Dixon conclusion that wildlife management goals had to extend beyond passive protection. This conclusion clearly shows that the Wright/Dixon recommendation had not been implemented by the service. Leopold concluded that restoration of the conditions that had existed at the time the area within the park was first viewed by Europeans should be "a primary goal." Like Wright/Dixon, Leopold acknowledged that full restoration would be impossible because extinction of certain indigenous species had occurred. However, the authors maintained, "If the goal cannot be fully achieved it can be approached. A reasonable illusion of primitive America could be recreated, using the utmost in skill, judgment, and ecologic sensitivity. This, in our opinion, should be the objective of every national park and monument."⁹

In the formulation of policies to attain this management objective, the Leopold Report urged the service to be flexible, because of "the enormous complexity of ecologic communities and the diversity of management procedures required to preserve them." It also recommended that the service restrict its management effort "to native plants and animals." As a broad guideline for formulating management policies, it concluded that "above all other policies, the maintenance of naturalness should prevail."¹⁰

Based on the assumption that "management without knowledge would be a dangerous policy," the Leopold Report concluded that research should "form the basis of all management programs." However, it also found that the research efforts of the Park Service were directed toward providing interpretive information rather than the kind of information required for management decisions concerning habitat manipulation and/or methods of population control. It therefore concluded that wildlife management in the National Park Service should "be under the full jurisdiction of biologically trained personnel."¹¹ Once the research program was in place, Leopold urged that only those

⁸ A. S. Leopold (chairman), S. A. Cain, C. M. Cottam, I. N. Gabrielson, and T. L. Kimball. *Wildlife Management in the National Parks: The Leopold Report* (Unpublished, 1963), 1-2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

organisms native to the park be managed. Any exotic species was to be removed by whatever means necessary.¹²

The Robbins Report, formally entitled *A Report by The Advisory Committee to the National Park Service on Research*, was completed on August 1, 1963. It accepted the Leopold premise that the Park Service should reorient its research perspective, and offered some methods for doing so. Its basic conclusion was that the Park Service did not possess the in-house capabilities to conduct the scientific research necessary for informed natural resources management decision making and that the service should correct that deficiency by hiring more persons trained in the biological sciences.¹³

The Wilderness Act of 1964 is chronologically the final document developed during the early 1960s that had natural resource management implications. Although Director Wirth testified against the application of its provisions to land owned by the service, the principle of nonintrusion, or minimal intrusion, is based on the older service natural resources management approach of passive protection. The potential for conflict between Wilderness Act management practices and Leopold/Robbins management practices is obvious. Removal of exotics or the employment of techniques to measure the impact of native species on habitat could be intrusive to a considerable extent.

Clearly, the Wilderness Act did not signify a reversion to traditional Park Service natural resource management practices. It demonstrates, along with the Leopold and Robbins reports, a heightened sense of sound ecological practices and the need to apply these practices to the Park Service's natural resource management policy. This heightened awareness would eventually propel the service across the threshold of scientific resource management, something the Wright/Dixon Report had failed to do. The impact of these changes at Olympic are discussed below on a resource-by-resource basis.

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AT OLYMPIC

Fish

Olympic National Park is the only national park in the contiguous United States which contains a fish population consisting of both anadromous salmonida and resident lake trout. The management of no other resource more aptly illustrates the evolution of natural resources management philosophy than the management of fish. The change from the early practice of stocking non-native fish for sport fishing to the modern efforts to preserve the species integrity of the salmon runs and the Beardslee trout in Lake

¹² Ibid., 12.

¹³ National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council. *A Report by the Advisory Committee to the National Park Service On Research* (Unpublished, 1963), 47.

Crescent offers the clearest example of the change towards more ecologically sophisticated management practices.

Early management goals for the park's fisheries differed somewhat from its wildlife protection goals. Because hunting was barred, maintenance of wildlife was to be the result of natural predator-prey relationships supplemented by hunting outside the park. Fishing was allowed and encouraged by the park administrators. Therefore, more specific regulations were required to protect the resource and its maintenance required artificial enhancement. Protection and maintenance of both resources were management goals. The methods of achieving those goals differed.

Early management practices of the park's fishery resources aimed toward maintaining a sufficient number of fish for visitors to catch in as many places as possible. David Madsen completed a fish management report on April 5, 1939. While Madsen concluded that every effort should be made to maintain the integrity of the species within the park, he also wanted to artificially increase supplies of both native species and exotics. He recommended that "a definite attempt to reestablish egg taking facilities at Crescent Lake and produce a sufficient number of native trout...to restore a normal population in Lake Crescent" be made and that rainbow and cutthroat trout fry should be introduced to the Elwha and Quinault Rivers. He also urged that the eastern brook trout, which was not a species indigenous to the park, be maintained and increased in the lakes where it had taken hold.¹⁴

Superintendent Macy managed to undertake one modest stocking operation before the onset of World War II. Macy also formulated the first fishing regulations prior to the war. He completed a set of proposed regulations in March, 1940, which were approved in April. They provided that fishing licenses would not be required to fish in the park's streams and lakes, that the open season would coincide with the state's, that fish eggs and roe could not be used as bait, and that no more than ten pounds of any single species could be taken by one person. They also opened the Hoh, Queets, Quinault, and Soleduck rivers to year-round fishing.¹⁵

After World War II, a much more ambitious stocking program was begun. During the 1950s, Lake Crescent was stocked with 300,000 Kamloops rainbow trout per year for several years. Lake Mills was also heavily stocked.¹⁶ By the end of the 1950s, these stocking programs had done severe damage to the species integrity of the native fish populations of these lakes. On December 15, 1959, O.L. Wallis, an aquatic biologist, reported, "The question of preserving unique or native species such as the Beardslee or

¹⁴ Madsen to Cammerer. 5 April 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 714 -- Fishes, 44, NA.

¹⁵ Macy to Cammerer. 7 March 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 208-06, pt. 1, NA.

¹⁶ Glenn Gallison. Review notes.

Crescent trouts apparently is no longer significant." He noted that, in the years before the Park Service assumed jurisdiction, "indiscriminate stockings of many species and strains of trout have so diluted the endemic forms that it is doubtful that pure strains can still be present."¹⁷

Such stocking continued throughout the 1960s. The 1964 Master Plan reported that "some 49 lakes have been investigated and 42 are on a managed program with Eastern brook and rainbow trout found either together in some or as individual species."¹⁸ By 1972, the service began re-evaluating the impact of stocking programs whose primary purpose was to maintain a supply sufficient for visitor use. A service-wide directive to end fingerling planting was issued.

At Olympic, Roger Allin stopped stocking the backcountry lakes, including Grand Lake and Flapjack Lakes, to evaluate the impact of stocking on the fish population of those lakes and to reduce visitor use of the areas.¹⁹ Stocking continued at Lake Mills until 1974, to complete an ongoing ten-year stocking program. By 1975, all stocking ended.

Allin, who was trained as a fish biologist, attempted to undertake a systematic investigation of the park's fishery resources. However, he was hindered by lack of funds. He did work with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other federal agencies and contracted with private sector experts to gain as much information as possible. One such instance of this type of activity resulted from the final stocking at Lake Mills. Allin persuaded the fisheries class at Peninsula College to monitor the progress of the release.²⁰

Superintendent Contor systematized Allin's efforts to gather information on fisheries and other resources of the park by establishing the Division of Science and Technology in 1980. He also provided the park with its first full time "fish crew" in 1983.²¹ However, much significant information continued to be gathered through contracting with experts.

The two most significant reports were completed by Brian Pierce and Reginald Reisenbichler in 1983. Both reports were presented at the Olympic Wild Fish Conference and form the foundation for the current management approach. Pierce

¹⁷ O. L. Wallis. *An Evaluation of the Fishery Resources of Olympic National Park and Needs for Interpretation, Research, and Management*, 15 December 1959, File OLYM 204, 6, History Collection, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library (hereinafter referred to as HFCL).

¹⁸ Master Plan For Olympic National Park, 4 December 1964, File OLYM Box 3, 12, HFCL.

¹⁹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, File OLYM Box 2, 12, HFCL.

²⁰ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1974, File OLYM Box 2, 7, HFCL.

²¹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1983, File OLYM Box 2, 4, HFCL.

concluded that the present Lake Crescent trout population was genetically identical to the original trout that had been known as Beardslee trout, and Reisenbichler concluded that the anadromous salmon still running in park rivers were also wild, native fish and warned against the potential damage to the genetic stock by the ongoing practice of outplanting.²²

At present, Superintendent Chandler has not only adopted management techniques to preserve the wild stock in the rivers where it now reproduces, but he is also attempting to restore native stock to the Elwha. That run was disrupted more than fifty years ago by the construction of a power dam. That structure's operating license is up for renewal and negotiations that may lead to the eventual re-establishment of anadromous fish in the system are underway.

Throughout the history of the park, management of its fishery resources has been marked by active, hands-on techniques. As service perceptions of its resource management goals have changed, the type of hands-on management activities have also changed. Fish management today follows the active philosophy of Leopold and Robbins rather than the passive protection ideas of the Wilderness Act. Its primary goal is the preservation of wild fish pools rather than providing visitors with a pleasant fishing experience.

Wildlife

The primary wildlife resource of Olympic National Park is the Roosevelt elk. The primary wildlife management problem of Olympic is the presence of the non-indigenous mountain goat. For reasons discussed below, far more is known about the goats than about the elk, even though the elk herd has been the focus of much public attention and study from the beginning of the twentieth century (see chapter 2).

Despite the conclusion of the 1932 Wright/Dixon Report that hands-on management was required to restore natural conditions to many parks, the management of the Roosevelt elk herd has remained basically a passive protection approach throughout the history of the park. Several reasons can be found for this fact. First, the size of the park ensures that the elk can breed, find sufficient range, and reach maturity within the boundaries of the park. Second, the density of the park's vegetation makes an accurate elk census difficult, if not impossible. Third, little or no evidence has been discovered to justify an attempt to increase the number of elk or enhance elk habitat.

The fact that Olympic became the large park that Franklin Roosevelt wished it to become is the single most important factor in determining appropriate management practices for the Roosevelt elk. During the years 1934 through 1938, while the final size

²² J.M. Walton and D.B. Houston, editors. *Proceedings of the Olympic Wild Fish Conference* (Port Angeles: Peninsula College Fisheries Technology Program, 1983), 33, 69.

of Olympic was being debated, both George Wright, co-author of the Wright/Dixon Report, and Ben Thompson, who had served as research assistant on the report project, visited Mount Olympus National Monument to determine where new boundaries should be drawn. Wright was part of the team that proposed the original alpine park, with some additions in the Hoh Valley.

Thompson, however, felt that a larger park was necessary to insure that the elk would have a protected winter range. Agreeing with Van Name, he reported to the director on May 22, 1934, "I should like to see the monument enlarged to its original size because I believe that in the long run its use as a national park would be of greater value to the American people than as a small and inadequate monument surrounded by commercially utilized forest."²³ Thompson went on to point out that the real danger to the elk was not the hunter, but the absence or scarcity of predators. Given this condition, he concluded that "the real danger is that the elk will usurp everything else."²⁴

Given this and the fact that the eventual size of the park was even greater than Thompson felt necessary to protect the herd, officials at Olympic assumed that the herd would be kept in natural balance after the hunting of both elk and predators was ended by the creation of the park.

During Macy's pre-war administration, he lacked the personnel necessary to undertake systematic studies of elk habits. During 1933 to 1934, Adolph Murie, David Madsen, and Thompson all made short investigations of the number and habits of the elk, but their investigations were too short-lived to be conclusive.

The only local person who had long-term contact with the elk herd was John Schwartz, a biologist with the U.S. Forest Service, who undertook elk range studies from 1935 through 1938. By 1936, Schwartz had constructed eight enclosures "in typical forage areas on the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault watershed."²⁵ Schwartz also noted that the elk tended to concentrate in the lower portions of these valleys during the early spring. However, his census methods were too lax to be reliable. He reported sighting more than 1,000 animals in the east fork of the Quinault, 700 in the north fork, 500 in the Queets, 675 in the north fork of the Hoh, and 378 up the south fork for the months of December through February, but it is impossible to know how many elk were counted more than once.²⁶

²³ Thompson to Cammerer. 22 May 1934. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 3, 2, NA.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Macy to Tomlinson. 29 June 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 13, 1, NA.

²⁶ Ibid., 5.

The first Park Service employee to practice the type of hands-on management of elk habitat later envisioned by the Leopold Report was Coleman Newman, who was hired as park biologist in 1952. Newman established some study plots and attempted to derive an estimate of the number of elk by their impact on these plots. His results were published in 1958 by Gunnar Fagerlund in a pamphlet entitled "Roosevelt Elk of Olympic National Park."²⁷ Newman estimated that the elk population was approximately 3000 and concluded that, as a result of the cessation of intensive hunting, "the elk population is more or less stable and is not subject to great fluctuation."²⁸

Through his research, Newman concluded that Olympic's faunal system was sufficiently complete to maintain the elk population at stable levels. This conclusion implied that little active management of the elk herd was necessary and, in fact, little active management of the herd was undertaken. The 1964 Master Plan accepted Newman's conclusion that the elk population was in balance with its food supply. However, the plan also called for the development of an "effective long-range research program on elk-forage relationships."²⁹

The 1965 Master Plan Brief also noted that elk management "consists of simple protection and continued observation of forage study plots" and compared these findings with those of past reports.³⁰ Basically, the management approach taken toward the elk seems to have been along the lines of the 1965 Master Plan Brief up to the present time. Along with protection from poaching, the primary management activity is monitoring the herd and its food supply to assure that no disastrous shift in elk population, either up or down, has occurred.

The 1965 Master Plan Brief also noted that the mountain goat was being managed in the same way as the elk, and concluded that "since the elimination of this animal from the Park scene is not indicated, the present management program will continue."³¹ This statement is an accurate reflection of the goat management practices from the beginning of the park until the 1970s, when several events led to the eventual decision to eliminate the goats from the park. Roger Allin became superintendent in 1970, and brought with him an aggressive, ecologically-oriented management philosophy. The goat population on Klahhane Ridge was increasing at a rapid rate and was damaging native plants, some

²⁷ Glenn Gallison. Review notes.

²⁸ Coleman C. Newman. *Roosevelt Elk of Olympic National Park* (Port Angeles, WA: Olympic Natural History Association, 1958), 22.

²⁹ Master Plan for Olympic National Park, Chapter 2, pt. 2, 29 September 1964, File OLYM Box 3, p. 3, HFCL.

³⁰ Master Plan Brief for Olympic National Park, 6 November 1965, File OLYM Box 3, 19, HFCL.

³¹ *Ibid.*

of which were rare endemic species. The service ordered parks to remove exotic species, a direct result of the Leopold Report philosophy of making parks "vignettes of primitive America."

Preliminary studies concerning the methods to be used to remove the goats began during Superintendent Contor's tenure. However, a final removal plan was not approved until 1988. The goals of the plan are to remove all goats from the interior of the park and to control the population along the eastern boundary where goats are also found on Forest Service land. It calls for a three-year period of live capture. After three years, live capture will continue to be the preferred method of removal, but it may be supplemented by a shooting program carried out by the park rangers in areas where live capture methods are impractical and dangerous.³²

RAIN FOREST AND ALPINE VEGETATION

Rain Forest Management

The passive protection management approach that has been applied to the elk has also been applied to the rain forests that serve as the primary habitat for the herd. If anything, the management approach has grown more passive as a result of the new perception of fire developed during the 1960s. The traditional approach emphasized minimal protection from infection and infestation, but strongly active protection against fire. The Leopold Report supported this approach, noting that "the traditional, simple formula of protection may be exactly what is needed to maintain such climax associations as arctic-alpine heath, the rain forests of Olympic peninsula, or the Joshua trees and saguaros of southwestern deserts."³³ However, as a result of a more sophisticated perception of what constitutes intrusion into wilderness conditions, fire protection has become less active.

As discussed in chapter 5, Preston Macy's management philosophy was shaped in large part by his belief in the 1930s wilderness principles and by the determinations made by a group that met at Olympic in August, 1938, to develop wilderness management policies for the park. A significant element of those policies was a hands-off approach to controlling infestation and infection. Macy followed this policy, reporting in January 1940, for instance, that the silver pine in the Dose Forks area was heavily infested by the pine bark beetle. He recommended that no action be taken because the infested trees involved "only a very small area of the forest."³⁴

³² Doug Houston. Interview, not taped.

³³ A. S. Leopold, et al. *The Leopold Report*, 5.

³⁴ Macy to Director. February 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-02.3, pt. 1, NA.

By contrast, Fred Overly pursued an active hands-on forest management approach in dealing with infestation and infection. Believing that parks were for people, Overly therefore believed that healthy trees were a scenic requirement. He utilized timber salvage operations "to remove danger trees, reduce fire hazards, eliminate breeding areas for tree killing insects and do some river control work."³⁵

Overly did not initiate timber salvage operations at Olympic. The first such operation was authorized to deal with a 1942 blow-down after the solicitor had determined that the director of the National Park Service could exchange down timber for privately owned lands.³⁶ (1955-08-08, p.1) However, upon becoming superintendent, Overly greatly increased the scope of such operations. Eventually, this approach to forest management brought Overly into conflict with the emerging wilderness management practices being developed and espoused by national conservation organizations. (See chapter 12 for a detailed discussion.)

Overly's successor, Daniel Beard, came to Olympic from Everglades National Park, another park managed in accordance with 1930s wilderness concepts. While at Everglades, Beard had a good working relationship with local and national conservationists and moved quickly to establish similar relations at Olympic. He quickly perceived that the active management practices that Overly had been pursuing had to be ended, and he ended them.³⁷ In dealing with infestation and infection, Beard's policies of nonintervention have been followed until the present.

Active fire prevention has been a consistent element of forest management throughout the history of the park. However, until recent time, it was the sole method of dealing with fire. From Macy through the end of Roger Allin's tenure in 1976, the sole response to fire was extinguishment. The 1976 Master Plan acknowledged that the change in the ecological perception of fire would eventually require change in the response to its occurrence:

The historic role of fire in determining past and present forest conditions is only beginning to be fully understood. For this reason, naturally occurring fires in remote areas of the park may be allowed to run their course--but only after careful reconnaissance determines that there is no threat to physical developments, private lands, and lands outside the park.³⁸

³⁵ Annual Forestry Report, Olympic National Park, 1957, Accession 60A-04-05, File 880-01, 6, NPS Records Office.

³⁶ Acting NPS Director Ben Thompson to Assistant Secretary Lewis. 8 August 1955. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, 1, Department of the Interior Records Officer.

³⁷ Daniel Beard. Interview by Herb Evison. Transcript. 35, HFCL.

³⁸ Olympic National Park Master Plan, 18 October 1976, 47, Olympic National Park Library.

In 1980, the responsibility for determining whether a fire should be allowed to burn was assigned to the newly-created Division of Science and Technology. By 1983, a Fire Management Plan for the park was completed.³⁹ This document established within the park's decision-making apparatus the perception that fire was ecologically significant and should be monitored rather than extinguished if it occurred under certain conditions. The first such fire occurred in 1987. Fire prevention and its attendant activities are still important resource management functions within Olympic, but the definition of fire has been expanded, thereby causing additional management responsibilities.

Alpine Floral Management

Unlike rain forest management, visitor use primarily determines management practices used to protect the alpine flora of Olympic. An awareness of the fragility of high country flora is apparent from the earliest days of the park. The wilderness management team discussed it during their planning sessions and David Madsen, in his report on stocking the lakes, pointed out that excessive fishing in the high country lakes could damage the flora. During the first twenty years of the park, however, the same type of passive management practices that characterized management of the rain forest and elk were applied to the alpine backcountry.

In January 1960, the Olympic Back Country Management study was completed. It concluded that "the Park visitor and his feet" were "loving it to death."⁴⁰ In addition to an overall increase in visitor use, it identified two causes of the visitor concentration that led to more severe damage in specific areas: shelter location and ease of access. Heart Lake was one instance where ease of access was causing resource damage. Because the Mink Lake and Wolf Bar shelters were located near roads, they received "heavy and misguided use." The report concluded that the two shelters should be moved further away from the roads and that the backcountry rangers should emphasize to visitors that the shelters were to be used only in inclement weather and were not merely social gathering places.⁴¹

The remedies proposed by the report were modest. It proposed that park service employees and concessioners increase their efforts to educate the backcountry visitor and that hikers and fishermen use common sense in the backcountry. These recommendations, if carried out, did not solve the problems attendant to increasing

³⁹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1983, File OLYM Box 2, 6, HFCL.

⁴⁰ Ray W. Murphy, Back Country Study Committee chairman. *Olympic Back Country Study*, 31 January 1960, File OLYM Box 3, 5, HFCL.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

backcountry use. The 1964 Master Plan called for additional studies to measure the damage to high-use areas.⁴²

By 1971, backpacking had become a recreational activity for a large number of the emerging baby boom generation. Concern over increased backcountry use led to the issuance of a directive by the Washington Office instructing all parks to improve the protection of backcountry resources from overuse by hikers.⁴³ Roger Allin acted forcefully on this directive. He instituted several measures to restrict backcountry use. They included a pass system, strict enforcement of overnight population limits at campgrounds, and a controversial shelter removal program (discussed in chapter 9).

The regulations for backcountry use that were made final in 1976 offer the best illustration of Allin's approach to the management of backcountry resources. They required that all groups planning to stay in the backcountry overnight be restricted to twelve members and eight pack animals. Overnight groups were required to obtain permits in advance. Day visitation to Lake Constance and Flapjack Lakes was restricted to twenty and thirty people respectively.⁴⁴ Allin's successor, James Coleman, endorsed these regulations. They have formed the basis for alpine floral management decision making. During the late 1970s, visitation to the park began to stabilize and backcountry use decline. No further restrictive measures have been required, and the alpine floral management practices developed by Allin remain in effect.

Cultural Resources

Efforts to identify and preserve the cultural resources within Olympic have been undertaken at various times since the park was established. In August, 1941, Doerr Yeager, assistant chief of the Museum Division, reported on his inspection of the property of Mr. C. W. Keller at Ozette Lake. Yeager, who had been asked to make this inspection by Superintendent Macy, reported that the buildings on property known as the Nylund Ranch should "be reconditioned so as to constitute an historic house museum" and "be refurnished with items of a contemporary period from the local residents."⁴⁵ Yeager's report was not acted on, perhaps because the ranch was not formally within the

⁴² Master Plan For Olympic National Park, Chapter 2, File OLYM Box 3, 6, HFCL.

⁴³ Glenn Gallison. Review notes.

⁴⁴ NPS News Release, "Current Backcountry Regulations at Olympic National Park", 23 May 1977, File OLYM Box 3, 1, HFCL.

⁴⁵ Yeager to Region IV director. 14 August 1941. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 833 - Exhibits (General), pt. 1, 2, NA.

park at that time. By 1958, the buildings had deteriorated beyond repair and they had collapsed by 1970.⁴⁶

Although the failure to protect the Nylund Ranch was a significant issue relating to cultural resource management, a systematic effort to identify and evaluate park cultural resources was not undertaken prior to the Leopold Report in 1963. While the Leopold Report and the Wilderness Act did not directly address the issue of cultural resource preservation, the theme of European intrusion that they shared carry strong presumptions against cultural resource preservation, including those cases in which the intrusion was historically significant.

The enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966 focused attention on the need to preserve historically significant structures within the park. This act resulted from the concern that increased federal activities, such as highway construction and urban renovation, would lead to the loss of historically significant properties. Although this was not occurring at Olympic, the service determined that all areas would undertake historic structure investigations. On October 10, 1968, the director issued a memorandum that required a Report of Survey on each building over fifty years old.⁴⁷

Perhaps as a result of this directive, NPS Historian Benjamin Levy visited Olympic and completed a Historic Structure Report on Humes' Ranch in the spring of 1969. This report was the first professional evaluation of a historic structure within Olympic. Levy concluded that the structure should remain in use as an emergency shelter and that it was sufficiently significant to be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.⁴⁸

On August 25, 1970, Superintendent Stuer Carlson reported to Regional Director John Rutter that the Ennis Creek Guard Station and Barn were more than fifty years old and were not historically significant. Rutter concurred and on November 27, 1970, received permission from Director George Hartzog to raze the buildings.⁴⁹ Humes Ranch, presumably on the strength of Levy's report, was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in early 1972.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Glenn Gallison review note.

⁴⁷ Director John Rutter, Pacific Northwest Region to director, NPS. 12 June 1972. File Olympic NP 1948-1974, History Division, NPS .

⁴⁸ Director William Bowen, Western Region, to director, NPS. 25 March 1969. File Olympic NP, 1948-74, History Division, NPS.

⁴⁹ Director George Hartzog to Rutter. 27 November 1970. File Olympic NP 1948-74, History Division, NPS.

⁵⁰ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, File OLYM Box 2, 13, HFCL.

The issuance of Executive Order 11593 on May 13, 1971 assigned responsibility for developing inventories of structures on federal lands to the agency owning the land, setting a July 31, 1973 deadline for the completion of such an inventory.⁵¹ To assist the parks in doing so, the Park Service developed an administrative entity called the List of Classified Structures. The LCS was to include "all structures in the National Park System that merit preservation because of historical, architectural, archeological, or aesthetic values and that are determined to be practicable of preservation." The list then provided guidelines for making these two determinations.⁵²

By early 1973, little had been done at the national level or at Olympic. On March 5, Associate Director Ernest Allen Connally addressed a memorandum to all field directors urging that the List of Classified Structures be completed as soon as possible so that the decision-making process for historic preservation could begin. Despite this directive, limited activity occurred at Olympic until March 26, 1974, when Associate Director Bennett Gale forwarded a list of historic structures compiled by Regional Office cultural resource professionals Vernon Tancil and Laurin Huffman to Superintendent Allin. The list included ninety structures of potential significance, including Rosemary Inn; the Lake Crescent Lodge complex, which contained Cabin (more correctly Cottage) 34, where President Roosevelt was believed to have stayed during his October 1937 visit, Storm King Inn and Storm King Ranger Station.⁵³

In transmitting this report, Gale noted that "both the Rosemary Inn and the Storm King Ranger Station are significant to local history," but urged that the nomination of these buildings to the National Register of Historic Places be delayed "pending determination of whether or not it is feasible to preserve the buildings and whether or not the historical themes which they represent are represented by other buildings." He then offered a list of potential historic themes and asked for Allin's evaluation.⁵⁴

Allin responded on June 5, 1974. He accepted Gale's implicit conclusion that historic themes need be represented by only one structure and that other structures duplicating that representation could be ignored or eliminated. For instance, Allin agreed that "at Soleduck and Staircase...are located fine examples of the old U.S. Forest Service's ranger stations and outbuildings." He concluded, "One of these should be maintained to show

⁵¹ Barry Mackintosh. *The National Historic Preservation Act and the National Park Service: A History* (Washington, D.C.: History Division, NPS, 1986), 37-38.

⁵² "National Park Service Activity Standards", 21 December 1971, Barry Mackintosh personal files, 17, History Division, NPS.

⁵³ Gale to Allin. 26 March 1974. Accession 79-83-0005, File H30 PNR OLYM, Enclosures, Sand Point Federal Records Center.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

the Forest Service influence in the history of this park while it was still a National Monument."⁵⁵ Presumably, the other two were dispensable.

No other systematic effort seems to have been made to gauge the overall number of historic structures and other cultural resources after the initial response to the 1971 Executive Order until 1982, when a historian-archeologist team, consisting of T. Allan Comp, project director, Eric Bergland, archeologist, Jonathan Dembo, historian; Gail Evans, architectural historian; and Leslie Helm, historian, arrived at the park and began work.⁵⁶ A preliminary archeological overview was completed during the summer of 1982 and the overall effort was completed in 1983. The final result was the publication of four significant documents--a Summary Prehistory and Ethnography, the Historic Building Inventory, a Historic Resource Study, and draft National Register nomination.⁵⁷ The latter three documents identify and describe in detail the park's historic structures. They are essential references for managing the park's historic resources.

Since completion of these general studies, individual historic structure and landscape reports on key sites have been completed and the preparation of a Historic Preservation Guide is under way. Upon its completion, the guide will provide more detailed guidance for the preservation and maintenance of Olympic's historic structures.

Identification and evaluation of historically significant structures is, and will continue to be, an ongoing process at Olympic because of the park's active land acquisition program. One example of this is the recent acquisition of the Higley property in the Quinault Valley. Evaluation of that site's historic and archeological significance is in progress, and it is possible that it may be interpreted as a historic homestead site within the park.⁵⁸

However, the amount of land to be acquired in the future is relatively small compared to what has already been included within in the park, and it is likely that the majority, perhaps the preponderance, of historic properties are known. This is not true of archaeological, ethnographic and cultural landscape resources for which extensive surveys and evaluation efforts remain to be done. The question now becomes what to do with these structures. Because of the documents discussed above, management plans can begin to emphasize the future function of known properties along with the continued identification and evaluation of newly acquired sites. Superintendent Chandler supported plans that assured that the resources served viable park functions. That is,

⁵⁵ Allin to Rutter. 5 June 1974. Accession 79-83-0005, File H30 PNR OLYM, 1, Sand Point FRC.

⁵⁶ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1982, FILE OLYM Box 2, 2, HFCL.

⁵⁷ Stephanie Toothman. Review notes.

⁵⁸ Stephanie Toothman. Review notes.

historic structures will be maintained to preserve their historical integrity, but may also be adaptively rehabilitated to meet contemporary park needs.

Two examples of this perspective are Lake Crescent Lodge and Rosemary Inn. The Lodge has always served as one of the major concession facilities of the park. As a result of extensive renovation in the early 1980s, the visitor will see the exterior much like it was during the 1930s and those who choose to stay in the main lodge will reside among furnishings evocative of the period in which Olympic was established. Visitors also have the option of staying in new cabins surrounding the lodge that have replaced the original cabins that had deteriorated beyond repair. These new cabins evoke images of the original cabins because they have been constructed on the same scale with identical or similar materials.⁵⁹

Rosemary Inn has been renovated to maintain its historical architectural integrity to serve as the quarters for the Olympic Park Institute. The lodge has been adaptively rehabilitated to serve as a learning center and dining hall, the cabins surrounding the main lodge are being individually restored, and new dormitory facilities, comparable in scale and materials, were built on adjacent property.⁶⁰

CONCLUSION

The natural resource management practices at Olympic National Park have changed as the definition of sound management practices have changed. From its inception, Olympic was to be managed as a wilderness park. However, the management philosophy within the Park Service at that time was oriented at least as strongly toward visitor use as toward wilderness preservation. These conflicting goals allowed for a wide range of acceptable management decisions.

Because of the emergence of new wilderness theories in the early 1960s, and their acceptance by Secretary of the Interior Udall and a younger generation of Park Service personnel, emphasis on providing visitor amusements has waned. A new, more ecologically sophisticated perception of resources has become the guiding force in resource management decision making. Cultural resource management practices based on the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, have similarly evolved.

Both natural and cultural resource management policies currently share an emphasis on the acquisition and management of baseline data to more informed decision making. Most promising is a growing awareness that many management problems will benefit from drawing on the expertise of both cultural and natural resource specialists with the search for viable solutions.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Randy Jones, interview; Robert Chandler, interview; Stephanie Toothman, review notes.

CHAPTER 9

Chapter 9

CONCESSIONS AND VISITOR FACILITIES

This chapter covers the management of concessions and other visitor facilities at Olympic. The concessions section discusses the management of those facilities which enable the overnight visitor to sleep in a bed under a roof. The visitor facilities section discusses the Hurricane Ridge Lodge, campgrounds, and shelters. This chapter is not intended to be a history of each concession operation, but an overview of the history of management practices as they apply to concessions and other visitor facilities.

The emergence of the 1960s wilderness philosophy has had virtually no impact on concessions management policy or practices. In fact, concessions management has been marked by a fairly consistent approach since the end of World War II. The emergence of the wilderness philosophy has had a significant impact on the management policies and practices developed to administer other types of visitor facilities.

CONCESSIONS

The superintendent has less administrative discretion in managing concessions than in most areas of park administration. The Washington Office and Congress exercise more stringent oversight in this area of park management, because in many cases private individuals profit from government-owned resources. When Olympic became a national park, certain rules for concession management had already been established. The length of a concession contract was limited to twenty years, and compensation to the concessioner was reimbursement for actual operating costs and 6 percent profit. Any profit above 6 percent was divided between the government and the concessioner. The government received 50 percent of the excess profit if it owned the facility and 25 percent if the concessioner owned it.¹ It was also established policy to use locally owned facilities "so long as the welfare of the visitor is protected," and to provide a variety of facilities at different price ranges.²

The original boundaries of Olympic National Park contained a number of concession facilities, including Rosemary Inn, Ovington's, Lake Crescent Tavern, Storm King Inn, and Graves Creek Inn.³ The 1940 Proclamation expanding the park brought the

¹ Acting Associate Director Hillory Tolson to Mr. Baldwin Myers. 28 June 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 901 B-R, 1, NA.

² Acting Director to Superintendent Macy, 6 February 1936. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, Part 3,2, NA.

³ NPS. 28 February 1939. "Olympic National Park," RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 17, 5, NA.

facilities of Olympic Hot Springs and Sol Duc Hot Springs within the park. At this time, these facilities were all privately owned, for the most part by individual families. Their operation was therefore subject to the financial and physical limitations of the owners.

The 1938 Planning Group developed a policy for managing these facilities that Preston Macy did not fully implement. The group determined that established facilities should be allowed to continue operation within the park. It also concluded that no new facilities were needed "since roadways leading to the boundaries will provide suitable sites for such developments," and that the facilities within the park should eventually be acquired amicably and demolished.⁴

The first facilities purchased by the park were acquired during the PWA condemnation of the Queets Corridor and the Coastal Strip. They included the Becker Resort at Kalaloch, Kelly's Ranch in the Queets Corridor, and the Fletcher Resort at Ruby Beach. Rosemary Inn was the first facility acquired by amicable purchase within the original park. As early as 1939, an effort was made to get permission to use PWA funds to acquire this facility.⁵ Permission was denied, however, and the Inn was not acquired until the end of 1943, when an option to buy was accepted by the original owner, Mrs. Rose Littleton, who was no longer interested in managing the operation.⁶ Macy acquired the facility with the clear intent of maintaining it as a concession and assigned management rights to National Park Concessions upon purchase.⁷

During World War II, most concession facilities were used primarily by military personnel assigned to duty in the area. Becker's Resort was used as a barracks to house Coast Guard patrol personnel, and various other operations provided housing for military personnel or "defense workers at the air base." During 1943, a number of facilities were not opened to the public.⁸ (1943-07-02) Although such heavy use might have been profitable, it took its toll. In 1949, Mr. Becker recalled, "This concessioner returned in January 1946 to find the resort literally wrecked, the Inn burned, and all other facilities in terrible shape."⁹

⁴ *Statement Of Controlling Development Policies*, 1950, File OLYM Box 3, B-3, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library (hereinafter referred to as HFCL).

⁵ Macy to Cammerer. 9 November 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610, pt. 1, 1, NA.

⁶ Superintendent's Annual Report, 1943, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-01.4, 1, NA.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Superintendent's Annual Report, 1945, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic File 207-01.4, 1.

⁹ Herbert Maier, acting director, Region 4 to director, NPS. 13 March 1951. RG 79, Accession 61A362, File C3823 Charles Becker, 1-2, NPS Records Office.

During the years immediately after World War II, it became apparent that some of the families operating facilities in Olympic did not possess sufficient capital to maintain an acceptable level of quality. In 1947, the Ovington Resort on Lake Crescent was acquired. However, the structures had deteriorated so extensively from a "lack of maintenance of the past number of years" that they could not be saved.¹⁰

Evidently, such conditions were extant throughout the park system. On November 1, 1948, the Park Service published new concession management policies, which were in part designed to increase the capital commitment by the concessioner through linking the length of the term of the concession permit to the amount invested in capital improvement. To obtain a five-year permit, a potential concessioner had to agree to invest at least \$10,000 in the facility, for a ten-year permit, \$10,000 to \$20,000, and \$20,000 to \$30,000 for a fifteen-year permit.¹¹ Uncharacteristically, Macy opposed this policy, arguing that such new demands on concessioners would destabilize concession operations by disrupting successful ongoing working relationships.¹²

When Fred Overly succeeded Macy as superintendent in 1951, he moved to acquire many of the privately owned concession facilities. He accelerated a timber salvage and exchange operation to acquire many significant concession and other commercial properties, primarily around Lake Crescent. By 1955, the Fairholm property on the western side of the lake, Lake Crescent Lodge itself, the Storm King Inn, the Log Cabin Resort, and 100 acres of land and shorefront upon which "a high class cabin camp and hotel can be constructed" were among the properties that had been acquired.¹³

Overly was clearly acquiring these properties to maintain them as concession facilities, thereby disregarding the Planning Group policy of acquisition for destruction only. In acquiring the 100 acres of shorefront property and planning to build a hotel thereon, he also disregarded the group's conclusion that new concession facilities should not be constructed.

Overly's primary concessions management goal was to provide comfortable and accessible accommodations for park visitors. His Master Plan Development Outline concluded that "significant is the public demand for higher standards of accommodations

¹⁰ Superintendent's Annual Report, 1946, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-01.4, 2, NA.

¹¹ Acting NPS Director Hillory Tolson to director, Region 4, 22 June 1949. RG 79, Accession 61A362, File C3823 General, pt. 1, 1, NPS Records Office.

¹² Macy to Region 4 director, 25 May 1949. RG 79, Accession 61A362, File C3823 General, pt. 1, 2, NPS Records Office.

¹³ Master Plan Development Outline, General Information Section, 14 March 1952, 6; Developed Areas Section, 10 August 1955, 2, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, NPS Records Office.

and services."¹⁴ However, the master plan also found that this significant demand was not being met by the facilities within Olympic. Because the private owners lacked sufficient capital to meet acceptable standards, the first step to improve concession facilities was the acquisition of those facilities by the service. Upon acquisition, the service would have the authority to designate the manager of a concession. Presumably, capital commitment would be a determining factor in that decision.

Overly worked vigorously to raise the standards of Olympic's concession facilities and to increase their chances for a profit. Larger facilities were given liquor permits for on-premises as well as carry-out sales. Smaller facilities were issued carry-out permits only.¹⁵

Overly also entered into a twenty-year lease with Becker's Resort in 1953. Becker had cash flow problems, and it is difficult to believe that he would be able to commit the more than \$20,000 required to be awarded a permit of such length. However, Overly agreed to provide Becker with lumber to expand his facility, so Becker must have made some commitment to invest capital in expansion.¹⁶

Overly did not have as good a working relationship with the owners of the two hot springs facilities as he did with Becker. In May of 1954, the U.S. Public Health Service reported that the sanitary conditions in both the Sol Duc and Olympic facilities were unsatisfactory. This report set off a debate between the concessioners and the Park Service concerning adequacy of effort and responsibility for remediation.

Overly attempted to suspend operations at both facilities, but both owners pursued the service's formal appeal procedures and continued operations without making any effort to improve conditions. Early in 1955, Director Wirth made a preliminary decision to close Olympic Hot Springs, which was owned by Harry Schoeffel. Overly persuaded Wirth to put off a final decision by attempting to replace Schoeffel with new management. He put together a coalition of several Port Angeles businessmen, including Jack Del Guzzi, and Jim and John Robinson, in the hopes that they would respond to the announcement that the concession permit was up for bid. However, they failed to apply after looking closely at the prospects of the facility and Schoeffel submitted the only proposal.¹⁷

¹⁴ Master Plan Outline, Developed Areas Section, 10 August 1955, 5.

¹⁵ Overly to Region 4 Director. 18 August 1952. RG 79, Accession 61A362, File C3823 National Park Concessions, pt. 1, NPS Records Office.

¹⁶ Overly to Region 4 Director. 13 February 1953. RG 79, Accession 61A362, File C3823 Charles Becker, pt. 1, 1, NPS Records Office.

¹⁷ Overly to Region 4 Director. 16 April 1957. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File C3823 OLYM pt. 2, Olympic Hot Springs Resort--Schoeffel, 1-3, NPS Records Office.

Despite his efforts to attract additional capital and to keep as many concessions open as possible, Overly was aware that some concession facilities would never attract the capital necessary to meet acceptable standards, and he stood ready to close such facilities. The private campground at La Poel was closed in 1956. Discussions concerning the closure of the Ruby Beach Resort were begun during Overly's tenure.¹⁸

Overly's concessions management approach was far more activist than Macy's. He removed control of most significant concession facilities from private family ownership by purchasing them and made every effort to induce capital improvements. He also at least tacitly accepted the management perspective that has remained constant at Olympic. He either attempted to improve concession facilities or he closed them. The good of providing either quality concessions or no concessions has defined is the overall management approach at Olympic for the past thirty-five years.

Dan Beard, Overly's successor, followed this management approach. During his brief tenure he closed several small, marginal operations, including Staircase Resort.¹⁹ A November 1959 report by Duncan Mills, regional chief of Concessions Management, concluded that the operations at Ruby Beach, La Push, and Waumilla should also be closed. In each case the recommendation for closure was based on the concessioner's inability to generate sufficient capital to maintain acceptable standards at the facility.²⁰

John Doerr did not demonstrate any change in management philosophy during his tenure at Olympic. The Waumilla Lodge ceased operation during his administration.²¹ Doerr encountered severe personal health problems and does not seem to have become as actively involved in concessions as Overly and Beard.

Bennett Gale, who succeeded Doerr, was more actively involved in concessions management. His 1965 Master Plan Brief listed as his three main goals the acquisition and upgrade of Sol Duc Hot Springs, the obliteration of Olympic Hot Springs, and the

¹⁸ Overly to Director Wirth. 28 February 1956. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File C3823 OLYM pt. 2, National Park Concessions, NPS Records Office.

¹⁹ Beard to Wirth. 8 May 1959. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File C3823 OLYM pt. 2, W. A. Lembeck--Staircase Resort, 2, NPS Records Office.

²⁰ Mills to Region 4 Chief of Operations. 3 November 1959. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File C3823 OLYM pt. 2, W. A. Lembeck--Staircase Resort, 1-3, NPS Records Office.

²¹ Wirth to the Congressman Jack Westland. 6 October 1960. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File Olympic 207, January 1951- October 1960, NPS Records Office.

replacement of the Storm King Visitor Center and Lake Crescent Lodge with a "combined visitor services complex."²²

He achieved two of these goals. In 1966, I. W. Abel, the owner of Sol Duc Hot Springs, threatened to subdivide his property. Gale, with the assistance of Assistant Secretary John Carver, began the process of acquisition. In 1967, Gale refused to renew the permit to operate Olympic Hot Springs. Some disagreement over the value of the Schoeffels' interest arose, but the operation ended.²³ Gale did not succeed in renovating the Storm King and Lake Crescent operations.

Gale also accepted the concessions management philosophy shared by his predecessors. As the outcome of the two hot springs operations shows, Gale believed in having either good concessions or no concessions. During this time, this attitude was reinforced at the national level by Assistant Secretary Carver.²⁴ Because of Carver's philosophy, concessions management practices did not change greatly during the 1960s, although at the same time, new wilderness management policies were being developed and implemented in other areas of park management.

Gale's successor, Stuer Carlson, functioned primarily as a caretaker for a year and was succeeded by Roger Allin, who shared the concessions management philosophy of Assistant Secretary Carver and Gale. He believed that if a concession operation were worth having at all, it should be run well.²⁵ He assigned a high level staff member to oversee the day-to-day management of concession activities. Initially, Assistant to the Superintendent Carl Lamb served in this capacity. When he was promoted to the Regional Office, he was succeeded by Assistant Superintendent Reed Jarvis.

Allin oversaw the razing of the facilities at Olympic Hot Springs as well as efforts to attain satisfactory concession standards at Sol Duc Hot Springs and the Log Cabin Resort. A 1973 audit report found that the conditions at Sol Duc were hazardous to human health and recommended that the resort be closed if the hazards could not be eliminated inexpensively. The service found that the hazards could be substantially eliminated at relatively little cost and Allin moved to do so. By 1975, he reported, "The pool operation at Sol Duc finally met USPHS standards and the problem appears to

²² Master Plan Brief For Olympic National Park, 6 November 1965, File OLYM Box 3, 23, HFCL.

²³ William J. Conniff to Gale. 10 July 1967. RG 79, Accession 72A67-79, File C3823 OLYM pt. 1, Schoeffel et al., NPS Records Office.

²⁴ Randy Jones. Interview.

²⁵ Roger Allin. Interview.

have been corrected."²⁶ The structures at Log Cabin were removed during 1973 and 1974 as part of "a preliminary step in upgrading the Log Cabin facility."²⁷

From Allin's tenure onward, superintendents have shared the traditional service concessions management philosophy. Most activity from Allin to the present has consisted of identifying substandard conditions and solving them when feasible. During James Coleman's tenure Becker's Resort received an unsatisfactory rating, and Becker eventually was replaced by Larry Lesley. Sanitation problems persisted at Log Cabin as well.²⁸ In 1979, Coleman announced some long range plans, including the renovation of Rosemary Inn for use as a visitor center and contracting for a feasibility study for the Sol Duc operation.²⁹

Coleman was selected to be assistant regional director for the Mid-Atlantic Region shortly after this announcement and was succeeded by Roger Contor. During his tenure, Lake Crescent Lodge was rehabilitated and a twenty-year permit was granted to National Park Concessions to manage the lodge. Another effort was undertaken to improve the Sol Duc operation in 1982. Both of these efforts were intended to improve the standards of these facilities, and each involved a considerable financial commitment from the concessioner and the National Park Service through the Visitors Facilities Fund.³⁰

Under Superintendent Chandler, a major renovation of Rosemary Inn was completed to house the Olympic Park Institute, an environmental education institute. The concessions management philosophy has changed little since the tenure of Fred Overly. Management practices have improved. In part, this is the result of allocating more person hours to concessions management. In part, it is the result of the stabilization of concessions operations. Because all concessions are now owned by the Park Service, a clearer statement of acceptable standards has been articulated within the service and communicated to and accepted by the concessioners.

²⁶ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1975, File OLYM Box 2, 3, HFCL.

²⁷ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1973, File OLYM Box 2, 3, HFCL.

²⁸ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1977, File OLYM Box 2, 4-5, HFCL.

²⁹ Port Angeles *Chronicle*, 9 May 1979, Olympic National Park Library.

³⁰ Randy Jones, interview; Barry Mackintosh, review notes.

VISITOR USE FACILITIES

Hurricane Ridge Lodge

The 1938 Planning Group agreed that a new road to Hurricane Ridge was needed and that some sort of facility for visitor use should be built at the end of that road. However, after World War II, that decision was re-evaluated. The question was whether the proposed lodge should be located on Hurricane Ridge or in the "Soleduck Park area." This question was answered by the August 28, 1946 report of Sanford "Red" Hill, regional landscape architect for the San Francisco Region. From mid-July to early August Hill inspected both sites in the company of Superintendent Macy and Charles Webster, editor of the Port Angeles *Evening News*. He reported that the Hurricane Ridge location possessed a large number of advantages over the Soldeduck Park area and thereby determined the location of the proposed lodge.³¹

The lodge was begun in 1952 and completed in 1954. Upon completion, the facility was managed as a concession by National Park Concessions. Skiing activities at Deer Park were transferred to Hurricane Ridge and the Deer Park operation closed. Overly, however, envisioned considerably more development on Hurricane Ridge than a single structure and a new road. His 1952 Master Plan called for "overnight accommodations, public contact or information station, a system of trails for self-guided nature walks, skiing and other winter uses."³² Director Wirth was not persuaded that overnight accommodations were needed at Hurricane Ridge, and, in 1955, ordered that a two-year study of visitor use be undertaken upon completion of the new road.³³

The new road was completed by the beginning of 1957 and a report was prepared in the fall of 1959, and submitted to Wirth on December 16. Its conclusions basically governed the management of the facility until 1983. Its first major finding, based on visitor interviews, was that "there is no real public demand for overnight accommodations at Hurricane Ridge."³⁴ Its second major finding was that the construction of a facility designed as a ski lodge was a mistake, because the facility received its heaviest use during the summer months.³⁵ In all, the report listed fourteen management

³¹ Hill to Region 4 Director. 28 August 1946. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 600-03, 1-2, NA.

³² Master Plan Development Outline, Olympic National Park, March 15, 1952, RG 79, Accession 63A231m File D18 Olympic, 11, NPS Records Office.

³³ Region 4 Director Merriam to Director Wirth. 16 December 1959. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 Olympic, 1, NPS Records Office.

³⁴ Superintendent Dan Beard to Region 4 Director Merriam. 30 November 1959. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 Olympic, 11, NPS Records Office.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 20-21A.

recommendations. These included the determination that the lodge be a day-use only facility, that winter use be "de-emphasized," that an increase in parking spaces was not required, that the old Elwha Road be completely abandoned, and that the interior of the lodge be remodeled to better accommodate the large number of summer visitors.³⁶

Although Director Wirth approved the construction of a second facility on Hurricane Ridge to serve as a visitor facility, none was built, and the lodge continued to function primarily as a concession facility until the early 1980s. During Roger Contor's administration, initial steps were taken to reduce the amount of floor space devoted to concessions and concomitantly to increase the amount of floor space devoted to interpretation. In 1983, a contract was let to remodel the lodge. The plan called for the relocation of all concession facilities to the lower level and the addition of interpretation facilities to the upper level. The remodeling was completed by 1985.³⁷

Campgrounds and Shelters

In 1941, the public campgrounds, "with complete camping facilities," were located at "Lapoel, Olympic Hot Springs, Altair, Elwha, Soleduck Hot Springs, the Lincoln Ranger Station, and Graves Creek." Campgrounds "with simple accommodations" were located "at Muncaster, July Creek near Lake Quinault, and Jackson Ranger Station."³⁸ The campgrounds were managed as concession facilities and therefore, the attitude toward concessions management--do it right or don't do it--formed the basis for campground management practices.

Superintendent Macy maintained the campgrounds he inherited upon the creation of the park. Overly pursued a more aggressive expansion policy. To meet the anticipated increase in visitors, his draft Mission 66 Prospectus called for the enlargement of all existing facilities and the creation of fourteen new ones. This prospectus formed the basis for the location and number of campgrounds that now exist. The major expansion occurred during the early 1960s, when Mission 66 funds reached the park. New 100-site campgrounds were built at Heart O' the Hills, Lake Crescent, Mora, and along the Hoh. The Soleduck Valley, Elwha, and Kalaloch facilities were upgraded and expanded. No new campgrounds have been built since 1965.³⁹

However, upgrading of existing facilities continued. Roger Allin maintained an ongoing upgrade program. He also acted to reduce the need for frequent maintenance by

³⁶ Ibid., 15-16.

³⁷ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1983, File OLYM Box 2, 12, HFCL.

³⁸ NPS. *Olympic National Park* (San Francisco: Guaranty Printing and Lithograph Co., 1941), 14.

³⁹ Glenn Gallison. Review notes.

preventing overuse. This effort to control use was based on the ecological concepts developed during the early 1960s. However, the improvement program showed that Allin also applied the traditional concessions approach to campground facility management. Roger Contor increased the period of fee collection to twelve months, and Robert Chandler maintained that fee structure.

If campground management has been fairly consistent, the management of shelters, especially backcountry shelters, has changed through time and illustrates the impact of the emergence of the 1960s wilderness philosophy. Shelters have existed within some areas now in the park from the earliest days of government stewardship. The Forest Service had begun construction of "shake-sided, high-pitched shelters" in the late 1920s.⁴⁰

However, no shelters were built in the park's backcountry until Fred Overly "embarked on a program of building small, log-sided shelters, mostly in the higher country where none existed before." Such shelters were located at Lunch Lake, Round Lake, Upper Cameron, and Sundown Lake. Other more modern shelters were built in the front country with Mission 66 funds.⁴¹

The backcountry structures provided hikers with campsites and emergency shelter along trails and at popular camping destinations. As visitor use increased, the concentrated hiker traffic in these locations became a threat to the ecology of the areas immediately surrounding the shelters. By the mid-1970s, overuse had caused such damage that Roger Allin began to remove the shelters. The cause for this removal was probably Allin's concern for the ecological health of the backcountry. However, the Forest Service had also begun a similar removal program at this time.⁴²

In all, Allin removed twenty-eight backcountry shelters from 1974 to 1976. The removal of the shelters led to a public protest of Allin's removal policy. His successor, James Coleman, made revision of the shelter removal criteria one of his top administrative priorities. While Coleman listened to the complaints, his revised plan accepted Allin's basic premise that ecological considerations should play a role in determining the location of shelters.⁴³

⁴⁰ Draft Proposed Shelter Establishment Criteria, Olympic National Park, 23 November 1977, 1, Reed Jarvis Personal Papers.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Glenn Gallison. Review notes.

⁴³

He moved to deal with the local leadership who opposed Allin's shelter management policies and to develop formal procedures to reassure them. On July 20, he reported to the regional director that he was taking a three day hike into the backcountry with Parteger and Jack Nattinger to review present shelter conditions. He transmitted "a proposed plan to seek public involvement in the shelter issue" to the Regional Office. This plan called for a series of workshops to be conducted throughout the peninsula to assure public input into the shelter management decision-making process prior to the announcement of final decisions.⁴⁴

Topics to be discussed at these workshops included health safety, resource protection and visitor impact, wilderness management objectives, and shelter design. Coleman suggested that Chief Ranger Gordon Boyd, Resource Management Specialist Paul Crawford, Resource Management Technician Bob Kaune, and Park Biologist Bruce Moorhead be assigned responsibility for leading these discussions. The schedule for completion of this workshop process called for an initial announcement on August 22. The workshops would take place in Port Angeles, Aberdden, and Seattle on September 20 through 22, followed by a review and evaluation of the workshops by staff and development. A review of draft shelter management decisions would be complete by November 11. Final decisions regarding shelters would be announced by December 1.⁴⁵

This schedule was completed more or less on time and on January 16, 1978, Coleman announced his decision. Basically, he accepted the need for the continued existence of backcountry shelters. However, his use and location policies did not vary greatly from Allin's. The overall number of shelters was to be reduced, shelters were not to be located on or near alpine lakeshores, and were to be "located to encourage the hikers to leave high risk areas such as mountain passes and sub-alpine areas during storms," that is, below, and in most cases, well below, tree line. These policies were scheduled for review and evaluation in five years.⁴⁶

Coleman's procedures and policies seem to have mollified local opposition to the wilderness approach to shelter management. However, opposition flared again in the fall of 1980 when Superintendent Roger Contor announced plans to raze Three Lakes Shelter. Both Parteger, of Friends of Olympic Trail Shelters, and Larry Penberthy of Mountain Safety Research and a manufacturer of hiking equipment, objected to the decision.

In December 1980, a group including Penberthy, Parteger and the Friends of the Olympic Trail Shelters, the National Park Users Defense Fund, and the Mount Rainier

⁴⁴ Coleman to Regional Director, PNR, 20 July 1977, Chief Ranger's Files, 1, Olympic National Park.

⁴⁵ Ibid., Enclosure.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

Defense Fund, filed suit in the U.S. District Court at Tacoma in response to the shelter management practices at Olympic combined with the removal of the popular Klaptache Shelter at Mount Rainier National Park. The suit sought to force the Park Service to remove the population restrictions placed upon the backcountry of both Olympic and Mount Rainier since 1972.

Although the plaintiffs filed only one suit against the Park Service, it was divided into two parts; one addressed the issues at Olympic, the other addressed the issues at Mount Rainier. Penberthy maintained the lead in the Mount Rainier suit and Partager assumed the lead in the Olympic suit. On September 19, 1986, the Olympic suit was dismissed with prejudice prior to a trial on the merits. This meant that the groups bringing the suit could bring no further suit on the same issues. The Mount Rainier suit went to trial and the plaintiffs' case was found to be groundless. These court decisions, and the fact that the number of shelters to be maintained at Olympic has been clearly defined, have stabilized this area of park management.

CONCLUSION

The prevailing management approach to concessions and campgrounds has been that they should be well maintained and provide acceptable service to visitors. This philosophy has changed little through time and no change in this attitude is foreseen. The management of backcountry shelters, however, has changed as the 1960s wilderness philosophy emerged. The management of these facilities has become minimal and hands-off as a result of that philosophy and will likely remain minimal in the future.

CHAPTER 10

Chapter 10

MAINTAINING PARK RESOURCES

The emergence of the wilderness management philosophy of the 1960s resulted in changes to the management philosophy and practices of the Maintenance Division at Olympic. While maintenance activities were constant and ongoing, as the word "maintenance" implies, the emergence of the wilderness philosophy, with a single significant exception discussed below, led to a diminished emphasis on construction of new structures and an increase in the level of repair, and in some cases restoration, of existing park buildings.

MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES: 1938-1970

The 1938 Planning Group that met at Olympic in August also outlined the policies for maintenance practices. Because they believed that Olympic should be managed so that the primary means of access to the park would be by trail, they concluded that "it is necessary to maintain a large mileage of passable trails if reasonably complete access is to be provided for foot or horse travelers." Although trail mileage was to be increased, the trails themselves were to be constructed to be as unintrusive as possible. The group concluded, "It is highly desirable that trail standards be kept in accordance with the nearest possible primitive condition with assurance of safety" so that "it will be only a matter of years until a well-defined trail is worn by travel, and the wilderness values will thus be enhanced."¹ While some trails were to be constructed and maintained to allow travel by horse, horses were barred from the backcountry.²

The Planning Group's focus on trail maintenance as the primary maintenance activity at Olympic was correct, and trail maintenance still constitutes the primary maintenance activity in the park. Preston Macy placed a high priority on trail maintenance. Most of the trail system was inherited from the National Forest Service. Prior to World War II, Macy oversaw the construction of a few miles of new trails. However, the vast majority of the park's present trail system was built by the Forest Service prior to the creation of Olympic National Park.

Trail maintenance was done by seasonals, who were overseen by rangers, and the activities were funded by PWA and CCC programs. These programs were discontinued with the outbreak of the World War II, and virtually no trail maintenance, or any other maintenance activity, was carried out until well after the end of the war.

¹ Statement of Controlling Development Policies, Undated, File OLYM Box 3, B-3, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library (hereinafter cited as HFCL).

² Ibid.

In an undated memo that was probably written in 1950 or 1951, Service Highway Engineer H. S. Shilko observed, "From the time the area became a National Park and up to 1946, practically no funds were provided by the Service for trail maintenance."³ As a result, "deterioration of trails and structures was going on at an accelerated rate." However, a revision at the national level in maintenance procedures in 1946 had resulted in an increase in the maintenance funds allocated to Olympic. By 1950, the park had received an average of \$60,000 per year to fund maintenance activities.⁴

In 1949, the administrative position of maintenance was also changed. Prior to 1949, maintenance operations, which were almost exclusively trail maintenance, were directed by a "mixed gang foreman," who was supervised by the ranger cadre. In 1949, the foreman began reporting directly to the park engineer. However, Engineer Shilko found, despite this reorganization, that "a considerable amount of trail maintenance funds is used rather inefficiently." He also found that due to the ruggedness of the park and the limited access, the number of maintenance personnel was "utterly inadequate."⁵

Fred Overly succeeded Macy as superintendent in August 1951. His March 1952 Master Plan provides an overview of the nature and level of maintenance activity at that time. By 1952, maintenance had become a separate administrative division entitled "Construction and Maintenance," which was staffed by twenty-six permanent personnel. The division was headed by a civil engineer and its employee titles included truck drivers, laborer foreman, laborers, mechanics, and carpenter. The permanent staff was augmented by a recurring seasonal staff of thirty people.⁶

As the name of the division implies, construction was an accepted role of maintenance personnel at that time. Overly's master plan listed preliminary planning, construction of roads, trails, bridges, and utilities as maintenance division functions along with maintaining and repairing such entities.

In the implementation of these functions, Overly placed his highest priority on road construction. His Master Plan Development Outline's Operation Prospectus pointed out that "the roads [within the park] are generally sub-standard, surfaced with native gravel in need of constant attention."⁷ To increase the efficiency of the use of maintenance personnel in road maintenance, Overly established two separate divisions, one on the

³ Engineer Shilko to Files, undated, 1, ONP Library.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Master Plan Outline, Olympic National Park, Park Operation Prospectus, 31 March 1951, RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, 2-3, NPS Records Office.

⁷ Ibid., 4.

"west side" and one on "the north-east side." Their locations were based "not so much on mileage as upon proximity of road sections." Trail maintenance activities were also decentralized. As a rule, trail maintenance was done by "small crews," who followed "the receding snows on the major drainages."⁸

While Overly emphasized road maintenance, he also oversaw the construction of several new structures in the park. He planned and built the Pioneer Memorial Museum, the Hurricane Ridge Lodge, and the present road to Hurricane Ridge.

Overly's master plan also found that the existing facilities which housed maintenance operations were inadequate. It noted that "the acute shortage of working space, coupled with the remote location of the equipment repair shop makes it impossible to properly maintain and protect the eighty-five pieces of wheeled equipment." Further, no facilities for housing electrical and plumbing equipment were available.⁹

Overly's Mission 66 Prospectus, dated May 11, 1956, also offers some insight into the nature and level of maintenance activities during the mid-1950s. Maintenance activities included repair of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and campgrounds. Roads and trails were maintained year round, "except, the Hurricane Ridge, Deer Park, Dosewalips and Staircase roads," and the roads to the campgrounds. Trail maintenance activities included "the removal of a tremendous amount of windfall trees, restoring washouts ... repairing drainage structures and bridges, replacing split cedar puncheon, regrading and resurfacing the treadway and trailside brushing."¹⁰

This work was done by "government forces" rather than contract. The Maintenance Division was now stationed at "the Headquarters area except for a two-man roadcrew at Quinault and the trail crews operating in the backcountry." Work assignment decisions were made at headquarters and work crews were detailed to the work sites for as long as necessary to complete the project.¹¹

Although Overly added an emphasis on road construction and maintenance that was not anticipated by the 1938 Planning Group, which had determined that trails would provide the primary visitor access to the park, and therefore, that trail maintenance would be the primary maintenance activity, he also continued the level of trail maintenance. This mixture of road and trail maintenance characterized activities at Olympic throughout the 1960s. Overly's immediate successor, Dan Beard, did not alter the basic maintenance

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Mission 66 Prospectus, Olympic National Park, 11 May 1956, File OLYM 204, 37, HFCL.

¹¹ Ibid.

practices described in the Mission 66 Prospectus, perhaps because his tenure at Olympic was too brief to implement any significant changes.

Because of ill health or lack of interest, Beard's successor, John Doerr, was not directly involved in maintenance decisions. On January 14, 1964, authority "regarding execution of contracts for construction, supplies, equipment or services" was delegated to the assistant superintendent.¹² (1964-01-01) In any case, many of the maintenance activities undertaken during Doerr's administration were predetermined by Overly's Mission 66 Prospectus. The funds to implement the plans in that prospectus arrived at the park during Doerr's tenure. Construction of the interpretive campfire circles and other interpretive facilities was completed during Doerr's tenure (see chapter 11).

Therefore, the emerging wilderness philosophy of the early 1960s did not have an immediate impact on maintenance practices. The Mission 66 construction activities and the increased emphasis on road construction continued. Along with Mission 66 funding, the park also received \$185,000 from the Commerce Department's Accelerated Works Program in 1963. The program was designed to infuse federal money into areas with high unemployment. The funds that reached Olympic were used primarily for road reconstruction and paving. In Grays Harbor County, the North Fork Quinault Road was improved for one mile beyond Finley Creek and the July Creek Campground roads were redone. In Mason County, the major activity was the reconstruction and paving of the Staircase Road for two miles from the park's boundary to the campground.¹³

MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES: 1970-Present

Overall expenditures for maintenance at Olympic grew rapidly through the second half of the 1960s. In 1965, the budget for maintaining roads, trails, and buildings and utilities was \$300,200. By 1970, the budget for buildings and utilities alone was \$314,000, and the total maintenance budget amounted to \$759,800. The budget categories show that the funds were being expended to support traditional maintenance activities described in the Mission 66 Prospectus.¹⁴

By 1970, however, construction became a less significant component of maintenance activity. In part, this resulted from the completion of the Mission 66 facilities. However, the appointment of Roger Allin as Superintendent in 1970 also had some effect. Allin believed in maintaining trails and roads that already existed. However, he pursued little

¹² Bernard Meyer, Assistant Solicitor, National Parks, to Director. 20 January 1964. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, January 14, 1964.

¹³ Accelerated Public Works Budget Outline, February 23, 1963, RG 79, Conrad Wirth Papers, File Accelerated Public Works, 14, NA.

¹⁴ Facts On Olympic National Park, 5, Olympic National Park Library.

new construction of any kind and no major structural construction. Allin's 1976 Annual Report illustrates the change in perspective. All buildings and grounds projects for that year involved rehabilitation rather than new construction. The report also noted that "the major rehabilitation projects listed...represent only a small percentage of the total work accomplished by the Maintenance Division. The work emphasis and therefore the bulk of the activities in the Maintenance Division has been directed towards routine or daily maintenance."¹⁵

Allin also changed the nature of maintenance activities to conform to the Leopold and Wilderness Act philosophies that had emerged during the mid-1960s. He used Maintenance to restore natural conditions at the Olympic Hot Springs and to control and limit visitor access to the backcountry by eliminating shelters. By 1972, the facilities at Olympic Hot Springs had fallen into extreme disrepair and Allin razed them. He continued work on the site for the next two years to restore the site's natural conditions as fully as possible. His 1974 Annual Report noted that the restoration of natural conditions at Olympic Hot Springs had been completed and that Maintenance had "planted grass, trees, etc."¹⁶ (see chapter 9). He also razed a considerable number of backcountry shelters, which were sufficiently accessible to cause an ecologically unacceptable concentration of visitors (see chapter 8).

Therefore, Allin continued certain traditional maintenance activities such as trail repair and campground maintenance. The 1976 Annual Report noted that the "parkwide campground and site restoration plan has been completed." However, he eliminated or radically reduced the amount of new construction. He also added nontraditional maintenance activities such as razing the backcountry shelters. In general, these new activities were more oriented to protection of the park's natural resources than toward facilitating visitor access to those resources. In certain instances, such as shelter removal, these new practices restricted visitor access to the park's resources.

Although Allin reduced construction activities, certain essential structures were probably planned during his tenure. Actual construction was not begun until 1977, when James Coleman was appointed to succeed Allin. Coleman did not change the administrative structure of the maintenance division, which was divided into "two basic units" which were placed in much the same place as Overly's road crews in the early 1950s. The West District, located at Kalaloch, was "primarily responsible for the routine maintenance on the west side of the Park." The North District, at Port Angeles, was similarly responsible for the northern parts of the park.¹⁷

¹⁵ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1976, File OLYM Box 2, 18, HFCL.

¹⁶ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1974, File OLYM Box 2, 13, HFCL.

¹⁷ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1977, 19, Olympic National Park Library.

The necessary construction included the installation of a new sewage system and comfort station at Ozette and the construction of a new residence at Kalaloch. The responsibility for completion of these projects fell to the Maintenance Division. In addition, the installation of a new water and sewage system at Barnes Point and the resurfacing of the road to Hurricane Ridge were to be completed by contractors.¹⁸

Coleman also downplayed the emphasis on rehabilitation that Allin had attached to that activity. The 1977 Annual Report observed that "emphasis has been placed on routine maintenance, with rehabilitation as a secondary goal."¹⁹ During Coleman's tenure, five additional maintenance positions were created as a result of the Land Heritage Program. They included three new maintenance worker positions, a sewage disposal plant operator position, and a utility systems operator position.²⁰

Roger Contor succeeded Coleman in 1979. Contor continued to attach a higher priority to routine maintenance than to rehabilitation. The 1980 Annual Report noted that "inflationary factors have been the primary motivation in the necessity to emphasize routine maintenance and to de-emphasize our needs for rehabilitation and preventive maintenance."²¹

Contor also oversaw a large increase in new construction activity at Olympic. He did not initiate this activity, however. The increase resulted from the decision by Secretary of the Interior James Watt to establish the Park Restoration and Improvement Program (PRIP). This program resulted in massive infusions of funds into the national parks. These funds could only be expended on modernizing existing facilities or constructing new facilities.

PRIP had a dramatic impact on Olympic's maintenance budget and the increase in the types and level of activities that were required to meet program goals. The 1981 Annual Report observed that "the park operating program, due to PRIP, has virtually doubled." In particular, "supervisors...have been busy as day labor projects increased, and construction, design, and project supervision have added to the normal workload."²²

The 1983 Annual Report indicated that the level of activity had continued to rise. It stated that "the maintenance operation including PRIP programs ran about \$3,600,000 and involved 60 FTE's." This increase enabled Contor to accomplish some rehabilitation

¹⁸ Ibid., 21.

¹⁹ Ibid., 22.

²⁰ Ibid., 20.

²¹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1980, 13, Olympic National Park Library.

²² Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1981, 7, Olympic National Park Library.

projects. While Contor continued "to emphasize the importance of routine maintenance," nevertheless "PRIP activities have forced the combination of PRIP and routine activities with about the same priority." The result was "somewhat of a decrease in the quality of routine maintenance," but the PRIP funds were "of great assistance in rehabilitation and major cyclic activities."²³

Robert Chandler succeeded Roger Contor in 1983. In his first year as superintendent, PRIP funding and activity continued to grow. The 1984 Annual Report indicated that the overall maintenance budget had risen to slightly more than \$4 million and required the time of seventy-four FTEs. Most of the activity in 1984 and 1985 consisted of major renovations of most of the park's major concession facilities (see chapter 9). Most of the park's signs and interpretive displays were also renovated or replaced.²⁴

CONCLUSION

Most maintenance activities consist of those that have become known as routine maintenance. In general, these activities include trail and trail structure maintenance and repair, road maintenance and repair, and minor structural repair. These activities have remained constant throughout the history of Olympic National Park and will continue to do so. More ecological and technological sophistication may change the methods used to maintain trails, but trails will be maintained.

The two other significant maintenance activities--new construction and rehabilitation--have changed in relation to each other from Overly's time to the present. Prior to 1950, the park's limited maintenance resources were fully absorbed in routine maintenance activities. During his tenure, Overly planned and implemented the construction of the Pioneer Memorial Visitor's Center, the Hurricane Ridge Lodge, and the new Hurricane Ridge road. Overly also planned, and his successors in part carried out, the Mission 66 construction program. Mission 66 resulted in the construction of many of the park's present campgrounds and interpretive facilities.

However, upon completion of the Mission 66 projects, most new construction activity ended and was replaced by rehabilitation, and in some cases, expansion of existing facilities. The level of rehabilitation activity has been dependent upon the amount of funding available to support it. Through the 1970s, funding levels were low, and routine maintenance activities were the primary activities of the Maintenance Division. In 1981, Secretary Watt's PRIP initiative resulted in the infusion of a large amount of funds and the level of rehabilitation rose accordingly. Although Secretary Watt called for expansion as well as renovation of visitor facilities throughout the Park Service, the PRIP

²³ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1983, File OLYM Box 2, 7-8, HFCL.

²⁴ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1984, File OLYM Box 2, 1, HFCL.

funds at Olympic were spent in rehabilitating existing concession and interpretive facilities. In some concessions, the facilities were expanded, but no new structures were built from the ground up.

The outcome of PRIP demonstrates that at Olympic, rehabilitation and, where possible, expansion, of existing facilities receive considerably more emphasis than the construction of new facilities. In cases where the public safety is endangered, some activities that could be called new construction have occurred. New sewage treatment systems have been installed in several areas of the park. However, in the absence of public safety concerns, rehabilitation has become the major non-routine maintenance activity at Olympic and is likely to remain so.

Two basic historical events account for the change from new construction to rehabilitation. The first is the emergence of the Wilderness Act and Leopold resource management policies during the mid-1960s. These ideas, which called for less emphasis on the display of resources to visitors and more emphasis on the preservation of the integrity of the resources, led to administrative decisions calling for less new construction. The second, and perhaps less obvious but equally significant, factor is that the planning and implementation of the Mission 66 Program at Olympic National Park was, for the most part, successful. It defined the interpretive and other structural needs of Olympic with sufficient scope that upon completion of the construction, few new structures were required.

Because of these two factors, the primary maintenance activities for the immediate future will continue to be routine maintenance and rehabilitation and possibly minimal expansion of existing facilities. The level of rehabilitation activity will depend upon the amount of funds allocated for this activity. Routine maintenance activity will continue to be necessary. Maintenance, like most other administrative functions at Olympic, has come through a period of change and is now relatively stable. In all likelihood, maintenance activities thirty-five years from now will more closely resemble ongoing maintenance activities than those ongoing activities resemble the maintenance activities of thirty-five years ago.

CHAPTER 11

Chapter 11

INTERPRETATION

This chapter discusses the history of interpretation at Olympic National Park. Interpretation consists of presenting information concerning the nature of the park's resources to visitors. This may be done within interpretive structures such as museums and information stations and by more informal means such as guided walks and campfire talks. This chapter will first discuss personnel within the park who serve as interpreters, then the physical development of the formal interpretive facilities. It concludes with a discussion of the type of information presented both formally and informally to visitors. The categories of personnel, facilities, and information in this chapter are artificial and are used for analytic convenience. In practice, facility sites are selected because that location offers a place to view a major park resource or because a ranger is stationed there. Gunnar Fagerlund observed in his first museum prospectus, "In the final analysis the interpretive program employs personal service, literature, and the museum. These three constitute an interdependent team."¹ Personnel, facilities, and information are all parts of an overall interpretive effort.

INTERPRETATIVE PERSONNEL

At Olympic National Park, the chief naturalist is the staff person with direct responsibility for overseeing daily the interpretive activities within the park and interpretive outreach efforts. Gunnar Fagerlund was the park's first chief naturalist. He transferred to Olympic from Hawaii in 1947.² He remained at Olympic until 1957, when he was succeeded by Glenn Gallison. Gallison was in turn succeeded by David Huntzinger in 1966. In 1974, Huntzinger left Olympic for a similar position at Lake Meade National Recreation Area. His successor was John Douglass, who in turn was succeeded by Henry Warren, the present chief naturalist, in 1979.

During most of his tenure, Fagerlund was the sole permanent interpretive employee. Therefore, the personnel who served the visitor were either seasonal naturalists or rangers. Under Gallison, the staff grew to six permanent personnel and more than twenty seasonal naturalists.³

¹ Olympic National Park Museum Prospectus, 40 April 1954, RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, 2, NPS Records Office.

² Gunnar Fagerlund. Interview.

³ Glenn Gallison. Interview 1.

However, during the mid-1960s, several events at the national level caused an erosion of the autonomy and the capability of interpretive personnel. In 1963, the publication of the Leopold Report, and its acceptance by Secretary Udall, began a re-evaluation within the service of the rationale for preserving the system's natural resources. Rather than contrived display, Leopold argued, park resources should be conserved through methods that, to the greatest extent possible, preserve their natural integrity. A few months later, the Robbins Report created within the service an awareness of the need to scientifically manage the system's resources, and to develop a clear definition of resource integrity.

These two reports were implicitly inimicable to the traditional role interpretive personnel played in the park system. Leopold argued, at least by implication, that upon restoration of the integrity of the park's natural resources, these resources would speak for themselves. Robbins argued that developing scientific management capability within the parks should be a higher priority than other, more traditional activities, including interpretation.

The service accepted both the Leopold and the Robbins arguments. While the overall budget allocations for Olympic increased almost 40 percent from the years 1965 through 1969, the interpretation allocation increased less than 18 percent.⁴ It is likely that the allocation for interpretation, along with some other administrative allocations, were redistributed to fund the increase in the allocation for natural resource management. At the national level, at least, this figure rose from virtually nothing in 1963 to a sufficient level in the years after the publication of the Leopold and Robbins reports to fund a significant amount of scientific study of park resources at Olympic and throughout the Service.⁵

Another event at the national level that disrupted interpretative activities was the implementation of the Field Office Study Team (FOST) Program. The central personnel element of this program was the ranger-generalist. In June 1969, The U.S. Civil Service Commission created this position by combining the Ranger Series, GS-453 and the Naturalist Series, GS-452, along with the General Clerical Series, GS-301, to create a new Ranger Series, GS-025.

This action had several causes. First, the reduction in the interpretation budget allocation discussed above may have led to an effort to shift greater administrative responsibility to on board personnel. Second, the Leopold-Robbins philosophy argued, implicitly, that scientific capabilities were needed in order for the service to manage its natural resources, but not necessarily to explain the nature of those resources to the visiting public. The ranger-generalist position reflects the Leopold-Robbins implication that, in the main, park resources, if scientifically managed, would speak for themselves.

⁴ "Facts On Olympic National Park," August, 1970, 7, Olympic National Park Library.

⁵ Glenn Gallison. Interview 1.

Third, the Park Service was under some pressure to show the potential within its administrative structure to meet the Equal Employment Standards of the day (see chapter 7).

While all these factors played some role in the formulation of the ranger-generalist position, the overall functions of which are discussed in chapter 7, the significant outcome for the purposes of this chapter is that the position of park naturalist, as an autonomous series with autonomous administrative responsibilities, was abolished.⁶ Although it is unclear whether there was any connection to the FOST Program, the annual reports for Olympic nevertheless indicate that a decline in the quality of the interpretive activities occurred. The 1972 annual report attributed this decline to "a reduced training at the beginning of the season, a loss in experienced seasonals and lack of time on the part of some of the Area Managers in auditing and supervising seasonal interpreters."⁷ Area managers were FOST positions. Therefore to some extent Superintendent Roger Allin viewed FOST as one element in the decline of interpretive services.

The loss of experienced seasonal personnel was also a problem that remained throughout the 1970s. Although Glenn Gallison had created a staff of at least six permanent personnel and twenty-one experienced seasonals, when Chief Naturalist Warren arrived at Olympic in 1979, the cadre of permanent interpretive personnel numbered five, including clerical support, and the seasonals numbered nineteen. These figures are made all the more significant when compared with the dramatic growth in visitation in the 1970s (see chapter 8). Since Warren's arrival, the permanent staff has grown to six full-time and two half-time personnel, and thirty-one seasonals.⁸

Therefore, for a combination of reasons, including the shift within the service budget to hire scientifically trained resource management specialists and the creation of the ranger-generalist position, the interpretive staff at Olympic suffered a decline in the 1970s. This decline has been halted and partially reversed since 1980. Superintendents Contor and Chandler decided to allocate more staff positions to permanent interpretive personnel. As a result, the staff has been increased, although a further increase in permanent personnel may be required.

⁶ U.S. Civil Service Commission, Park Management Series GS-025, 30 June 1969, 1.

⁷ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, File OLYM Box 2, 6, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library (hereinafter referred to as HFCL).

⁸ Henry Warren. Review notes.

INTERPRETIVE FACILITIES

Basically, the interpretive facilities at Olympic today were planned by Gunnar Fagerlund in the mid-1950s, built by Glenn Gallison when the Mission 66 funds reached the park in the mid-1960s, and expanded and repaired when PRIP funds became available in the early 1980s.

The first interpretive facility at Olympic National Park was a multiple-unit pit toilet that was rehabilitated by maintenance personnel in 1948 and set up near the administration building. It served as the original focal point for dispensing park information and orienting visitors to the park.⁹

No major permanent facilities were constructed until the completion of the Pioneer Memorial Museum in 1957. Planning for the construction of this structure began in the fall of 1951. On November 9, Superintendent Fred Overly reported to Regional Director Lawrence Merriam that he had received a memorandum from Associate Director Wirth suggesting that the master plan sheet for the development of the thirty-eight acre tract adjacent to the Headquarters site, which called for the construction of a campground, trail shelter, and comfort station, be amended to include a public information station and a few exhibits for the campground.¹⁰

The thirty-eight-acre tract had been donated to the Park Service by Thomas Aldwell. Overly discussed Wirth's suggestion of placing a visitor center-museum on the site with both Aldwell and Charles Webster, editor of the Port Angeles *Evening News*. Both men approved the idea, and Overly then suggested a plan for the construction of the museum facility, which they also approved. Because of a shortage of funds, he developed a plan that involved the exchange of a small amount of timber on the site for construction materials and the use of volunteer labor to construct the building.¹¹

He suggested this plan to Regional Director Merriam in his November 9 report: "I think it would be possible to have the museum site and parking area cleared by one of the local loggers...[and] that it would be possible to obtain enough lumber, plywood and shingles on a salvage contract to erect the building. Perhaps some labor could be donated for the actual work of constructing the building or sufficient funds might be obtained through donations to allow hiring the necessary labor." Overly anticipated that

⁹ Gunnar Fagerlund. Interview.

¹⁰ Overly to Merriam. 9 November 1951. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, pt. 1, 1, NPS Records Office.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

the local historical society might be the source of such donations in exchange for some space within the museum.¹²

Merriam did not fully accept Overly's plan. He objected to using wood to construct the museum because it would not be fireproof and he saw problems in offering to share one room of the structure with the local history organization. Merriam forwarded Overly's report to Chief Naturalist John Doerr in the central office with the recommendation that "a contact station with a small room for a few orientation exhibits" be authorized if Doerr did not approve of Overly's plan.¹³ Doerr, relying in part on the opinion of his assistant chief naturalist, Paul Franke, endorsed the Overly plan. Franke concluded that both the concept of locating a visitor center on the site and the method of construction that Overly proposed were sound. Doerr agreed with Franke's position, noting that "Olympic represents a situation in which adequate visitor reception center facilities could be a very important factor in visitor use and enjoyment of the area."¹⁴

This conclusion was forwarded to Merriam by Acting Director Hillory Tolson on February 15, 1952. However, Tolson qualified the endorsement by requiring that "the Service should own whatever facilities are constructed into the area" and "an approved design for the area" should be included in the park's master plan.¹⁵ In response, Gunnar Fagerlund developed a preliminary museum prospectus section for the 1952 Master Plan.

Fagerlund expanded this section of the master plan into a full blown museum prospectus by 1954. This prospectus defined the park's physical interpretive needs. It called for a system of wayside museums throughout the park. It included the central museum on the Aldwell Tract, a wayside museum at Kalaloch, an observation museum and a fire lookout at Hurricane Ridge, and a wayside museum at Lake Crescent. Exterior wayside exhibits were planned at Hurricane Ridge, the Hoh, Staircase, Graves Creek, Ozette, and Dosewallips.¹⁶

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Merriam to Doerr. 11 January 1952. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, Pt. 1, 1, NPS Records Office.

¹⁴ Doerr to Messrs. Vint, Lee, and Allen. 25 January 1952. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, pt. 1, NPS Records Office.

¹⁵ Tolson to Merriam. 15 February 1952. RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, pt. 1, NPS Records Office.

¹⁶ Olympic National Park Museum Prospectus, 30 April 1954, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, 22, NPS Records Office.

This prospectus was modified somewhat by Fagerlund, and his successor, Glenn Gallison. These modifications included establishing a wayside museum in the Hoh along with the exterior exhibits, placing the Coastal Strip museum at Ozette rather than Kalaloch, and abandoning the planned Hurricane Ridge Fire Watch Tower and establishing exterior exhibits at the Lodge. However, it defined the nature and location of several interpretive facilities present in the park today. The facilities were built, for the most part, when Mission 66 funds became available in the early 1960s. The Pioneer Memorial Museum had been completed in 1957, and the Hurricane Ridge Lodge, which was primarily a concession rather than an interpretive facility in its early days, also opened in 1957. The park's present campfire circles and the Hoh Visitor Center were completed with Mission 66 funds.¹⁷

Upon completion of the physical interpretive facilities in the mid-1960s, little, if any, construction of new facilities has occurred. The 1977 interpretive prospectus for the park, which was developed by the Denver Service Center, indicated that the facilities completed during the Mission 66 activities still constituted the primary interpretive facilities in the park. However, the prospectus concluded that these facilities, particularly the number and location of wayside exhibits and guidelines were inadequate. The prospectus also recommended that the Hurricane Ridge Lodge, had significant potential as an interpretive facility and that the entire second floor of the structure be converted from concession space to interpretive use.¹⁸ When the lease for National Park Concessions, the concession operator at Hurricane Ridge, expired in 1981, the re-negotiation process resulted in the conversion of the second floor to an interpretive facility. With the use of PRIP funds, the physical conversion was completed during 1983.¹⁹

During the 1980s, other facilities have been renovated or converted from concession to interpretive use. The Pioneer Memorial Museum was remodelled and many of its exhibits upgraded by Harpers Ferry Center. Rosemary Inn, which was placed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1979, was nevertheless deteriorating because of a lack of maintenance funding. Chandler adopted the goal of Chief Naturalist Warren to establish an independent educational organization modeled after the Yosemite Institute. Using a combination of government and private funds, the Rosemary Complex was rehabilitated and now serves as the campus for Olympic Park Institute, which offers environmental education classes and field seminars for students of all ages.²⁰

¹⁷ Glenn Gallison. Interview 1.

¹⁸ Olympic National Park Interpretive Prospectus, June 1977, 13, Olympic National Park Library.

¹⁹ Henry Warren, review notes; Randy Jones, interview.

²⁰ Randy Jones, interview; Henry Warren, review notes.

The only planned construction of new facilities has been proposed for the Coastal Strip. Gunnar Fagerlund's 1954 museum prospectus called for a wayside museum at Kalaloch, but one was not built. An interpretive prospectus for the Coastal Strip was developed in 1985 and approved by Acting Deputy Regional Director Richard Winters of the Pacific Northwest Region, on June 3, 1986. This prospectus found that "in general the coastal strip has not lived up to its interpretive potential" and called for an expansion of interpretive facilities along the Coastal Strip. Anticipated facilities include a year round visitor center in the area of Kalaloch, the construction of a new contact facility at Ozette, and an increase in the number of wayside orientation exhibits at the roadheads and trailheads.²¹

INTERPRETIVE INFORMATION

Interpretive information is conveyed to visitors by three means: publications, displays at museums and wayside exhibits, and personal contact with park interpretive personnel. Radio and television presentations fall somewhere between publications and personal contact.

Gunnar Fagerlund completed the first official park publication, *Olympic National Park*, in 1954. The booklet was the first of a planned Natural History Handbook Series to be developed by park naturalists throughout the Service. The publication presents a clearly written straightforward account of the natural resources and geologic history of the park and is a useful reference for the park visitor.

By 1977, the Olympic Branch of the Pacific Northwest National Parks and Forests Association listed twelve titles pertaining to Olympic. Presumably some, but not all, of these titles, which included *Geologic Guide to Hurricane Ridge*, *Guide to the Hoh Rain Forest*, and *Olympic Seashore*, were developed by the park's interpretive personnel. The most recent publication is *Olympic: The Story Behind the Scenery*, by Chief Naturalist Henry Warren. Published in 1982, the book, like Fagerlund's, provides the visitor with descriptions of the nature and significance of the park's resources along with superb color photos of the park. Because of the increased ability to perceive the park physically, it presents more sophisticated maps than Fagerlund could have imagined. The geologic history has been updated to include the concept of plate tectonics. However, with one significant exception, the narrative description of the park's resources does not differ greatly from Fagerlund's. The exception is the chapter entitled "The Teeming Seashore," which presents the ecology of the Coastal Strip with more detail and acuity than Fagerlund, who gave little attention to that area of the park, perhaps because it had been formally added only a year before he completed his work.

²¹ Interpretive Prospectus: The Coastal Strip, Olympic National Park, 3 June 1986, 7, Olympic National Park Library.

The design and formulation of museum and wayside exhibits is perhaps the most difficult task faced by interpretive personnel. Only a limited amount of information can be presented in these displays and it is therefore important that every word and visual display convey the most information possible.

For the most part, the themes presented by the park's Mission 66 wayside exhibits remained unchanged until the early 1980s, when PRIP funds allowed for repair and refurbishing of museum and wayside exhibits. The original displays were prepared prior to the completion of the Leopold and Robbins Reports. This is not to say that the exhibits were prepared from a non-wilderness perspective. Fagerlund pointed out in his early publication, "The principal purpose for which the park was established was to preserve and display the natural wilderness."²² However, because the wayside exhibits were prepared prior to the final emergence of the Leopold/Robbins concepts, those concepts were not incorporated into the exhibits.

Another example of this is the interpretive treatment of mountain goats and fishery resources in park literature. In his publication, Fagerlund set the tone that would be followed for the next twenty-five years. He acknowledged that mountain goats were not indigenous to Olympic. Their presence, however, was treated as desirable or at least acceptable. The primary discussion of the park's fishery resource was designed to inform the reader/visitor where each type of fish could be caught.²³

This perspective on goats and salmon remained unchanged until 1979, when Henry Warren became chief naturalist. He began emphasizing in the interpretive treatment of goats the significance of the fact that the goats are not indigenous to the park and therefore constitute a resource management challenge.

The park's fishery resource offers yet another problem for interpretation in the park. Warren's 1982 publication briefly mentioned that the Beardslee and Crescenti trout stock had been "contaminated by plantings of hatchery fish before the park was created" and that "trying to maintain a pure native fish population is one of the most difficult challenges facing the park."²⁴

More recent studies have shown that the trout stock in Lake Crescent may be sufficiently pure genetically to be deemed native (see chapter 8). Therefore, although Warren was reporting accurately the state of knowledge at the time of his publication, this state of knowledge was soon rendered obsolete by ongoing scientific research. Because

²² Gunnar O. Fagerlund, with the assistance of Frances I. Fagerlund. "Olympic National Park: Washington," *Natural History Handbook Series No.1* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1954), 42.

²³ *Ibid.*, 42, 55.

²⁴ Henry C. Warren. *Olympic: The Story Behind the Scenery* (Las Vegas: KC Publications, 1982), 36.

investigation of the park's natural and cultural resources is an ongoing process, the park's information base concerning its resources is constantly, and at times rapidly, changing. Staying abreast of new scientific research may be the most difficult task facing the park's interpretive staff.

CONCLUSION

Because Olympic was created as a wilderness park within the 1930s understanding of the term, the park has, for the most part, been managed and interpreted with some form of wilderness principles in mind. However, the emergence of the Leopold-Robbins wilderness philosophy of the mid-1960s was slow to influence interpretation at Olympic. In part, this was the result of the success of those two reports in persuading Stewart Udall and Park Service leadership that park resources management needed to be based on scientific data. As a result, the natural science specialists were hired to meet administrative rather than interpretive demands. Because of limited funds, the service therefore placed its specialists in management rather than interpretive positions.

A second factor, which was in part a response to this hiring change, was the development of FOST, and its ranger/generalist personnel position. The development of this position classification meant that the park was being interpreted to visitors by generalists while, at the same time, the park management staff was investigating the park's resources in an increasingly specialized manner.

For these reasons, incorporation of the Leopold-Robbins perspective into the Olympic interpretation program did not begin until Henry Warren became chief naturalist in 1979. Since then, substantial progress has been made in all areas of interpretation--staff size, facility renovation, and the content of wayside and museum exhibits. However, the success of the Leopold and Robbins reports in instigating a scientific approach to managing park resources has resulted in an ongoing process of detailing the nature of those resources. To stay abreast with this process, interpretive staff and programs will require a flexibility in formulation and presentation that was not required prior to those reports.

CHAPTER 12

Chapter 12

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE ENTITIES

The 1955 position description for the superintendent of Olympic National Park stated that the superintendent "is responsible for interpretation of broad policies of the Service and for taking the initiative in determining the course of action to be followed. He must at all times exercise sound judgment and tact in dealing with the public, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, private organizations and concessioners, and in his relations with his subordinates." The position description also stated that "mental demands in administering Olympic National Park are particularly significant because of the controversial issues involved."¹ Controversial issues, combined with the large number of groups interested in some aspect of the management of the park, have been constant factors in the park's history.

The history of the relations between the office of the superintendent of Olympic National Park and the various governmental and private entities that interact with that office is a complex story, in large part because the superintendent has been faced with many different entities whose goals and agendas are in conflict and sometimes stand in direct contradiction to each other. Every superintendent of Olympic has had to make "no-win" decisions. Further, patterns of relations with other entities have been shaped more by the personalities of the individuals involved than by philosophy. Therefore, they do not conform completely to the patterns shown in the past five chapters, which describe the evolution toward wilderness management concepts until the appointment of James Watt as secretary of the Interior.

However, some patterns have resulted from the adherence by certain groups to elements of the concepts of visitor primacy or resource primacy. For instance, national conservation groups have consistently based their evaluations of a superintendent's decision, and thereby their response to that decision, on resource primacy premises. The business groups of the surrounding local communities have generally based their evaluations and responses to a superintendent's decision on visitor primacy premises.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: Other Federal Entities, State and Local Governmental Entities, National and Local Conservation Organizations, and Inholders. However, it should be remembered that the various entities are constantly interacting.

¹ Superintendent's Position Description, 3 June 1955, Fred Overly Papers, Box 2, File Incoming Papers, B-G, 16, University of Washington Libraries.

OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES

U.S. Forest Service

The federal agency other than the Park Service which most significantly affects the management of Olympic National Park is the U.S. Forest Service. Its early relations with the park were marked by hostility to the park's existence. Its opposition to the creation of the park is discussed in chapter 4. That opposition is described only briefly here as the starting point in a process that has evolved to an overall positive relationship today.

Early Forest Service opposition to the creation of the park was led by J. H. Plumb, supervisor of Olympic National Forest. In a report of a meeting with the Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, O. A. Tomlinson, superintendent of Mt. Rainier, described Plumb's position to the director: "Despite Plumb's statement to the Port Townsend [sic] Chamber of Commerce that he is not against the park, he has repeatedly stated the contrary. In fact, he maintains that the Olympic area is not of national park quality."² Preston Macy recalled that Plumb's superior, C. J. Buck, "was a virulent fighter against the park, and all knew it."³

The early hostility of the Forest Service toward Olympic resulted from its exploitative resource management philosophy. However, the awareness by both agencies of the need for resource protection partially overrode this hostility. Therefore, the Park Service and Forest Service have engaged in cooperative activities from the park's creation. Superintendent Preston Macy reported in his 1938 Annual Report that "since the establishment of the park, the Washington office of the National Park Service has arranged with the United States Forest Service for the continued forest protection by the latter during the present fire season."⁴

No evidence has been found to indicate whether this agreement was extended beyond the 1938 season. However, the forestry section of Fred Overly's 1952 Master Plan indicated that a cooperative firefighting agreement was in effect between the State Division of Forestry, the Park Service, and the Forest Service.⁵ Superintendent Overly's Mission 66 Prospectus indicated that a mutual agreement with the Forest Service for fire

² Tomlinson to Cammerer. 23 March 1935. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 2, NA.

³ Preston Macy. Interview by Herb Evison.

⁴ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1938, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, 7, NA.

⁵ Master Plan Development Outline, Olympic National Park, Forestry, July 1952, RG 79, Accession 63A231, File D18 OLYM, 7, NPS Records Office.

protection had been signed on February 10, 1954. The agreement was "to remain in effect until cancelled at the request of either party."⁶

John Doerr's 1964 Master Plan envisioned expanding the relationship of the park, the national forest, and state agencies beyond fire protection. One of its objectives was "to plan the physical facilities of the Park as part of a comprehensive recreational plan for the Olympic Peninsula. This is a logical, self-contained planning unit." This goal was to be achieved "through cooperation with the Olympic National Forest, Washington State Park and Recreation Commission," and other entities on the Olympic Peninsula. The result would be the development of "a rational inter-relationship of facilities and services of the different agencies and private enterprise."⁷

This objective in Doerr's Master Plan, like several others, was somewhat ahead of its time. Roger Allin was the first superintendent to broaden the scope of the cooperative efforts between the Park Service and the Forest Service. His 1972 Annual Report indicated that the Park Service, the State Department of Natural Resources, and the Forest Service were working jointly to combat fire.⁸ This aspect of the cooperative effort continued throughout Allin's administration and has been continued by his successors. The 1972 Annual Report also announced that the first in a series of annual meetings was held at Ocean Shores, Washington. At that meeting, "mutual problems were discussed and a tour of logging operations was made to gain greater insight into the U. S. Forest Service work."

Of greater significance was the development at the first annual meeting of an interagency agreement which broadened the cooperative efforts to include routine maintenance activity. The purpose of the agreement was to lower maintenance costs by authorizing the agency that could perform the task required at the lowest cost. Costs were met on a reimbursable basis. Allin reported, "The park and National Forest developed and implemented a joint trail and road maintenance agreement to assist each other. This was the first year of operation and it worked successfully..."⁹

Allin's 1975 annual report described growing cooperation with the Forest Service. In addition to their regular annual meeting, Allin and his staff discussed "reconstruction of the North Shore Road at Lake Quinault in conjunction with USFS timber sales." They later held a "meeting of regional USFS and NPS personnel in Seattle to work with

⁶ Mission 66 Prospectus, Olympic National Park, 11 May 1956, File OLYM 204, 84, NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library (hereinafter referred to as HFCL).

⁷ Master Plan For Olympic National Park, 4 December 1964, pt. 3, 1-2, HFCL.

⁸ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, File OLYM Box 3, 17, HFCL.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

Randy Sheffield and Ed Hill to review the draft master plan for the Quinault unit of Olympic National Forest."¹⁰

The relatively positive relations established during Allin's tenure have for the most part remained intact through the administrations of James Coleman, Roger Contor, and Robert Chandler. In 1980, for instance, Contor's annual report noted that "the new Joint Information Office, USFS/NPS, opened in Forks in January."¹¹ Contor's 1983 Statement for Management indicated that a fire protection agreement was in existence and that the agencies were working closely in the areas of seasonal training and law enforcement.¹²

Superintendent Chandler stated in a July 24, 1986 interview that the annual meetings were still being held to discuss areas of agreement and disagreement.¹³ Clearly, because of the differences in their respective agency missions, some disagreement exists. In a July 24, 1986, interview Ranger Paul Crawford related the events of a 1978 meeting he attended between Superintendent Coleman and the regional forester. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the possibility of the Forest Service gaining permission to hook their log moving equipment to the trees abutting the park's boundary. Coleman refused permission for the case at hand and the regional forester asked if he would be willing to pursue this issue on a case by case basis. According to Crawford, Coleman said he would be willing to do so, but "the answer will still be no."¹⁴

In some cases, because of the divergence of their missions, the answer will always be "no." But today the two agencies are working as well together as at any time in their history and the undisguised hostility that characterized their relationship at the beginning of the park has changed to a positive working relationship.

¹⁰ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1975, 21, Annual Report Collection, HFCL.

¹¹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1980, 10, Olympic National Park Library (hereinafter referred to as ONP).

¹² Statement for Management, Olympic National Park, 8 April 1983, 3-4, ONP.

¹³ Robert Chandler. Interview.

¹⁴ Paul Crawford. Interview.

INDIAN TRIBES

The only other federal entities that have maintained a long-term relationship with the park are the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian tribes who occupy reservations on the park's western boundaries. At present, these tribes are the Quinault, Quileute, Hoh, and Makah. In earlier times, members of the Ozette tribe lived on or near their reservation at Ozette Lake. The major areas of potential conflict between the park and the tribes involve the rights of the tribes and their members to hunt and fish within the park, and other jurisdictional issues. In the first two decades of the park's existence, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was involved on a day-to-day management basis. Beginning in the early 1960s, the tribes began to assume these responsibilities, and the BIA today principally serves as a mediator in areas of dispute between a tribe and the park.

During the process of establishing Olympic, the Bureau of Indian Affairs acted to ensure that the rights of Olympic Peninsula tribes that existed before the establishment of the park would be protected afterwards. On March 19, 1938, less than four months before the final enactment of the Olympic legislation, Assistant Commissioner William Zimmerman reported to Director Cammerer that the language in Section 4 of the bill that was eventually amended and enacted into law did not contain sufficiently specific language to recognize and protect the rights enunciated in the Treaties of July 1, 1855 and January 25, 1856. It therefore did not offer adequate protection of those rights. To remedy this, he suggested an addition to Section 4, the clause recognizing and protecting other valid existing rights. He suggested that it read, "...nor the rights reserved by treaty to the Indians of any tribe." A Park Service or departmental legislative affairs specialist noted that "this was approved by Mr. Speck of the Solicitor's Office." Probably for this reason, this language was included in the bill that was finally enacted. It forms the primary legislative basis for relations between the tribes and the park.¹⁵

The activities of the tribes and their members before the creation of the park are discussed in chapters 2 and 3. Some evidence of the attitude of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs toward the rights of Indians to hunt in the area prior to its becoming a park has been discovered. On January 31, 1916, Assistant District Forester Thomas MacKenzie reported that he had received a report from Ranger E. R. Paull:

The Indians from the reservation make trips into the hills and kill probably from 5 to 15 elk each year. Those killed by them do not amount to a great many, but they wound a large number which get away and later die. The Indians are backed up in their contention that they have a right to kill any game on any of the Government

¹⁵ Zimmerman to Cammerer. 19 March 1938. RG 79 Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Legislative-H.R. 4724, NA.

lands under a treaty of 1855 or 1856 by the Indian Agent at Taholah. Permits have, in some cases, been granted to them to kill elk for their own use by the agent.¹⁶

The Forest Service forwarded this report to the U.S. Biological Survey which in turn sent it to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for comment. The BIA asked the agent at Taholah if the allegations concerning his attitude were true and the agent replied in the negative. On April 1, 1916, Assistant Commissioner for Indian Affairs E. B. Merritt reported to the Biological Survey that the agent at Taholah had advised his office:

I have always instructed the Indians not to hunt or fish off the reservation unless they comply in every respect with the State laws. I have never issued a permit to an Indian to hunt or fish on or off the reservation. If any of the Indians presented such a permit to a ranger on the National Forest it was a forgery.¹⁷ (1916-04-01)

During the early years of the park, the service displayed little knowledge of the attitudes of the Indians on the nearby reservations. On January 9, 1939, Acting Superintendent Fred Overly reported on the desirability of purchasing portions of the Quinault Reservation. He recommended that three strips of land be purchased: strips along Highway 101 and the Quinault River to preserve scenic values and a strip along the ocean which would include the tidelands.¹⁸

On January 19, 1939, Associate Director A. E. Demaray forwarded Overly's report to Secretary Ickes. He commended Overly's effort but he also reminded Ickes that President Roosevelt had indicated in an earlier conversation that he wished to purchase all the allotments on the reservation. Demaray reported, "As I recall the conversation, the President suggested that all of the Indian timber be acquired and that a plan for selective cutting within the body of the Reservation be worked out. He indicated that a thorough study of this proposal should be made and that any necessary legislation should be introduced after the authorized extension of the Olympic National Park had been made." Demaray concluded by suggesting that Ickes consult Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier.¹⁹

Ickes requested a report from Collier, who replied on February 9. He indicated that Overly's recommendations, while sound, would not be accepted by the tribal membership. He recommended that the president's original plan be accepted. He pointed out that "the Quinault Indians are unanimously opposed to the practice of

¹⁶ Forest Supervisor Fromme to MacKenzie. 28 January 1916. RG 22, Central Classified Files, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, 2, NA.

¹⁷ Merritt to H.W. Henshaw, Chief, Biological Survey. 1 April 1916. RG22, Central Classified Files, Wildlife Refuges, Olympic National Forest, NA.

¹⁸ Overly to Tomlinson. 9 January 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 601, pt. 1, NA.

¹⁹ Demaray to Ickes. 19 January 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic File 601, pt. 1, NA.

selective logging on their lands." Therefore, the only acceptable plan was the president's, which would acquire all the allotted lands.²⁰ In response to this memo, Demaray requested that Ickes authorize Collier "to prepare a draft bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to purchase the Quinault Indian Reservation, to be managed as an Indian forest..."²¹ No evidence has been found that such legislation was drafted.

Another potential acquisition of Indian-owned land was the Ozette Lake Indian Reservation, which was located to the west of Ozette Lake and abutted the Pacific. Superintendent Macy recommended that it be acquired as early as October 7, 1941. In a November 27 memorandum, Commissioner Collier pointed out:

There are Ozette Indians living now who moved to other places, whose equity in the Ozette reservation apparently has not been extinguished. Our Superintendent Phillips Phillips thinks that some of these Indians would want to be resettled on the Ozette reservation. The resettlement would not necessitate the cutting of the timber. A rather valuable fishing right exists on the Ozette.²²

Macy persisted, however. He chaired the committee which formulated the redefinition of the park's western boundaries. That committee also "studied the proposal for boundary extensions east of Ozette Lake and north of the Ozette River, Olympic Coastal Strip Acquisition." The committee unanimously concluded that "the lake itself is probably the last remaining lake of equal or larger size within the United States, adjacent to any seacoast, which now retains what amounts to primeval, untouched natural conditions about its shores. It presents, therefore, an opportunity for preservation of one such lake."²³ The committee further recommended that "the objective should be to acquire all the shores and islands in the lake. Otherwise we recommend against further consideration."²⁴

The committee also expressed the belief that "the Ozette Indian Reservation should eventually become a part of the Coastal Strip inasmuch as it is a natural part of the area and is not to our knowledge being used in any way by the Indian Service or Indians."²⁵ This statement summarized the attitude of the service, which intensified as the number of Ozette Indians diminished.

²⁰ Collier to Ickes. 9 February 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 601, pt. 1, NA.

²¹ Demaray to Ickes. 28 February 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 601, pt. 1, NA.

²² Collier to Demaray. 27 November 1941. RG 49, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610, pt. 1, NA.

²³ Report of Committee on Study of Boundary Extensions, Ozette Area, Olympic Coastal Strip, September, 1943, RG 79, Central Classified Files, File 610--Indian Lands, 1943-44, 1, NA.

²⁴ Ibid., 2.

²⁵ Ibid., 2.

In September 1946, the Office of Indian Affairs' Information Service issued a release for the September 29 Sunday papers. It announced that only one member of the Ozette Indian Tribe remained alive. He was "Elliott Anderson, 70-year-old widower, the last surviving member of the once populous Ozette Tribe and therefore the sole owner of tribal rights in the 719-acre Ozette Reservation in Clallam County, Washington."²⁶ The press release concluded with a description of the reservation:

The Ozette Reservation was established by Executive Order in 1893. ...It is deserted except that occasionally Indians fish in the Ozette River. Once it was famous for cedar which the Ozettes used for canoe making and for barter with their friends, the Makahs on the north and the Quileutes and Quinaielts on the south. Timber nearly covers the reservation now but it is of poor quality and largely inaccessible...²⁷

In a memorandum of June 24, 1947, Macy reported that "the matter of the Ozette Indian Reservation has again come to my attention. In discussing various matters with one of the local county officials recently he mentioned that he had a few days previously suggested to the Washington State Parks Director that the State should have this for a state park."²⁸ Macy expressed doubt that this would happen.

Macy reported that he had visited the reservation with an outdoor club and an Indian had told him that they were netting salmon on the Ozette River. Macy expressed the concern that if other local Indians attempted to assert control over the reservation, they would succeed, stating, "We perhaps should look with favor upon such a process in most cases. However, in this instance we should have the control of the Ozette River over the short distance it traverses the reservation. This we do not hesitate to urgently recommend because of the circumstances."²⁹

Macy's recommendations were dismissed by Acting Director Tolson on August 18, 1947. He offered two reasons for not pursuing ownership of the reservation. The first was opposition within the BIA to the removal of the land from the jurisdiction of the Indian Service. Second, the 1947 legislation to reduce the amount of acreage within the park

²⁶ Office of Indian Affairs Press Release, 29 September 1946, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 610--Indian Lands, pt. 1, 1, NA.

²⁷ Ibid., 3.

²⁸ Macy to Region 4 Director. 24 June 1947. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Washington Liason Office - General, 1, NA.

²⁹ Ibid., 1-2.

had been introduced, and Tolson did not want to offer potential areas of expansion to justify the removal of rain forest from the park.³⁰

However, Macy's memorandum illustrates that the problems posed by Indian rights can extend to different areas of park management. In this instance, he hoped to acquire the reservation not only to conserve the area for future generations, but also to prevent the resource management problems that might arise if an Indian tribe obtained the right of prior access to the salmon run.

The circumstances that Macy was referring to arose in the early 1940s and resulted from the State of Washington's efforts to regulate Indian commercial fishing. In letters of April 5 and June 20, 1940, the Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce requested a statement from the commissioner of Indian Affairs concerning his policy on the issue of Indian off-reservation fishing. William Zimmerman, Assistant Commissioner, replied on July 12. He pointed out that "the treaties between a number of Indian tribes in the Pacific Northwest and the United States reserve to the Indians the right to fish at their usual and accustomed places in common with the citizens of the States." However, he emphasized that

while it is our duty to see that these treaty rights are protected and that the Indians are permitted to enjoy them without interference by the States, yet we do not approve of the Indians exercising these rights in a manner which does not conform with the principles of conservation. We encourage the Indians to abandon hunting and fishing practices which will deplete the wildlife resources on as well as off their reservations.³¹

Zimmerman's letter indicated that "there are cases now pending in Court which, when decided, will determine some of the controversial points in connection with the treaty fishing rights of the Indians off their reservation."³² On May 2, 1941, the Port Angeles *Evening News* reported the initial outcome of one such case:

Federal Judge John C. Bowen yesterday permanently enjoined officials of the state fisheries and game departments from interfering with fishing practices of the Makah Indians of the Olympic Peninsula as guaranteed by a treaty between the tribe and Washington Territorial Governor Isaac Stevens in 1859.³³

³⁰ Tolson to Region 4 Director. 18 August 1947. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Washington Liaison Office - General, 3-5, NA.

³¹ Zimmerman to Charles Webster. 12 July 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 714--Fishes, pt. 1, 1, NA.

³² Ibid.

³³ Superintendent Macy to Director. 28 May 1941. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 714--Fishes, pt. 1, NA.

The article noted that a similar case was pending before the U.S. Supreme Court. That case was evidently decided in favor of the tribes. In his June 24, 1947 memorandum cited above, Supt. Macy observed, "The State Game Protector had recently warned the Indians they could not net on the Reservation but of course the Indians are aware the state lost its case and that they can net."³⁴

Concern over Indian rights during Overly's administration resulted from the formal addition to the park of the Coastal Strip by the January 6, 1953 executive order. On August 20, 1954, Overly transmitted a memorandum asking for a statement of the nature of the Quileute Tribe's rights to hunt and fish within the park. The memo was referred through Director to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Glen Emmons, who responded on March 21, 1955. He pointed out that Overly's memo raised a general question as to "whether the Indians of the Quileute Reservation may hunt and fish in the Olympic National Park pursuant to the treaty of July 1, 1855 (12 Stat. 971), between the United States and the Quinaielt and Quileute Indians" and the specific question of "whether the Indians have a right, under the treaty, to take fish in the portions of the Quillayute and Dickey Rivers that are within the National Park, as well as to hunt game animals on Park lands adjacent to the reservation."³⁵

In response to these questions, the commissioner first noted that Section 5 of the Act which created the park protected "any rights reserved to Indians by treaty." He then noted that the rights of the Quileutes had not been addressed directly by a court. However, he offered one case for guidance in defining the tribe's off-reservation fishing rights and another to define its off-reservation hunting rights.

The fishing rights case was *Tulee v. State of Washington*, which was decided by the United States Supreme Court (315 U.S. 681). The Court ruled that the state could not impose a charge for a fishing license on Indians fishing off their reservation but in their usual and accustomed places. However, the Court also established the principle that the state could "impose on Indians, equally with others, such restrictions of a purely regulatory nature concerning the time and manner of fishing outside the reservation as are necessary for the conservation of fish..." Therefore, the rights of the Quileutes were limited by conservation considerations. The commissioner acknowledged that the factual question of the exact location of usual and accustomed places was not answered and suggested that Overly contact the bureau's Portland Area Office for further information on this question.³⁶

³⁴ Macy to Region 4 Director. 24 June 1947. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, Field Washington Liason Office, General, 1, NA.

³⁵ Emmons to Director, NPS. 21 March 1955. Accession 70A706, File W30, 1-2, Sand Point Federal Records Center.

³⁶ Ibid.

The hunting rights case offered by the Commissioner was *Idaho v. Arthur*, which involved the treaty right of the Nez Perce to hunt on "open and unclaimed land outside the reservation" and had been decided by the Idaho Supreme Court. That court determined that "open and unclaimed" meant unsettled, and that the tribe and its members could hunt within the boundaries of a National Forest.³⁷

The commissioner's memorandum did not fully address the issue as it specifically related to the park. However, on August 10, 1955, almost a year after Overly had raised the question of Indian rights within the park, Julian H. Golden, Acting Assistant Solicitor, National Parks, responded. He concluded that the principle of resource conservation established by the *Tulee* case could also be extended to hunting rights. He stated that as a matter of law, "such regulations governing fishing and hunting rights as are necessary for conservation purposes are applicable to Indians equally with other persons. It would seem then that regulations which carry out fish conservation measures in the Park are applicable alike to the Indians, and it follows that regulations relating to hunting within the Park which are for conservation purposes are also binding on the Indians."³⁸

In response to the commissioner's March 21 memorandum, the Portland Area Office of the BIA also forwarded to Overly copies of the pertinent pages of the Swindell Report to assist him with the factual determination of the location of usual and accustomed places. This document had been prepared by the BIA in 1942 to assist in the litigation of the *Tulee* case cited above. It contained information on the locations of tribal fishing villages gathered by interviewing tribal elders. One 90-year-old Quileute indicated that his people had fished along the Sol Duc River and had lived in a village at the mouth of the Dickey River. He testified that "the Indians who used to live at this village, as well as others from La Push and other Quileute villages, used to go up to the area around Dickey Lake for the purpose of hunting elk which they smoked and brought back to the village to eat as a change from the fish that they were accustomed to eating most of the time."³⁹

Perhaps because the 1953 executive order expanded the park, little consideration seems to have been given to the addition of the Ozette Indian Reservation during Overly's tenure. However, the department's solicitor rendered an opinion on the ownership of the reservation that would provide a basis for further acquisition efforts. On November 21, 1957, in response to the Makah Tribe's request for ownership of the reservation, the solicitor issued an opinion which concluded that no Indians other than Ozettes could

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

³⁸ Golden to Director Conrad Wirth. 10 August 1955. RG 79, Accession 70A706, File W30, 2, Sand Point FRC.

³⁹ Martin B. Holm, Assistant Area Director to Overly. 29 April 1955. Accession 70A706, File W30, 221, Sand Point FRC.

claim either title or rights in the Ozette Reservation. Therefore, because no Ozette Indians remained, the terms of the treaty on which the ownership and rights of the reservation were based had been fulfilled.⁴⁰

On February 21, 1961, Director Wirth recommended to the secretary that he "approve, in principle, adding the former Ozette Reservation to Olympic National Park." This recommendation was based on the solicitor's opinion and a subsequent opinion by the associate solicitor for Territories, Wildlife, and Parks, that the land could be added to the park. Assistant Secretary Carver approved this recommendation on March 28.⁴¹ On April 24, 1962, legislation to add the reservation to the park "as the Makah Memorial Park Area" was introduced in the House of Representatives.⁴²

This decision and the subsequent proposed legislation met resistance from other Indians on the peninsula. On April 26, 1963, Quentin Markishtum, a Makah Tribal Council member, wrote to Representative Julia Butler Hansen to inform her of his tribe's claim to the Ozette Reservation. He pointed out that his tribe had raised their claim for several years and it remained unresolved. He also pointed out that "it would seem that the U.S. Park Service has been the organization blocking our claim."⁴³

Representative Hansen forwarded this letter to the Park Service. Acting Assistant Director Harry K. Sanders replied on May 17. He quoted the testimony of Assistant Secretary Carver in favor of proposed legislation transferring the reservation to the Park Service, which pointed out that the 1957 solicitor's opinion held that the Makah Tribe could not acquire the Ozette Reservation without an act of Congress. It also listed the service's reasons for desiring to add it to the park. He observed that the reservation "adjoins the Olympic Park Ocean Strip, and is completely surrounded by National Park lands. The area includes Cape Alava, the westernmost point in the conterminous United States."⁴⁴

The testimony transcript also showed that the land was needed for recreational and educational purposes:

⁴⁰ Harry K. Sanders, Acting Assistant Director, NPS to Representative Julia Butler Hansen. 17 May 1963. File OLYM Box 3, 2, HFCL.

⁴¹ Wirth to Carver. 21 February 1961. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, 2, Department of the Interior Records Officer.

⁴² Sanders to Hansen. 17 May 1963. File OLYM Box 3, 1, HFCL.

⁴³ Markishtum to Hansen. 26 April 1963. File OLYM Box 3, HFCL.

⁴⁴ Sanders to Hansen. 17 May 1963. File OLYM Box 3, 1, HFCL.

The Ozette Fishing Village contains the richest known archeological remains on the Ocean Strip, according to a survey made by the University of Washington...Ozette Island, which is the largest island along this stretch of coast, lies to the west of the Ozette Indian Village site. Between the shore and this island is the richest habitat of intertidal marine life adjoining the Olympic Ocean Strip. Another smaller island, known as Indian Island or Cannon Ball Island, because of the unusual boulder formations found there, lies closer to the shore of the reservation. The Ozette Reservation is the best shoreline vantage point from which an interesting sea lion colony off-shore on a rocky islet can be viewed.⁴⁵

On August 30, 1963, Assistant Secretary Carver sent a report on H.R. 3799, a bill calling for the construction of "an approach road into the Ozette Lake region in the Olympic National Park," to Representative Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This report contained language identical to that in Carver's earlier report offering the service's reasons for acquiring the reservation and also indicated that the Makah wished to obtain the land to serve as "a memorial to their aboriginal background." Carver reported that the tribe had indicated a desire to eventually turn the land over to the state to be managed as a memorial park.⁴⁶ Left unstated were the potential management problems caused by an area under state jurisdiction within the boundaries of the park.

Questions of title and jurisdiction continued to arise. During Roger Allin's administration, an error in the 1953 executive order was discovered which had resulted in the Park Service asserting jurisdiction over land owned by the Quileute Indian Tribe. An initial conference between the tribe and the service was held on June 27, 1974.⁴⁷ On January 16, 1975, the tribe submitted its report to the commissioner of Indian Affairs, who in turn forwarded it to the department's solicitor for an opinion. Acting Deputy Commissioner Raymond Butler noted,

There is...an immediate pressing need to have full Departmental recognition of the boundaries of the Reservation and the jurisdiction of the Tribe over the Reservation. That need stems from the fact that an on-going housing program, together with the need to build a sewage disposal plant within the Reservation, are being seriously impeded, if not totally stopped.⁴⁸

Deputy Solicitor David Lindgren announced his opinion on July 16, 1975. He first reviewed the events that had led to the mistake. He observed that the February 19, 1889

⁴⁵ Ibid, 1-2.

⁴⁶ Carver to Aspinall. 30 August 1963. File OLYM Box 3, 2-3, HFCL.

⁴⁷ C. P. Raynor, Assistant Solicitor, Parks and Recreation to Assistant Director, Interpretation, NPS. 24 July 1974. RG 48, File 6-24, July 1974, 1, Department of the Interior Records Office.

⁴⁸ Butler to solicitor. 24 January 1975. RG 79, Accession 79-83-0005, File L30 Land Use--OLYM, 1, Sand Point FRC.

executive order establishing the reservation included a phrase respecting all prior claims to the lands reserved for the tribe. This phrase was included to protect the entries on two parcels of land in the northwest corner of the proposed reservation. Both entries, made by Hattie Bright and David Smith, were patented after the creation of the reservation. The lands were still privately owned in 1916, when a survey of the reservation's boundary was made. Because they were privately owned, the surveyor excluded the parcels from the reservation. The lands were reacquired by the U.S. during the PWA land acquisition program and were added to the park by Truman's 1953 executive order, which also contained a provision that no Quileute Reservation lands were to be added to the park.⁴⁹

Lindgren concluded that the 1916 boundary survey was in error, noting that "the proviso in the proclamation--that this withdrawal shall not affect valid existing rights of any party--should not have been construed as detracting from the boundaries delineated by the Proclamation. Rather, it indicates an intent that the property rights in those parcels be protected notwithstanding their inclusion within the reservation boundaries." Therefore, when the rights were subsequently acquired by the U.S., the land should have reverted to the tribe.⁵⁰

The title problems were complicated by the fact that the park's La Push concession facility was located on the land in question. However, on February 26, 1976, Michele Metrisko, associate solicitor, Conservation and Wildlife, informed William Beyers of Seattle that "it is presently intended to transfer the lands upon which LaPush Ocean Park is situated to the Quileute Tribe, either by legislation now pending in Congress or by administrative action."⁵¹ The lands were restored on October 21, 1976 by P.L. 94-578.⁵²

The Quileute boundary issue offers an example of the basic change in relations between Indian tribes and the park that occurred in the 1970s. Prior to that time, the Park Service relied on the Bureau of Indian Affairs to speak for the tribes. Therefore, Superintendents Macy and Overly consulted with the commissioner of Indian Affairs to resolve questions of land title and jurisdiction. However, as the Makah Tribe's efforts to acquire the Ozette Reservation in the early 1960s indicated, tribes were beginning to assert themselves and act on their own behalf. This trend increased in the 1970s and continues.

⁴⁹ Lindgren to Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Assistant Secretary, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. 16 July 1975. RG 79, Accession 79-83-0005 Land Use--OLYM, 1-2, Sand Point FRC.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁵¹ Metrisko to William Beyers. 26 February 1976. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, Department of the Interior Records Officer.

⁵² *U.S. Statutes At Large*, Vol. 90: 2741.

Superintendents Allin and Coleman seem to have dealt with this trend by maintaining open lines of communication with the tribes. Allin's 1975 Annual Report showed that considerable discussion on a wide range of issues was held with all the tribes on the peninsula. Working together with the Quinault Tribe and the state, a dispute over the issuance of permits was resolved and the Quileute land transfer was given a high priority.⁵³ Coleman's 1977 Annual Report noted that the park was engaged in a salmon enhancement program with the Quinaults and was implementing a similar program with the Hoh Tribe.⁵⁴

Although superintendents Contor and Chandler did not act to end this effort at cooperation through communication, during the 1980s, the tribes, particularly the Quinault Tribe, by asserting tribal sovereignty, have increasingly challenged the authority of the park to make management decisions. On November 24, 1982, two Quinault Indians, Gregory Hicks and Stevens Shale, killed three elk in the Queets Corridor of the park. They argued that as members of the Quinault Tribe, they had a right to hunt elk in the park under their 1855 Treaty.⁵⁵

U.S. District Court Judge Walter McGovern issued an order adopting the Report and Recommendations of Magistrate Weinberg, which affirmed the Indian position. However, after a rehearing of the issues at the request of the Justice Department, Judge McGovern reversed his position and concluded that as a matter of law, Olympic National Park was not an open and unclaimed area. He took into consideration the Idaho Supreme Court's decision in *State v. Arthur* discussed above and subsequent case law and concluded that "the term 'unclaimed' must have a greater meaning than that land only appropriated to private ownership."⁵⁶

Although the court upheld the park's right to bar hunting, tribes have continued to assert their authority in other management areas. One such area is the management of the fishery resources. Superintendent Chandler's 1984 Annual Report noted that both the state agencies and the tribes "continue to ignore the concerns of the NPS, making plans for enhancement and setting escapement goals on a stock by stock, river by river basis, even when these plans and goals directly affect fishery resources in ONP."⁵⁷ Conversations with Justice Department personnel in the mid 1980s indicated that the

⁵³ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1975, 20, Annual Report Collection, HFCL.

⁵⁴ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1977, 10-11, Olympic National Park Library.

⁵⁵ *U.S. v. Hicks*, U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington, 9 April 1984, Superintendent's Files, 1, Olympic National Park.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁷ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1984, 4, Annual Report Collection, HFCL.

Quinault Tribe continued to assert its right to manage the fishery resource within the park's boundaries.

Law enforcement is another area where the tribes are asserting the right to function within the park. On September 26, 1984, Assistant Superintendent Donald Jackson reported on a meeting held the day before at Quileute. Also in attendance were members of the Quileute Tribe and the Washington State Police. One of the purposes of the meeting was "to clarify discussions held recently on the subject of carrying of firearms by Tribal enforcement officers within the Olympic National Park." Jackson stated that the park's policy was to allow "the carrying of firearms for tribal law enforcement officers while on duty, in uniform, and with proper identification."⁵⁸ This policy seems to have satisfied the Quileute tribal law enforcement personnel.

The trend of increasing tribal assertion of sovereignty has resulted in a pattern of relations that are different from those with other federal agencies and state and local government agencies. Those agencies have developed relatively stable institutional perspectives and standards of procedure. Indian tribal decision-making entities are relatively sensitive to tribal politics and therefore, less stable and coherent in their perspectives and procedures. Therefore, the tribes may interact with the Park Service in a less predictable way. This unpredictability will be a likely source of friction between the tribes and the park for years to come. Because Indian treaty rights are based on legal precedent and interpretation, each generation will have to define them as new specific instances of conflict arise.

OTHER AGENCIES

Other federal agencies that have interacted intermittently with the park include the U.S. Public Health Service, the Coast Guard, and the U.S. Army. The role of the Public Health Service role in defining concession sanitation problems and the impact of the army on concession facilities during World War II are discussed in chapter 9. The Park Service had to deal with a new set of civilian agencies established during World War II to manage the wartime economy. Primarily this involved central office interaction with the War Production Board to protect the Sitka spruce within the Park. This effort is discussed in chapter 4.

The Coast Guard and the park have had a positive relationship throughout the park's existence. The Coast Guard often provided assistance for search and rescue operations. One of the objectives in Bennett Gale's 1964 Master Plan was "to continue to develop a high degree of liaison or rapport with adjacent law enforcement and search and rescue organizations such as the U.S. Coast Guard..." and Superintendent Allin's annual reports indicated that this activity continued into the 1970s. In 1975, for instance, he reported

⁵⁸ Jackson to Files. 26 September 1984. Superintendent's Source Chron--1983, 1, Olympic National Park.

that "the Coast Guard helicopters and their crews have rescued park visitors from high ridge tops, in the interior of the Park, seaside cliffs and narrow trail openings in backcountry."⁵⁹

One tragic event that involved the army, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and state and park rescue personnel was the March, 1975, crash on Mount Constance of a C-141, a personnel air transport plane. Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior Douglas Wheeler reported to Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, that rescue personnel had "recovered the bodies of the victims, salvaged the wreckage, and effectively restored the area to its natural condition." He offered the highest commendations to all personnel involved in the project.⁶⁰ Park Service relations with the Coast Guard and the military have continued to center around emergency situations. No management conflicts have been discovered.

Another agency that has recently become re-involved with the park is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As noted in chapter 8, the service initiated some fish stocking programs immediately after the park was established. These programs were halted by World War II. Roger Allin was the first superintendent to formalize relations with the Fish and Wildlife Service. In his 1975 Annual Report he announced, "Cooperative efforts this year culminated in the signing of a joint Memorandum of Understanding between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Park for joint interpretation and assistance."⁶¹ Contor's 1983 Statement for Management indicated that this agreement was still at least partially in effect. It observed that the park and the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuge had "agreed that the park would provide interpretive planning assistance and space for displays, invite Fish and Wildlife Service personnel to local National Park Service training, report violations of laws and regulations governing wildlife, and send in evidence and exchange data regarding wildlife."⁶² Recent legislation has transferred jurisdiction of the refuges to the Park Service, but it is too soon to evaluate the change in relations between the agencies that may occur as a result.

For the most part, with the possible exception of the Indian tribes, relations with other federal agencies have become more positive through time. In part, this has resulted from the emergence of a shared perspective based on the experience each agency has acquired in dealing with the others. The areas of agreement and potential conflict due to differing missions have been defined with increased accuracy.

⁵⁹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1975, 22, Annual Report Collection, HFCL.

⁶⁰ Wheeler to Schlesinger. 26 September 1975. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic, 1, Interior Department Records Office.

⁶¹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1975, 22, Annual Report Collection, HFCL.

⁶² Statement for Management, Olympic National Park, 1 April 1983, ONP Superintendent's File Statement For Management, 3.

INHOLDERS

Since 1960, the exact meaning of the language in Section 5 of the act creating Olympic National Park, has been increasingly debated. Section 5 states:

Nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry made under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land...(52 Stat. 1242).

The earliest controversy involving landowners within the park resulted from the decision to condemn the land in the Queets Valley and the Ocean Strip. In his 1940 March monthly report, Superintendent Macy described the height of the reaction:

Local protest against the acquisition program reached a comic climax when a determined party of 14 Queets residents emulated the historical 'Coxey's Army' and, equipped with signs and prepared complaints, mobilized and caravanned to Olympia where they posed briefly on the capitol steps with a demand that the State militia be called out to protect them from the National Park Service.

Macy noted that Governor Martin chose not to honor this request.⁶³

Although the Macy and Overly administrations had few problems with inholders, except for those inholders of concession facilities discussed in chapter 9, the seeds for future difficulty were sown by the creation of the park and the first addition to the park made by President Roosevelt in 1940. This addition included the northern and eastern forks of the Quinault River and the northern shore of Lake Crescent, which contained most of the private property within the park.

Macy could do little to acquire private property during his administration because of a lack of funds. Overly made some headway through his use of timber salvage operations. However, Overly's Mission 66 Prospectus reported:

There are some 7,354 acres of alien or private land within the boundaries of the park. This consists of approximately 800 tracts controlled by more than 600 owners. There is more than seven miles of frontage on Lake Crescent which is privately-owned, some of which has sold for \$20.00 a front foot.

Overly estimated that the total value of the inholdings was at least \$1,000,000. He proposed that the property be acquired "as it became available."⁶⁴

⁶³ Macy to Director. 10 April 1940. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-02.3, pt. 1, 2, NA.

⁶⁴ Mission 66 Prospectus, Olympic National Park, 11 May 1956, File OLYM 204, 71, HFCL.

Overly did make some progress in the Quinault addition. The property owners along the north shore of Lake Quinault had never approved of the inclusion of their property in the park by President Roosevelt's 1940 Proclamation. In 1947, George Fields testified in favor of a boundary adjustment bill which would have removed their land from the park, as well as eliminating some of the heavily timbered area of the lower Bogachiel Valley. His major complaint was that the Park Service could not keep open the only access road to his property and to that of many others.⁶⁵

By January 1958, the Quinault property owners had organized the North Shore Association to serve as the community's mechanism for protecting its interests. Irene S. O'Connor, the group's secretary, wrote a letter to Congressman Russell Mack on January 21, 1958, complaining about the continuing road problems. Mack forwarded this letter to Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton on January 27. He pointed out that "the North Shore Association consists of the some fifty families living within the boundary of Olympic National Park. They own and farm some 4,000 acres of privately owned land, much of which was originally homesteaded by their parents and grandparents." Mack also noted that, although these property owners paid taxes to the state and county, the Park Service had to provide them with roads. Because Park Service efforts were inadequate and because he believed that the farm land was not of park caliber, Mack suggested that "all this land be removed from the Park."⁶⁶

Assistant Secretary Roger Ernst replied on March 18. He justified the continued inclusion of the area within the park by refuting Mack's assertion that the land in question was not of park caliber. He pointed out that the land had been included for two purposes: "to preserve splendid examples of the rain forest on both the North Fork and the East Fork of the Quinault River and to protect the forested mountain slopes in the area." Ernst concluded, "We believe that the Quinault River Valley and the North Shore of Quinault Lake are essential parts of the Olympic National Park, that they were rightfully added in 1940, and that they should remain in the park."⁶⁷

Ernst also pointed out that the number of acres owned by private landowners in the Quinault Valley was diminishing. Of the 26,000 acres added in 1940, almost 6,000 acres had been privately owned. As of the date of his letter, that acreage had diminished to "approximately 3,650 acres." The remainder had been acquired during Overly's tenure "by sale or exchange" and "through voluntary negotiations." Ernst did not make any commitment that would restrict the method of acquisition to a willing seller basis,

⁶⁵ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Public Lands, *Hearings Pursuant to H. Res. 93*, 80th Congress, 1st Sess., 16, 17 September 1947, 150-52.

⁶⁶ Mack to Seaton. 27 January 1958. RG 79, Accession 60A405, File D, 1, NPS Records Office.

⁶⁷ Ernst to Mack. 18 March 1958. RG 79, Accession 60A405, File D, 1, NPS Records Office.

however. He stated "there is no intention of using other means unless some emergency or development need, not now foreseen, should occur."⁶⁸

This exchange between Mack and Ernst illustrated the pattern of the debate which would continue until today. The proponents of removing portions of the Quinault area from the park argue that the area does not contain areas of park quality sufficient to justify its inclusion within the park. Those who favor keeping it in the park claim that it does.

The argument persisted throughout the 1960s in various forms. On January 20, 1960, Ernst answered an inquiry from Senator Henry Jackson, who had forwarded the resolutions of the mayor and the city council of Hoquiam and the Grays Harbor Board of County Commissioners urging the removal of the private lands in the Quinault Valley from the park. He responded negatively to these resolutions, stating, "These private lands cannot be excluded from the park without defeating the major conservation objectives for which the Quinault area was added to it." He then illustrated the problem in doing so. "To exclude the private inholdings here would result in a park boundary so complex as to cause unsolvable administrative problems, while to exclude the whole section would mean the loss of rain forest lands of the greatest importance as park territory, reopening a nationwide controversy over park and timber values."⁶⁹

An October 10, 1961, briefing statement to the secretary reported that on June 21, 1960, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs passed a resolution requesting the secretary of the Interior to appoint a three-person commission "to study the question of whether or not private lands in the Quinault area of Olympic National Park, totaling some 3,300 acres, should or should not be excluded from the park." The secretary had appointed a Quinault Study Committee on June 6, 1961. It consisted of Gordon Marckworth, dean of the University of Washington School of Forestry, who had been recommended by Governor Rosellini, and John Osseward and Irving Brant, who had been recommended by Director Wirth.⁷⁰

Although the committee was asked to report by September 21, they did not begin work until their initial meeting on August 11, at which Osseward was named chairman. The briefing paper pointed out that the lateness of the start meant that the committee could not both meet the deadline and allow for full hearing of the area home-owners. The

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ernst to Jackson. 20 January 1960. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic National Park, 1, Department of the Interior Records Office.

⁷⁰ Acting NPS Director Eivid Scoyen to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. 10 October 1961. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic National Park, 1, Department of the Interior Records Office.

briefing statement recommended, and the secretary agreed, that hearing the residents had the higher priority.⁷¹

Perhaps in anticipation of the Quinault Study Committee's report, the North Shore Association issued its own formal statement on March 20, 1961. Its statement raised three arguments in favor of eliminating the area from the park. First, it concluded that the area was not of park caliber. Second, it stated that "in 1940 without a hearing or warning to the residents, the area was proclaimed a part of Olympic National Park, thereby invading a basic right of the people who live here." Third, they argued that they were entitled to the same privileges of ownership as private property owners outside the park.⁷²

The Quinault Study Committee report, which was initially completed in March 1962, contradicted all three of these assertions. It dismissed the assertion that the area was not of park caliber. It conceded that the privately owned lands might not be worthy of inclusion in the park, but it also pointed out that "the lake and the predominate forest that intervenes between private lands but covers the mountains behind is an essential part of Olympic National Park, more so now than when it was first acquired because of these qualities."⁷³

The report also denied that the property had been added to the park without notice. It noted that President Roosevelt had made his personal desire to include the area within the park quite clear at a stopover at Lake Crescent Lodge during his 1937 visit. The Congress had also expressed an interest in including the north and south shores during the legislative process which established the park. The State Planning Board and the Park Service had consulted prior to the issuance of the 1940 proclamation, and both agencies had agreed that the area proposed by Brant should be included, and the area residents indicated that they were aware of these meetings. The report therefore concluded, "It is evident that the acute desire of North Shore residents to have their properties eliminated from the park has arisen from causes of later date than their inclusion in it."⁷⁴

The third assertion of the association, that they had the same property rights as private land owners outside the park, was the subject of much deliberation within the Quinault Study Committee. On July 7, 1962, John Osseward forwarded a letter of inquiry to

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Statement of the North Shore Association, 20 March 1961, 1, 10, Olympic National Park Library.

⁷³ Quinault Study Committee to the Secretary of the Interior and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, 19 March 1962, File OLYM Box 2, 51, HFCL (hereinafter referred to as the Quinault Report).

⁷⁴ Ibid., 34-36.

Assistant Secretary John Carver. He informed Carver that his fellow committee-man Gordon Marckworth believed that the language of the 1940 proclamation protecting all existing rights in the area being included in the park, which was identical to the language in Section 5 of the act creating the park, was in direct conflict with 36 CFR 1.32, which stated that "owners of private lands...within the limits of any park...are entitled to the full use and enjoyment thereof, subject to any regulations by the secretary specifically relating to such private lands." Osseward told Carver that he did not share Marckworth's belief, but he requested that Carver provide him with the most current legal opinion on the subject.⁷⁵

Carver replied on August 10. He agreed with Osseward's conclusion that the state's cession of jurisdiction to the United States in March 1941 served as sufficient authorization for the secretary to regulate private inholdings. He also provided the most pertinent court decision, *United States v Petersen*, which had been decided in the U.S. District Court in the Southern District of California in 1950. It had "involved privately-owned lands which were included within the boundaries of Kings Canyon National Park, subject to valid existing rights, and the application to the owners of such lands of a Federal regulation prohibiting the sale of certain alcoholic beverages without a permit secured from an official of the National Park Service." California had ceded jurisdiction to the United States. Carver noted that "the Court found that the regulation could be validly applied to the use of privately-owned lands located within the exterior boundaries of the park and that owners of such lands could be subjected to criminal and other appropriate penalties for violation of the regulation." The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had upheld the decision and the Supreme Court had declined to hear the case.⁷⁶

The study committee adopted this legal position: "A distinction must be observed between the rights of private individuals in land and the legal duty of the secretary of the Interior to administer, protect, maintain, and develop all lands in accordance with the 1916 Act and all other laws, rules, and regulations applicable to Olympic National Park."⁷⁷ After justifying the secretary's right to regulate private property within the park, the report offered a formal policy to stabilize relations with the inholders:

The Secretary of the Interior should, within the exterior boundaries of the Quinault area, acquire land and interests therein by purchase or otherwise subject to the proviso that no parcel shall be acquired, without the consent of the owner so long as it is used exclusively for agricultural purposes, or remains in its natural state.

⁷⁵ Osseward to Carver. 6 July 1962. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic National Park, 1-2, Department of the Interior Records Office.

⁷⁶ Carver to Osseward. 10 August 1962. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic National Park, 1-2, Department of the Interior Records Office.

⁷⁷ Quinault Report, 19 March 1962, File OLYM Box 2, V, HFCL.

Further subdividing or the permitting of nuisances would subject the property to condemnation.⁷⁸

In addition to concluding that the secretary had the right to regulate the lands within park boundaries, the report also presented evidence to show that very few private land owners were using their property as a primary place of residence. It pointed out that of the total acreage in question, only 140 acres had been plowed. It also observed that "absentee ownership exists in many instances, there being only a dozen permanent year round postal addresses of acreage owners living in the North Shore."⁷⁹

The Quinault Study Committee offered powerful arguments in favor of retaining the private lands within the park. These arguments were accepted by the 1966 Boundary Study Committee, which had been formed to evaluate the January proposals of Fred Overly, who at that time was regional director for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The committee consisted of Overly, who had recommended that the Quinault section of the park be excluded along with the westernmost area of the Bogachiel; Sidney Malbon, landscape architect for the BOR; Robert Luntney, regional office resource planner; Stuer Carlson, assistant superintendent at Olympic; Nathaniel Owings, a member of the Advisory Board on National Parks; Eivid Scoyen, former associate director of NPS; and Bennett Gale, superintendent of Olympic and committee chairman.⁸⁰

The committee issued a majority and minority report on September 2, 1966. In its majority report, the 1966 committee specifically endorsed the acquisition policy enunciated by the 1962 committee. It also recommended that a new approach to land use management and zoning be tried. It concluded that "the National Park Service has the authority and responsibility as well as the experience to provide the leadership and guidance needed to develop and implement a plan for appropriate interim use of these private inholdings. This could be accomplished through retention of the private lands within the Park regulated under zoning and building codes issued by the secretary after consultation with the owners of land in the Park."⁸¹

Although the committee did not agree on the best solution to the Quinault problem, it was unanimous in recommending the "immediate acquisition of the Arthur Benson property in the eastern section along the Quinault River." The cause of the recommendation was the threat of subdivision. "An option for the purchase of the major part of this land for speculative subdivision has recently been entered into by a southern

⁷⁸ Ibid., XXI.

⁷⁹ Ibid., XX.

⁸⁰ Olympic National Park Boundary Study, Committee Report, 2 September 1966, File OLYM Box 3, 31, HFCL.

⁸¹ Ibid., 9.

California development company and Mr. Benson. The land in question is highly desirable prime winter range for elk and should remain undeveloped for this purpose."⁸²

The zoning concept did not originate with the Boundary Study Committee. Superintendent Doerr's 1964 Master Plan also called for zoning as a method of managing inholders' property. One of its management objectives proposed to "control the use of private land through a zoning regulation; to control the standards of health and safety of structures on such land through a building regulation."⁸³

On June 30, 1966, Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., forwarded a memorandum to Secretary Udall describing the progress toward the formulation of interim zoning regulations for Olympic. He reported that he had been advised by Assistant Solicitor Bernard "Bernie" Meyer that "an essential of proper zoning for Olympic National Park was the adoption of a comprehensive plan which would become the basis for zoning proposals that bear a direct relationship to the differing circumstances within the park." Realizing that the formulation of such a plan would require at least six months, the assistant solicitor had agreed that "it should be possible to promulgate an emergency regulation having as its sole purpose preservation of the status quo until a general regulation can become effective." Accordingly, Hartzog enclosed a proposed rule to be published in the *Federal Register* to accomplish this.⁸⁴ In an October 13, 1977 interview for the Everett *Herald*, James Flaherty stated that this rule was declared invalid by a court, but no evidence of litigation has been located to date.

The reason for the issuance of this rule seems to have been increasing subdivision activity by inholders. An inspection report by Robert M. Landau of the solicitor's office, prepared after visiting the park from November 17 through November 21, 1966, showed that at both Lake Crescent and the Quinault Valley, inholders were beginning to subdivide in earnest. On November 18, Landau visited the Lake Crescent area. He reported, "The Lake Crescent area contains numerous inholdings which are now being subdivided, or are being considered for subdivision."⁸⁵ On November 21, he visited the Quinault Valley and observed, "The most complex situation, by far, exists in the Quinault area." The first inholding seen when entering the park was a shingle mill, which had recently burned down. Farther up the entry road, Landau saw considerable evidence of subdivision. "Subdivisions are evidenced by signs advertising lots for sale. New

⁸² Ibid., 10-11.

⁸³ Master Plan For Olympic National Park, 4 December 1964, File OLYM Box 3, 8, HFCL.

⁸⁴ Hartzog through Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, to Udall. 30 June 1966. RG 48 Series 6, Olympic, 1-2, Interior Department Records Office.

⁸⁵ Landau to Hartzog. 11 January 1967. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic National Park, 4, Department of the Interior Records Office.

construction is in progress on several lots, and that viewed was substantial in nature. One area, to the left and adjacent to the main access road, has been cleared preparatory to subdivision sale." Arthur Benson owned most of the land between the road and the lake. While its surface seemed suitable for subdivision, its proximity to the lake meant that the subdivision would cause severe health and safety problems. A high water table and large potential for flooding increased the possibility of contamination of the area.⁸⁶

The increasing rate of subdivision alarmed park officials because it posed potential damage to the integrity of the resource. Subdivision also meant that the cost of acquiring the property would increase. It was ironic that at the same time that the Park Service had secured a permanent source of funds to acquire inholdings as a result of the enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Act in 1965, it was faced with the prospect of rapidly growing acquisition costs. Although Landau reported no evidence of it, the implications of the enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Act could not have been lost on the inholders.

The initial reaction of the inholders in the Quinault and every-where else within the park to the proposed rule was negative. For the most part, they attempted to blur the distinction between the privileges attendant to ownership of private property and the right of the secretary of the Interior to regulate privately owned property within the park stated so clearly in the 1962 Quinault Study Committee Report. A report done in 1981 for the Friends of Lake Crescent by Kent Anderson concluded that the rule was "the first time in the history of ONP that the National Park Service proposed to prohibit the rights of the property owners to change their land and its usage." The position of the inholders who responded to the publication of the rule seems to have been that the Park Service could not regulate their use of their lands now because it had not done so before.⁸⁷

As Anderson noted, "The comments the Park Service received in 1966 were not numerous, but they were intense."⁸⁸ Despite the fact that they were not numerous, Bennett Gale, who placed a high priority on positive relations between the park and the local community, moved to reassure the inholders that no grave threat to their property existed. However, he did not retreat from the position that the Park Service could regulate the activity of inholders when that activity was deemed to be detrimental to park values. In response to an inquiry from Representative Lloyd Meeds, Gale responded that "there is no intent to deprive any owner of reasonable use of his

⁸⁶ Ibid., 9-11.

⁸⁷ Kent Anderson. A Socio-Cultural Assessment of Inholders in the Olympic National Park--Lake Crescent and Elwha Valley Area, 1981, 11, Olympic National Park Library.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 12.

property."⁸⁹ Gale left unsaid the fact that the standards of reasonableness would be applied by the Park Service, not the inholder.

What Bennett Gale left unsaid, Roger Allin made quite clear. Allin embraced the policy developed by the Quinault Study Team, and several efforts at subdivision by inholders were met with condemnation proceedings. On March 20, 1973, the acting solicitor for the Department of the Interior requested that the attorney general file a declaration of taking on the property of Harold Sisson. The basis for the action was that "the owners of these tracts are in the process of cutting a road across their land in order to sell lots for trailer campsites." The solicitor had concluded that "this new development would be most adverse to the park's environment and beauty."⁹⁰

On May 9, 1974, Deputy Secretary Douglas Wheeler requested approval from James Haley, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, for condemnation of the land of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Myren. Wheeler reported that the Myrens, who owned land at the park's Elwha Road entrance, were "undertaking to subdivide the property and, at this writing, have sold off at least one lot on a contract sale...should this be allowed to continue, this, the most popular entrance to the park, will be marred by the development of a subdivision of houses and trailers."⁹¹ The request was approved by the pertinent House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on September 25, 1974.⁹²

These condemnations led to the formation of Friends of Lake Crescent, which was founded by Jim Flaherty and Don Jones in the fall of 1973. The Anderson report indicated that "Jones was the first informal 'chairman' of the group while Flaherty became the first President of the F.O.L.C. the following year."⁹³ The group's goals and philosophy were identical to those of the North Shore Association.

In addition to confronting subdivision, Allin also had to deal with logging on private lands in the Quinault Valley. On May 25, 1976, he informed Roger Scott of Barnett/Turlis that he would be required to obtain a permit to use the North Shore Road to transport logs. The next day, he provided the same information to James Gold. Gold did not pursue the matter, but Barnett/Turliss applied for a special permit. As

⁸⁹ Ibid., 11.

⁹⁰ Raymond Carter to the Attorney General. 20 March 1973. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, 1, Department of the Interior Records Officer.

⁹¹ Wheeler to Haley. 9 May 1974. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic, 1, Department of the Interior Records Officer.

⁹² Francis Wiles, Director of Budget to Director, NPS. 25 September 1974. RG 48, Series 6, Olympic National Park, 1, Department of the Interior Records Office.

⁹³ Anderson. A Socio-Cultural Assessment of Inholders, 14-15.

their attorney noted in a July 13, 1976 letter to Allin, they were told that they could use the road only before 10:00 in the morning and after 6:00 in the evening, and had to pay a \$6,000 fee. The attorney questioned the reasonableness of such requirements and Allin replied with justification on July 22. It is not known whether the logging plan was implemented.⁹⁴

By 1976, Allin had decided that legislation was the only hope for a solution to the inholding problems at Olympic. In a September 10, 1976 memorandum to the Pacific Northwest regional director, Allin stated,

I believe the inholding problem best satisfied by legislation which would provide for the continued occupancy and use of privately owned lands and structures by current inholders and their direct lineal descendent heirs...provided the government be given a first refusal option to buy the land at fair market value plus relocation costs in advance of such time as it would be made available for public sale.

Allin also believed that Congress should define the extent to which owners could manipulate their property. "Legislation should specifically authorize that additions, modifications or improvements to inholding properties would be permitted for personal, non-commercial purposes, but such developments would not be subject to compensation at the time of sale."⁹⁵

Allin's 1976 Master Plan accepted the policy developed by the 1962 Quinault Study Committee. It stated that "privately owned lands within the park will be acquired as they become available under the 'opportunity purchase policy' from willing sellers; acquisition by eminent-domain procedures will be recommended when adverse or inappropriate uses such as subdivision or logging threaten park values."⁹⁶ Yet, while Allin agreed with the committee's policy, he did not agree with their conclusion that the private inholdings in the Quinault Valley should remain within the park. He did not favor any large removals, but his master plan called for the removal of the inholdings along the North Shore Road, some 2,152.5 acres, and the road right of way from the park.⁹⁷

Allin's effort to remove the private inholdings in the Quinault Valley were successfully opposed by local and national conservation groups, with Olympic Park Associates leading the opposition. Three days after Allin's master plan was formally approved, Congress enacted legislation altering the boundaries of the park. That legislation authorized the

⁹⁴ Allin to Dennis Harlowe. 21 July 1973. RG 79, Accession 79-84-0006, File 3027 OLYM, 1-2, Sand Point FRC.

⁹⁵ Allin to Regional Director, PNR. 10 September 1976. Glenn Gallison Papers.

⁹⁶ Olympic National Park Master Plan, 18 October 1976, 27, Olympic National Park Library.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 68.

secretary to exclude private lands in the Quinault Valley from the park. However, it also stated that "prior to excluding such lands from the park, the secretary shall study and investigate current and prospective uses of the private lands, as well as the implications of their exclusion both for the lands involved and for Olympic National Park."⁹⁸

The secretary was to report within two years after enactment, and the report was then subject to a congressional veto. The secretary did not report to Congress before the Supreme Court declared that legislative veto procedures were unconstitutional, and the land has remained within the park.⁹⁹

Allin's personal relations with inholders were not always cordial. However, Anderson's report indicated that the procedures of the Land Acquisition Office were the cause of much inholder unease. Anderson noted that "The LAO often seemed to function independently from the Superintendent."¹⁰⁰ When Allin retired at the end of 1976, the decision was made to take a more conciliatory course with the inholders, and, as noted in chapter 6, James Coleman was instructed to pursue such an approach.

However, in the fall of 1977, NPS Director William Whalen announced a policy for land acquisition which aroused the inholders. Basically, it embodied Allin's recommendations, except that it contained severe restrictions against any structural improvements. It stated that "substantial alterations to existing improvements, including major additions to existing structures, constitutes an incompatible act." Friends of Lake Crescent contended that the policy violated Section 5 of the act creating the park and protested vigorously.

No changes in policy occurred during Coleman's abbreviated tenure, and Coleman's ability to maintain good relations with the inholders probably minimized tension. However, on June 18, 1979, Director Whalen participated in an acrimonious meeting with the inholders at Port Angeles at which he defended his policies. The next morning he met again with the inholders and made some conciliatory commitments. He agreed to rewrite the land acquisition policy to clarify and relax some of its requirements and to consider reassigning Land Acquisition Office personnel. However, as the Port Angeles *Daily News* reported, he stood firm on one issue: "inholders will not be allowed to sell or give their inholdings to anyone other than members of their immediate families or to the park service, unless the United State Congress says differently."¹⁰¹

⁹⁸U.S. Statutes At Large, Vol. 90: 2740.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Anderson, A Socio-Cultural Assessment of Inholders, 1981, 15.

¹⁰¹ Port Angeles *Daily News*, 20 June 1979, File OLYM Box 2, 1, HFCL.

As a result of this meeting, a new policy was formulated which required each park to prepare a land acquisition plan. That task fell to Roger Contor, who completed it in March 1980. He presented a preliminary land acquisition plan which contained significant concessions to the inholders. They were allowed to construct additions to existing structures, they could sell to whomever they chose, and the owners of thirty-two vacant lots along Lake Crescent would be allowed to build on those lots if they did so within five years. Further, condemnation proceedings would be instituted on a case by case basis with the approval of the House Appropriation Committee, and only in those instances where serious environmental damage could be shown.¹⁰²

However, the plan also contained one provision designed to minimize development along Lake Crescent. The lots in the area were consolidated into tracts by owner and only one structure for each tract was permitted. Therefore, owners of more than one lot were prevented from placing a structure on each of their properties.¹⁰³

With the appointment of James Watt, all parks were required to develop Land Protection Plans to replace the land acquisition plans. Watt also placed a moratorium on the addition of new land to the park system on February 17, 1981. In an April 16 memo to all Regional Directors, NPS Director Russell Dickenson defined the parameters of the moratorium. He indicated that it was to continue through fiscal year 1982, and that the monies in the Land and Water Conservation Fund could be used to pay only "administrative costs...deficiencies in condemnation cases and related costs; a limited number of hardship and emergency purchases; and the monitoring of active state and local projects funded in the previous state grant program of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service." After outlining the exceptions, Dickenson directed the regional directors to halt all activity relating to land acquisition, except for donations, transfers or exchanges, which were to be undertaken on a "case-by-case basis."¹⁰⁴

Contor's March 1983 Land Protection Plan met with immense inholder hostility, because he had reinstated many of the 1977 restrictions on the use of their property. The plan used language similar to Gale's 1965 Master Plan Brief in justifying the acquisition of inholdings. Especially upsetting to the inholders was the statement that "private inholdings within the park boundary directly and adversely degrade the integrity of Olympic." The plan also contained uncomplimentary photos.¹⁰⁵ In general, the plan

¹⁰² Anderson, 23-24.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Dickenson to All Regional Directors and Project Manager, Appalachian Trail Project Office. 16 April 1981. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, DOI Records Officer.

¹⁰⁵ Helen and Fred Radke to Roger Contor. 10 May 1983. RG 79, File L1425 OLYM, 2, NPS Records Office.

reflected a more militant attitude toward protecting the park's resources and preserving its integrity than the earlier land acquisition plan. In attitude, it was much closer to Allin's philosophy than Coleman's, and the same negative relations between Superintendent Contor and the inholders appeared.

When Superintendent Chandler succeeded Contor, he made some conciliatory modifications in the Land Protection Plan to improve relations with the inholders. He also succeeded in persuading both the service and the department that the only successful method of acquisition at Olympic is full fee. Further, by his own admission, he was fortunate that land prices declined during his administration. As a result of all these factors, he grasped the opportunity to move aggressively in the area of land acquisition.¹⁰⁶

Several patterns can be seen in the park's relations with inholders. First, the secretary of the Interior clearly has the right to impose regulations on private property owners within the park. The extent to which regulation impacts on property rights has been the cause of most of the tension between property owners and the Park Service. Second, in its selection of superintendents, the Park Service has alternated between aggressively protecting the park's integrity and establishing positive relations with the inholders. Since the days of Bennett Gale, a superintendent emphasizing positive relations has been succeeded by one who emphasized park integrity. Finally, the number of inholders objecting to park management policies is usually a minority among the property owners. As Superintendent Chandler observed, "There are always willing sellers in Olympic."¹⁰⁷

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The relationships between the park and the government of Washington state, and the park and its surrounding communities have followed the pattern of the relationship between the park and the Forest Service. As discussed in chapter 4, state and local governments were initially opposed to the creation of any park, and particularly opposed to the inclusion of a significant amount of timber within the park after its establishment was made inevitable by President Roosevelt.

The state agency leading the opposition to a large park was the Washington State Planning Council, headed by Ross K. Tiffany. Its July 1938 *Bulletin* announcing the establishment of the Park summarized its position: "It is believed that had public opinion in the state of Washington, expressed through its chambers of commerce and other public bodies, been more clearly defined, a park of much smaller area, more in keeping with the recommendations of the Council and Governor, would have been adopted by Congress." In response to the provision allowing the president to add more areas to the

¹⁰⁶ Robert Chandler. Interview.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

park, the *Bulletin* concluded, "In view of the present provision to add still more acreage to the present boundaries it behooves public bodies to give immediate study to the question and to express themselves to the President, to Governor Martin, and to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior."¹⁰⁸

Local governments also opposed the establishment and enlargement of the park for economic reason. As early as 1935, Superintendent Tomlinson reported the results of a meeting with the Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

Following my talk, I answered questions for about half an hour. Two main points were covered by the questioners, indicating that the people of Port Townsend and Jefferson County are pretty much concerned with the threatened loss of revenue now derived from the Forest Service if the area is made a national park. The County Treasurer stated that Jefferson County now receives about \$16,000 annually as its share of the national Forest revenue. He asked what the Park Service proposes to do to offset this revenue.¹⁰⁹

In addition to raising political opposition to the park, state and local government agencies maintained jurisdiction over the lands within the park. On July 1, two days after the enactment of the legislation creating the park, Superintendent Tomlinson wrote to Director Cammerer seeking clarification on the issue of jurisdiction: "Several inquiries have been received from County and State Game officials and owners of private property regarding police authority and licensing jurisdiction on Federal lands and privately-owned property within the newly-created Olympic National Park." The questions ranged from Clallam County's ability to continue to license and regulate pinball machines and other slots to the regulation of hunting on private property within the park. Tomlinson requested a response as soon as possible.¹¹⁰

Cammerer replied on July 21. He reported that, because the Washington state legislature had not yet ceded jurisdiction, the laws of the state were in force within the park. However, they could be enforced only where they did not "seriously interfere with the protection, use and control of the lands by the United States for park purposes. The authority of the United States is paramount in such matters." Further, although the U.S. was considered to be another proprietor within the state, "by reason of its ownership of lands, [it] possesses a power with relation to such lands which is analogous to the police power of the states."¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ Tomlinson to Director. 1 August 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 600, pt. 1, NA.

¹⁰⁹ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 23 March 1935. RG 79 Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 5, 1, NA.

¹¹⁰ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 1 July 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000 General, pt. 16, 1, NA.

¹¹¹ Cammerer to Tomlinson. 21 July 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, 1, NA.

In short, the U.S. exercised concurrent jurisdiction with the state over its lands within the park that it owned. However, it had no authority over privately owned lands within the park. Cammerer noted that "on the privately owned lands, the police power of the state is unaffected by the authority of the Federal Government. Therefore, it appears that all licensing and other regulatory provisions of the state laws may be enforced on all private lands as heretofore."¹¹²

Cammerer also offered an analogy using fishing licenses. He pointed out that in parks where states exercised concurrent jurisdiction, "as a matter of comity, the park regulations usually provide for the purpose of enforcing the license requirements [of the state]." However, state officials were still entitled to enter the park and enforce their fishing regulations.¹¹³

The state agency most hostile to the establishment of Olympic was the State Game Commission. Tomlinson reported the attitude of that agency in a November 9, 1938, memo to NPS Supervisor of Fish Resources David Madsen. He noted that no discussions had been held with the state game staff "because of their extreme prejudice, which we have known from the beginning."

He related an incident which involved Fred Overly, at that time one of the few permanent employees at Olympic. Overly and another ranger named Lewis Buckmaster had arrested three men for killing an elk in the Hoh Valley. The men claimed that they were not aware that a park had been established and had entered the area at night, so they failed to see the boundary signs. On his way to deliver the men to the U.S. commissioner at Port Angeles, Overly stopped at the State Game Checking Station to be sure that the elk carcass was there. During this stop:

Chief Protector Loughery advised the three arrested men that the Park Service has no authority to arrest them or seize their elk, which they were entitled to because they had paid for State game licenses. Some discussion followed with Overly informing the state game protector that he was a Federal officer and that the slaughtered elk was in a Federal car, and that if they took it by force he would have to furnish a receipt and state the circumstances.¹¹⁴

The three men chose to cast their fate with Overly. Richard Van Vleet, the one who actually killed the elk, was eventually convicted and fined \$25.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid., 2.

¹¹⁴ Macy to David Madsen, Supervisor of Fish Resources. 9 November 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Mt. Olympus, File 715-Wildlife, pt. 1, NA.

Tomlinson also informed Madsen that, in addition to harassing Park Service personnel, members of the state game staff were lobbying in the state legislature to prevent the enactment of legislation ceding jurisdiction to the United States. "In reference to state legislation for ceding jurisdiction of the Olympic National Park to the Federal government, some members of the State Game Department have been canvassing candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives, asking that they oppose any bill that may be submitted for that purpose."¹¹⁵

Despite this opposition, the Washington state legislature enacted legislation on March 16, 1939, ceding jurisdiction over "all the territory that is now or may hereafter be included in that tract of land in the State of Washington set aside for the purposes of a national park." When Congress reviewed this language in its effort to enact legislation to accept the cession of jurisdiction, questions concerning its precise meaning arose. Therefore, the state legislature amended its law on March 8, 1941 and ceded jurisdiction over all land in the park on that date. This cession was accepted by Congress on March 6, 1942, and jurisdiction was formally assumed by Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes on January 1, 1944.¹¹⁶

Despite these actions, friction between the park and the state game director continued after World War II. Superintendent Macy's October 1946 monthly report stated that the "State Attorney General declined to reverse his opinion on the jurisdiction over private lands in the park and the State Game Director refused to close the 3 month open season on elk on private lands in the park."¹¹⁷

However, relations with the fishery management section of the State Game Department seems to have been positive. Superintendent Macy cooperated with the state's effort in the latter years of the 1940s to conserve the steelhead population by amending his regulations to assure that they were identical to the state's.¹¹⁸ Macy also developed a cooperative agreement with the State for fire protection, which was "to remain in effect until cancelled at the request of either party."¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 1-2.

¹¹⁶ Ickes to Governor Langlie. 26 November 1943. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 2, File 12-47 Olympic, Administrative, pt. 1, 1, NA.

¹¹⁷ Summary, Superintendent's Narrative Report, October 1946, RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 207-02.3, NA.

¹¹⁸ Macy to Region 4 Director Tomlinson. 20 September 1949. Accession 61A362, File W42 OLYM, 2, NPS Records Office.

¹¹⁹ Mission 66 Prospectus, Olympic National Park, 11 May 1956, File OLYM 204, 84, HFCL.

After succeeding Macy as superintendent, Fred Overly continued to work closely with the Fisheries Management Division of the State Department of Game. He further revised the park's fishing regulations in October 1953 to assist the state in preserving the steelhead run and had a good working relationship with that agency.¹²⁰

Overly also attempted to interact positively with the Department of Game by developing and recommending for approval regulations that authorized hunters to stay at accommodations and campsites within the park. Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay approved these regulations on July 7, 1953.¹²¹

Some strain in relations with the state resulted from President Truman's January 6, 1953 executive order adding the Queets Corridor and the Coastal Strip to the park. Local protest by the timber industry and its associates led Governor Arthur Langlie to establish a committee to develop recommendations to reduce the park. As discussed in chapter 4, the committee failed to develop specific recommendations and the minority report offered sound evidence to support not reducing the park.

Aside from the protests, however, the executive order caused new jurisdictional problems. Section 10 of the March 6, 1942 Act by which Congress had accepted the state's 1941 cession of jurisdiction, contained the phrase "now and hereafter" and, as noted above, the state act did not. However, the state legislature amended its legislation in 1945, two years after the May 29, 1943 executive order, adding the Morse Creek drainage to the park, to include this same phrase. Therefore, it seems to have been assumed by all parties that the Truman executive order was in itself sufficient to vest the Park Service with sole jurisdiction over all the lands it described.

Nevertheless, on April 29, 1960, Acting NPS Director E.T. Scoyen recommended that the secretary of the Interior formally accept cession of jurisdiction. Scoyen pointed out that "the United States has exclusive jurisdiction in most of the main body of the park, but only proprietorial jurisdiction in the Queest Corridor, the Olympic Ocean Strip, and the land added by the Proclamations. This lack of uniform jurisdiction and the difference between the State and park regulations as to hunting and fishing add greatly to the problem of administering and protecting the areas and causes confusion to the public and park staff." Scoyen also indicated that Superintendent Dan Beard had held a

¹²⁰ Overly to Region 4 Director. 8 October 1952. Accession 61A362, File W42 OLYM, 1-2, NPS Records Office.

¹²¹ NPS Director Conrad Wirth to McKay. 1 July 1953. Accession 61A362, File W42 OLYM, 1-2, NPS Records Office.

preliminary discussion with the governor's administrative assistant and that the state agreed with the service.¹²²

Secretary Fred Seaton accepted the cession of jurisdiction from Governor Albert Rosselini effective July 12, 1960. The state retained jurisdiction over State Highway 9, two gravel pits used to quarry material to surface the road, and "the area of Forks," which was too remote from the park to be made part of it.¹²³

State relations with the park stabilized during the 1960s. The only mention of administrative difficulty was caused by another jurisdictional problem. Superintendent Gale pointed out in the 1965 Master Plan Brief that "the fact that the beaches and other tidelands along the Coastal section are owned by the State of Washington presents the problem of mixed jurisdiction and complicates to some extent the resource management and visitor management and use programs." His solution was "to acquire the intertidal zone, and possibly certain nearby islands, adjoining the Pacific Coast Area from the State of Washington. As an alternate to encourage State legislation to protect adjacent park values within the intertidal zone."¹²⁴

This jurisdictional problem arose from a decision made during the PWA acquisition process in 1939 and 1940. In a letter to the Justice Department discussing the progress of the acquisition of the Coastal Strip, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman indicated that "it is the intention of this Department to acquire tide lands and shore lands and some additional area that will bring the total lands to be acquired to 49,954.13 acres."¹²⁵

At that time, the state evidently wished to retain ownership of the tidelands. By 1942, it had developed a Declaration of Policy which stated, in part, that "IT IS HEREBY DECLARED to be the policy of the State of Washington that no part of the tidelands along the shore of the Pacific Ocean from the mouth of the Queets River to Cape Flattery shall ever be sold or otherwise disposed of, and the State shall not use or allow any part of said tidelands to be use for any purpose detrimental to the public parkway and recreational area now being established by the United States of America." Although Superintendent Macy objected to allowing the state to retain control of the tidelands, this

¹²² Scoyen to the Secretary of the Interior. 29 April 1960. RG 48, Central Classified Files, Series 6, Olympic, 2, Department of the Interior Records Officer.

¹²³ NPS Press Release, 12 July 1960, Accession 61A231, File 601 OLYM General, 1, NPS Records Office.

¹²⁴ Master Plan Brief For Olympic National Park, 6 November 1965, File OLYM Box 3, 7, 9 HFCL.

¹²⁵ Chapman to Assistant Attorney General Nomran Littell. 7 December 1939. RG 48, Central Classified Files, File 12-47 Olympic--Lands, pt. 1, NA.

statement seems to have satisfied the Department of the Interior and the Justice Department, because the lands below high water mark were not acquired.¹²⁶

This decision had significant negative consequences. On March 9, 1959, Superintendent Beard reported, "It is very obvious to me that state ownership of the tidelands is a real threat to the Park. Bulldozers work up and down the beaches salvaging logs. Elk, deer, and raccoon are killed along the beach on state land (and sometimes on ours). Seals are shot for bounty in the breaker line and on offshore rocks." Beard concluded, "It would be a very definite recommendation from me to extend the Park boundaries into the water and to include the offshore islands. If there are future boundary adjustments we might consider exchanging lands to be deleted from the Park for the beaches and intertidal zone."¹²⁷

John Doerr, who succeeded Beard, also recognized the need to acquire the tidelands and the implicit threat to their resources that state ownership and management posed. One of his 1964 Master Plan's management goals was "to acquire title to the intertidal zone, and possibly certain nearby islands." Failing that, the master plan called for persuading the state to manage the area in accordance with "Park values."¹²⁸

In his 1972 Annual Report, Roger Allin raised the same issue: "The ocean beaches below the high water mark are State property. The NPS administers them along the Ocean Strip above the high water mark. This causes problems in administering park regulations, law enforcement, etc., as well as confusion in the visitors' minds." Allin's approach to resolving this problem typified his approach to dealing with other governmental entities. "We are working with the State on beach management to try to develop a workable arrangement for future years."¹²⁹

Likewise, in other areas, Allin moved to create positive working relationships with the state agencies that interacted with the park. In his 1973 Annual Report, he announced the "execution of a cooperative agreement with the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission covering joint management of the seacoast." He also made very effort to maintain a good working relationship with the State Department of Highways in joint park-state road maintenance operations.¹³⁰ Allin also negotiated with the

¹²⁶ Joseph Taylor, Land Acquisition Coordinator, to Director. 22 May 1942. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 601, pt. 2, 1, NA.

¹²⁷ Beard to director, 9 March 1959. File OLYM Box 3,2, HFCCO.

¹²⁸ Master Plan for Olympic National Park, 4 December 1964, pt. 3, File OLYM Box 3, 2, HFCL.

¹²⁹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, File OLYM Box 2, 26, HFCL.

¹³⁰ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1972, File OLYM Box 2, 17, HFCL.

Washington State Department of Game to assist in the removal of mountain goats from the park.¹³¹

Allin's annual reports in general show a successful effort to maintain positive relations through consultation and cooperation with all state agencies whose missions related to the park. James Coleman, Allin's successor, seems to have continued this effort. His 1977 Annual Report noted that "Park Naturalist Janet Scharf joined with DNR personnel to present Smokey Bear fire prevention programs in every Port Angeles and Crescent elementary school."¹³²

Superintendent Contor continued the cooperative efforts established by Allin and maintained by Coleman. The goat removal program was expanded and cooperation with the State Department of Game was continued.¹³³ Contor's 1983 Statement for Management indicated that the "agreement for the cooperative management of the state beachlands along the coastal strip from Cape Alava to Kalaloch" with the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission was still in effect: "The National Park Service agreed to assign personnel to beach law enforcement patrols, provide interpretation and informational service, and assume primary search and rescue responsibilities." In return, the State Commission "will make an effort in critical situations to obtain state and county resources to assist the Service in meeting emergency demands and in expediting the deputization of Service personnel." The two parties would continue to work together "to provide for the cleanliness and sanitation of the beach, consider joint management actions, and furnish assistance in providing for safe routes across headlands."¹³⁴

However, the statement also indicated that some problems could emerge. One involved jurisdiction. On October 21, 1976, Congress added land to the park. The statement noted that these lands

are administered under proprietary jurisdiction as the governor has not been notified that the United States will accept and assume jurisdiction over the newly added areas or return sole jurisdiction to the State. The 1976 Act granted general authority to the Secretary of the Interior to relinquish (retrocede) exclusive jurisdiction to concurrent jurisdiction to the state; however, that authority has not been exercised by the Secretary.¹³⁵

¹³¹ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1975, Annual Report Collection, 7, HFCL.

¹³² Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1977, 7, Olympic National Park Library.

¹³³ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1981, 1, Olympic National Park Library.

¹³⁴ Statement for Management, Olympic National Park, Superintendent's File, 3, Olympic National Park.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

Another potential area of disagreement between the park and other surrounding entities involves fishery management goals. Contor's statement called for "assuring preservation of native wild fish stocks through reduction or elimination of stock transfers and prevention of over harvest."¹³⁶ This goal conflicts with the need of the commercial fishing entities on the peninsula and, to some extent, with the goals of the state's Department of Natural Resources. Further evidence of this emerging conflict can be seen in the 1984 Annual Report, which noted that "State agencies" as well as tribes and other fishing interests were disregarding the park's fish management goals.¹³⁷

On November 7, 1986, Congress enacted legislation to revise the park's boundaries, which were extended to low water mark and to certain small islands formerly under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service (100 Stat. 3527). This legislation is in part, therefore, an attempt to remedy the jurisdictional problems discussed above. It is possible that implementing the provisions of the act will cause as many problems as it solves, but that remains to be seen. In general, relations with state agencies and local governments have followed the same pattern as with the Forest Service and federal entities other than Indian tribes. The relations have evolved from overt hostility to the park's existence to relatively technical differences that arise from the conflict inherent in differing agency missions.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS

From its inception, Olympic National Park has been a focal point for national and local conservation organizations. The local organizations, particularly Olympic Park Associates, serve as on-hand observers for the national organizations. When they are supported in their position on any Park administrative decision by the national organizations and/or prominent state politicians, they often prevail.

The role of the national leaders and organizations, such as Rosalie Edge and the Emergency Conservation Committee, and local organizations, such as Arthur Vollmer and the Mount Olympus National Park Association, has been discussed in chapter 4. The following account by Preston Macy, given during an interview with Herb Evison, offers a pattern of interaction between national and local organizations that was repeated during the efforts to establish the park. Macy, who at the time was custodian of Mount Olympus National Monument, recounted that when he learned of the pending visit by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1937, he called on the forest supervisor and "requested that space be provided at Lake Crescent Tavern for Supt. Tomlinson" upon the president's arrival. The supervisor informed Macy that the Secret Service had indicated that no space was available.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 25.

¹³⁷ Superintendent's Annual Report, Olympic National Park, 1984, 4, Annual Report Collection, HFCL.

Macy then recalled, "I therefore went to Ellsworth Lumley, a well-known conservationist in Seattle, also a friend of mine, and gave him the picture. He immediately got in touch with Rosalie Edge in New York." As a result, "The morning of the President's visit, Major Tomlinson was called by C. J. Buck, Regional Forester, in Portland, Ore." who informed Tomlinson that the president wanted him to attend the meetings to be held at Lake Crescent Lodge that evening.¹³⁸

In short, national conservation organizations worked with local organizations in the effort to establish Olympic National Park. In his first Annual Report, Superintendent Macy cited the Northwest Conservation League, the Washington State Grange, the local chapter of the Mountaineers, and the Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce as local organizations which worked for the park. He also singled out certain individuals for recognition: "Mr. Irving Clark, Mr. Ellsworth Lumley, Mr. William G. Schulz, and Mrs. Margaret Thompson."¹³⁹ Mr. Clark headed the Mountaineers, Mrs. Thompson the Northwest Conservation League, and Mr. Lumley is discussed above.

Local and national conservation organizations also played a large role in defining the management philosophy of the new park. On July 19, 1938, Superintendent Tomlinson reported to the director on a meeting of a Seattle conservation group. The group had "passed a resolution somewhat similar to the resolution adopted recently by the Northwest Conservation League, asking that Olympic National Park be administered as a wilderness park." This meant that "no additional roads be constructed, with the possible exception of a few miles connecting the existing Forest Service truck trails ending at Obstruction Point and Deer Park, and no additional concession be granted."¹⁴⁰

Local and national conservationists also worked to ensure that the largest possible amount of rain forest be included in the presidential additions to the park authorized by the establishing legislation. Specifically, a controversial proposed addition was the lower Bogachiel. In a January 4, 1939 memo to the director, Region 4 Director Frank Kittredge reported his conclusions concerning the lands to be added to the park. His recommendations did not contain the lower Bogachiel Valley. On the same date, Irving Clark addressed a letter to Secretary Ickes on the same subject. He stated that "Mr. Irving Brant and others have suggested that the lower part of the Bogachiel valley within the national forest might be left out without serious damage to the park." Clark disagreed, "In its present state this watershed has very good natural protection from fire,

¹³⁸ Preston Macy. Interview by Herb Evison.

¹³⁹ Macy to Director. 13 July 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 000, General, pt. 16, NA.

¹⁴⁰ Tomlinson to Cammerer. 19 July 1938. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File Administrative General, pt. 1, 1, NA.

but if there is any logging in the valley, the fire hazard will be tremendously increased."¹⁴¹

The increased fire hazard would threaten what was to Clark the most important west side river valley. He pointed out that

It is the least changed from the primitive. Inside the forest boundary there is no road; nothing but trails. There has been no over-grazing, so that the plant life is still intact. All the main forest trees typical of the region are found here, and in all stages of growth--from the sapling to the overmature giant. All the leading game species of the Olympics are present. The Bogachiel is the only large stream in the Olympics of clear water, unclouded by glacial silt. In short, this valley presents the most perfect example of the Pacific-Cascade region of a wilderness forest of the lowland type.¹⁴²

Clark's eloquence persuaded Ickes to recommend that President Roosevelt include the lower Bogachiel in his January 3, 1940 proclamation adding lands to the park. Roosevelt signed the proclamation, despite a last-minute objection by Governor Martin (see chapter 4).

Roosevelt's proclamation did not end this disagreement, however. Several efforts were made to remove the lower Bogachiel from the park. In 1947 and in 1953, advocates of removing the valley mounted campaigns for its removal. In both cases, these campaigns failed, due in large measure to the strength the national and local conservation organizations derived from the nation's interest in Olympic. National and local conservationists also played a key role in combatting efforts in 1962 and 1966 to remove portions of the north shore of Lake Quinault from the park. In all of the above cases, the national and local conservation organizations were successful in large part because they could energize a larger congressional constituency than the other side. As protectors of the park, national and local conservation groups have proven to be valuable allies.

However, national and local conservation organizations have also intruded upon specific management practices within the park. No problems seem to have occurred during Preston Macy's tenure. However, beginning with the administration of Fred Overly, national and local conservation groups have at times gone beyond protecting the park to influencing the management of the park. This practice holds the potential for disagreement with park administrators and can generally be traced to a difference of opinion over the validity of specific management decisions.

¹⁴¹ Clark to Ickes. 4 January 1939. RG 79, Central Classified Files, Olympic, File 602, pt. 1, 1, NA.

¹⁴² Ibid.

In Overly's case, the disagreement arose over his timber salvage operations, which were discussed in chapter 8. Overly had begun the timber salvage operations while still chief of realty, Washington Office, in 1950. At its 1951 annual meeting, the Wilderness Society passed a resolution which expressed concern over the implications of timber salvage operations by the Park Service and established a committee to study and report on conditions service-wide. That committee, chaired by Arthur Winder and consisting of Olaus Murie, Leo Gallagher, John Osseward, and Irving Clark, inspected the areas cut over at Olympic as part of its effort to evaluate the impact of timber salvage on Park Service resources.¹⁴³

This committee issued an ambiguous report in 1952. It found that at Olympic unauthorized cutting had not occurred and that the properties acquired through the effort "constitute a great gain for the park, and it may be that the operations in blowdown areas reduce the fire hazard." Yet it also concluded that "your committee believes, however, that precisely because of these immense advantages, the temptation in a continuing program of this kind will almost inevitably lead to abuses."¹⁴⁴

Despite the committee's recommendation, despite the Wilderness Society's subsequent resolution supporting the committee position, and despite NPS Director Wirth's assurance to Irving Clark and Olaus Murie that the timber salvage program at Olympic would be curtailed, it continued to grow until 1956. Two events in that year brought the disagreement to a critical stage. The first was a set of remarks by Overly in defending his management practices, which were forwarded to Wirth by Olaus Murie. The second was a September 23, 1956 telegram from Paul Shephard, conservation chairman of the National Council of State Garden Clubs, informing the Wilderness Society that he had "personally seen severe logging damage at Lake Crescent, Sol Duc, Bogachiel, Hoh, Quinault, and Olympic Hot Springs."¹⁴⁵

On October 19, 1956, Olaus Murie sent Wirth a letter reminding him of several past conversations in which Wirth had agreed to curtail Park Service timber salvage practices. Murie observed that the initial Wilderness Society report had been relatively modest in its demands, because Wirth had indicated that he would reverse the Olympic timber salvage operation. He also reminded Wirth, "Subsequently I talked with you, and told you that in my presence the superintendent said he wanted the boundaries of Olympic Park reduced. He had also said that eventually we must lumber our national parks generally." Finally, Murie noted that at the Wilderness Conference at Portland in the

¹⁴³ National Park Timber Policy, October 1956, Irving Clark Papers.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 3, 11.

spring of 1956, Overly had heatedly defended lumbering at Olympic in the face of criticism of the practice.¹⁴⁶

Murie quoted Overly as saying he was "proud of" his timber salvage efforts. From Overly's point of view, he had ample reason to feel that way. The 1952 Wilderness Society report had agreed that he had used the timber to acquire valuable additions to the park, and by the spring of 1956, had made considerable progress toward completing the Pioneer Memorial Museum with timber salvaged from clearing the right of way for the new road to Hurricane Ridge. From Overly's perspective, the primary management goal was to improve the park for the benefit of the visitor.

Conservationists, however, did not share Overly's definition of improvement, nor did they agree with the methods by which he was attaining this improvement through the economic exploitation of the park's resources. Executive Secretary Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society enunciated this difference in an October 3, 1956 letter to Wirth. He joined other letter writers protesting timber salvage operations at Olympic, adding, "we would urge you not only to order a cessation of the logging operations now being protested but also to take immediate steps toward a firm policy of safeguarding all the national parks and monuments against any program whereby resources of the National Park System are used as commodities for purposes."¹⁴⁷

Shephard's telegram to the Wilderness Society led to an inspection trip by Regional Director Merriam. He inspected the sites of timber salvage in the company of John Osseward, Philip Zalesky, Patrick Goldsworthy, and Mrs. John Dyer. He reported to Wirth by telephone on October 2 that many of Shephard's statements were exaggerated. He concluded, "If we can develop a sound policy and convince them we are not going all over Olympic and take out salvage stuff, we won't have too much trouble with them."¹⁴⁸

Wirth accepted Merriam's conclusion. He met with a conservationist group at the Seattle/Tacoma airport on the evening of October 15 after attending a hearing in Seattle on his Mission 66 Program for Mt. Rainier. He agreed to issue a policy statement embodying their position that Park Service resources were not to be viewed as potential revenue or be exploited to generate revenue.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 10-11.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 7.

¹⁴⁸ Telephone Report from Regional Director Merriam. 2 October 1956. RG 79, Accession 60A495, File Y3415 OLYM, 3-4, NPS Records Office.

¹⁴⁹ Wirth to Goldsworthy. 30 October 1956. RG 79, Accession 60A495, File Y3415, 1, NPS Records Office.

None of Overly's successors has had such strained relations with national and local conservation groups. As noted in chapter 6, Dan Beard correctly perceived that his role as superintendent was in part to ease the tension between conservationist organizations and the park. He succeeded in doing so, and his successors have recognized the need to take into account conservationist positions as part of their management decision-making process.

Most disagreements between conservation groups and superintendents have come over the size of the park. During the process of establishing Olympic, Rosalie Edge and Willard Van Name consistently argued for a larger park than the Park Service advocated. A more modern illustration of such disagreements between conservationists and the service can be seen during the early 1970s efforts to have Olympic declared a wilderness area. Everyone agreed that an extensive portion of the park should be declared a wilderness, but the preliminary wilderness proposals included, at the direction of Pacific Northwest Regional Director John Rutter, enclaves within the wilderness areas. Most conservation organizations objected to this concept, and their opposition aided Superintendent Roger Allin's efforts to have the concept removed from the management plan at the Departmental level.¹⁵⁰ Similar disagreements occurred during the formulation of the 1976 boundary adjustment legislation and the 1986 legislation.

The Overly timber salvage controversy was the most significant instance in which conservation groups attempted to alter specific management practices. However, the evolution in park resource management practices discussed in chapter 8 has created the possibility of such intrusion. One potential instance is the goat elimination program. The planned actions, if proven to be traumatic to the goats, will encounter the opposition of the SPCA.¹⁵¹ Changes in fire management policy may also invite criticism, if not thoroughly adhered to.

Within the last ten years, Olympic has received recognition from international conservation organizations. On May 18, 1977, Superintendent James Coleman announced that the United Nations had designated the park as part of its Man and Biosphere Program. Coleman noted that the program "recognizes selected areas throughout the world as part of an international network of Biosphere Reserves" to "provide a standard against which can be measured the effect of man's impact on his environment."¹⁵²

On November 9, 1981, Superintendent Roger Contor announced that Olympic had been recognized as a World Heritage Park. The dedication ceremony took place on June 29,

¹⁵⁰ Roger Allin. Interview.

¹⁵¹ Robert Chandler. Interview.

¹⁵² NPS News Release, 18 May 1977, File OLYM Box 2, HFCL.

1982, the forty-fourth anniversary of the enactment of the legislation establishing the park. As part of the ceremony, Dr. Michel Batisse, deputy assistant director of Science at UNESCO, presented a plaque to Director Russell Dickenson. It read:

Through the collective recognition of the community of nations expressed within principles of the convention concerning protection of the world cultural and natural heritage, Olympic National Park has been designated a World Heritage Site and joins a select list of protected areas around the world whose outstanding natural and cultural resources form the common inheritance of all mankind.¹⁵³

Such a designation is the logical outcome of the policy pursued by the original advocates of a large park, who were led by President Franklin Roosevelt.

¹⁵³ World Heritage Plaque Inscription, 27 October 1981, Superintendent's Files--World Heritage Site, Olympic National Park.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Upon completion of this project, the single most important collection of primary sources will be the Olympic National Park - History Collection, which will consist of all documents cited in this work, and a considerable number of other archival documents which contain information deemed relevant to the history of the park. This collection will be permanently housed in the park's library.

The single most important source of information for the period 1933-49 is Record Group 79 Central Classified Files, which is housed in the National Archives in Washington, D.C. It is Entry 7 in the Preliminary Inventory for RG 79. Entry 6 also contains some useful information for the period 1916-33. A second useful collection found in the National Archives is Record Group 48, Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, Series 12, Parts 1 and 2. Part 1 covers the years 1907-36 and Part 2 covers 1937-53. All Secretarial records after 1953 are held by the Records Officer of the Department of the Interior. These records contain information on those activities at Olympic that were raised to the Secretarial level. Olympic is found in Files 12-34 in Part 1 and 12-47 in Part 2. These records cover the period from 1933-53. The audio visual branch of the archives also contains some audio taped interviews by Herb Evison, who interviewed Preston Macy, Fred Overly, and Dan Beard. Overly's tape is missing.

The post-1949 collection in Record Group 79 is extremely difficult to use because, for Olympic, it is virtually inaccessible. These records have not been turned over to the National Archives Records Administration, and therefore, responsibility for management of these records remains with the Park Service. Olympic no longer has a copy of the accession lists of the records it has turned over to Federal Records Centers. Therefore, the park has no knowledge of what records it has turned over or in which repository those records were placed. Accession lists at the Suitland and Sand Point Federal Records Centers and the Pacific Northwest Regional Office, were reviewed and for the most part, found to be lacking in a detailed description of the nature of the records accessioned. It seems that most records retained in Federal Records Centers are not submitted on a park specific basis.

This is not to say that no significant record collections for the post-1949 period can be found. A small portion of these records have been preserved and made accessible through the work of Park Service Personnel. For Olympic, and probably for most parks, the single most useful repository for information from 1950 through the early 1980s is the Harpers Ferry Center Library - History Collection. It holds several key documents which made understanding the Roosevelt/Ickes approach to wilderness possible, and for the years 1960 through 1981, virtually all written documentation cited in this work, and therefore most of the written documentation located for this work is found there. It also holds transcripts of the Herb Evison interviews mentioned above, including Fred Overly's

transcript. Research in this collection is imperative for anyone investigating post-1949 historical questions.

Some useful records were found at the Washington, D.C., Federal Records Center at Suitland, Maryland, and the Sand Point Federal Records Center in Seattle. The University of Washington Library system holds the papers of Preston Macy, Fred Overly, Irving Clark, and other local conservationists. These three holdings contain relatively little information in comparison to that at Harpers Ferry, and all these collections combined are scant in comparison to the magnitude of the pre-1950 records.

For these reasons, if the National Park Service is to regain its institutional memory, two steps must be taken. First, and foremost, its holdings in the various Federal repositories must be inventoried in far more detail than presently available. Second, exit interviews should be required of all retiring personnel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Secondary Sources

A. Monographs

Albright, Horace M., and Taylor, Frank J. Oh Ranger! A book About the National Parks. Golden, Colorado: OUTBOOKS, 1986.

Avery, Mary W. Washington: A History of the Evergreen State. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965.

Caro, Robert A. The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York. New York: Vantage Books, 1975.

El Hult, Ruby. The Untamed Olympics: The Story of a Peninsula. Portland, Oregon: Binfords & Mort, 1954.

Everhart, William C. The National Park Service. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1983.

Fagerlund, Gunnar, and Frances I. "Olympic National Park: Washington." Natural History Handbook Series. No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

Frome, Michael. Whose Woods These Are: The Story of the National Forests. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1962.

Garrison, Lemuel A. The Making of a Ranger: Forty Years with the National Parks. Salt Lake City and Chicago: Howe Brothers, 1983.

Kirk, Ruth. Exploring the Olympic Peninsula. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.

Martin, Paul J. Port Angeles, Washington: A History. Vol 1. Port Angeles: Peninsula Publishing, Inc., 1983.

Meany, Edmond S. History of the State of Washington. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1909.

Morgan, Murray. The Last Wilderness. New York: Viking Press, 1955.

Murphy, Bob. Desert Shadows: The Bizarre and Frightening True Story of Charles Manson. Billings, Montana: Falcon Press, 1986.

Newman, Coleman C. Roosevelt Elk of Olympic National Park. Port Angeles, Washington: Olympic Natural History Association, 1958.

Parratt, Smitty. Gods & Goblins: A Field Guide to Place Names of Olympic National Park. Port Angeles: CP Publications, Inc., 1984.

Runte, Alfred. National Parks: The American Experience. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

Russell, Jervis (ed.). Jimmy Come Lately: History of Clallam County: A Symposium. Port Angeles, Washington: Clallam County Historical Society, 1971.

Steelquist, Robert. Olympic National Park and the Olympic Peninsula: A Traveler's Companion. Del Mar, California: Woodlands Press, 1985.

Twight, Ben W. Organizational Values and Political Power: The Forest Service Versus the Olympic National Park. University Park, Pennsylvania and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983.

Unrau, Harlan D., and Willis G. Frank. Administrative History: Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s. Denver: NPS Service Center, 1983.

Van Name, Willard G. Vanishing Forest Reserves: Problems of the National Forests and National Parks. Boston: The Gorham Press, 1929.

Warren, Henry C. Olympic: The Story Behind the Scenery. Las Vegas, Nevada: KC Publications, 1982.

Wirth, Conrad L. Parks, Politics, and the People. Norman Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.

Wood, Robert L. Across the Olympic Mountains: The Press Expedition, 1889-90. Seattle and London: The Mountaineers and the University of Washington Press, 1967.

_____. Men, Mules and Mountains: Lieutenant O'Neil's Olympic Expeditions. Seattle, Washington: The Mountaineers, 1976.

WPA Writer's Program in the State of Washington, Washington: A Guide to the Evergreen State. Portland, Oregon: Bindfords & Mort, 1941.

Wright, George M., Dixon, Joseph S., and Thompson, Ben H. Fauna of the National Parks of the United States: A Preliminary Survey of Faunal Relations in National Parks. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933.

B. Journal Articles

Alcorn, Rowena L. and Gordon D. "Evergreen on the Queets." Oregon Historical Quarterly. LXXIV, No. 1 (March 1973); 5-33.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-77-0009.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-77-0011.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-79-0010.

Department of the Interior Records Officer. Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. Series 6, Parks, Sites, etc. "Olympic 1954-84."

Sand Point Federal Records Center, Seattle, WA. Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 70A706. A22, Associations, OLYM."

_____ Accession 79-83-0005. "H30, Historical and Architectural Structures."

_____ "L30, Land Use OLYM."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-84-0006. "L3015, OLYM."

_____ "L3027, Land Use, Roads, OLYM."

_____ "L48, Wilderness Area."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-84-0007. "D30, Roads and Trails, OLYM."

NPS Harpers Ferry Center Library. History Collection. "Olympic."

_____ "Superintendent's Annual Reports."

_____ "Herb Evison Transcripts."

Olympic National Park. "Superintendent's Files."

Olympic National Park Library. "Miscellaneous Historical Files."

_____ "Newspaper Clipping Scrapbook."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. RG 79, Conrad Wirth Papers. "Personnel, 1958-59."

_____ "Horace Albright, 1956-58."

Washington, D.C., Federal Records Center. Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 60A405. "A3415 RAF."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 61A362. "W42 OLYM."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 63A166. "L1425 OLYM."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 63A231. "K1815 OLYM."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 63A231. "C3823 OLYM."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 63A231. "L1425 OLYM."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 64A470. "Olympic 601."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 66A231.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 66A377. "OLYM 2162."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 68A359.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 69A346. "Annual Information and Interpretive Reports, 1965-66."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 70A6476. "Olympic Established Area."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-76-35.

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79, Accession 79-77-0008.

Bretherton, B.J. "Ascent of Mount Olympus." Steel Points. 1, No. 4 (July 1907): 148-59.

Freidel, Frank. "Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Northwest: Informal Glimpses." Pacific Northwest Quarterly. (October 1985): 122-31.

Lien, Carsten. "The Olympic Boundary Struggle." The Mountaineer. 52, No. 4 (March 1959): 18-35.

Richardson, Elmo R. "Olympic National Park: 20 Years of Controversy." Forest History. 12, No. 1 (April 1968): 6-15.

Smith, A.A. "The Olympics." Steel Points. 1, No. 4 (July 1907): 141-45.

Wickersham, James. "A National Park in the Olympics... 1890." The Living Wilderness. No. 77 (Summer-Fall 1961): 5-13.

Primary Sources

National Archives, Correspondence of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Record Group 22. "Wildlife Refuges—Olympic National Forest."

_____ Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, Letters Received, Lands and Railroad Division. Record Group 48. "File 1415-97."

_____ Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. Record Group 48. "12-1 Parks, Reservations, and Antiquities—Mount Olympus."

_____ Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. Record Group 48. "12-34 Parks, Reservations and Antiquities—National Parks—Olympic National Park, 1933-36."

_____ Correspondence of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. Record Group 48. "12-47 Olympic National Park, 1937-53."

_____ Correspondence of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Division R. Record Group 49. "National Forests—Olympic."

_____ Correspondence of the Geological Survey, Geologic Division. Record Group 57. "Hague Papers, 8. Forest Reserves."

_____ Correspondence of the National Park Service. Record Group 79. "Olympic National Park, 1933-49."

_____ Correspondence of the National Forest Service. Record Group 95. "Olympic National Forest."

Interviews

Reed Jarvis, Asst. Dir. PNWR	July 21, 1986
Glenn Gallison	July 22, 1986
Chuck Jonda, Chief Ranger, ONP	July 23, 1986
Gunnar Fagerlund	July 23, 1986
Bud Hanify, Ted Sullivan, and Floyd Dickenson	July 23, 1986
Robert Chandler, Supt. ONP	July 24, 1986
Ranger Paul Crawford	July 24, 1986
Gloria Thompson, Admin. Officer, ONP	July 24, 1986
Bennett Gale	July 25, 1986
Mrs. Preston P. Macy	July 26, 1986
Dwight Rettig	September 4, 1986
James Coleman, Dir. Atl. Reg.	September 9, 1986
Mrs. Fred Overly and Patricia Overly Wallace	September 24, 1986
Don Jackson, Asst. Supt., ONP	June 8, 1987
Randy Jones, Asst. Supt., ONP	June 8, 1987

Bruce Moorhead, Naturalist, ONP	June 8, 1987
Glenn Gallison	June 9, 1987
Roger Allin	June 10, 1987
Roger Contor	June 11, 1987

NOTE: All accessions listed for the Washington, D.C. Federal Records Center were reviewed for all file codes. Those listed contained relevant information. All other file codes contained no information of historical value. In addition, Accession 59A34 contained no significant information, and Accessions 60A408, 60A495, and 61A186 contained missing boxes that may have contained useful information.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Superintendents

Tenure

Preston Macy	6/29/38 to 9/15/51
Fred Overly	9/15/51 to 6/01/58
Daniel Beard	6/01/58 to 9/09 60
John Doerr	1/10/60 to 12/06/64
Bennett Gale	3/14/65 to 6/29 69
Stuer Carlson	8/22/69 to 1/09/71
Roger Allin	1/24/71 to 3/26/77
James Coleman	5/08/77 to 7/29/79
Roger Contor	7/29/79 to 4/30/83
Robert Chandler	6/26/83 to Date

Assistant Superintendents

Tenure

Fred Overly	1939-48 (1942-45 served in Naval Intelligence)
Thomas Williams	1951-54
Jerry House	1955-58
Oscar Sedergren	1958-64
Stuer Carlson	1965-68
Reed Jarvis	1971-77
Don Jackson	1978-Date
Randy Jones	1983-Date
John Teichert	1983-Date

Chief Rangers	Tenure
William Augustine	1939-45
Otto Brown	1946-51
John Aiton	1952-56
Stan McComas	1956-65
Delbert Armstrong	1965-71
Gordon Boyd	1971-82
Chuck Janda	1982-Date

Appendix B

B: LEGISLATIVE DATA

Olympic National Park

Establishment of park	Act of June 29, 1938
Jurisdiction, State cession over area included in park on March 8, 1941	State Act of Mar. 8, 1941
Jurisdiction, State cession of 1941 accepted	Act of Mar. 6, 1942
Acquisition of non-Federal land within park in exchange for national forest land	Act of Dec. 22, 1942

An Act To establish the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, approved June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1241)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That the Mount Olympus National Monument established pursuant to proclamation of the President dated March 2, 1909, is hereby abolished, and the tracts of land in the State of Washington particularly described as follows, to wit: Township 25 north, range 4 west, sections 5 to 8, 17 to 20, and 29 to 32, inclusive (unsurveyed); township 26 north, range 4 west, sections 1 to 12, 17 to 20, and 29 to 32, inclusive (unsurveyed); township 27 north, range 4 west, sections 5 to 8, 17 to 20, and 29 to 36, inclusive (unsurveyed); township 28 north, range 4 west, sections 17 to 22, and 27 to 34, inclusive (unsurveyed); townships 25, 26, and 27 north, range 5 west (unsurveyed); township 28 north, range 5 west, sections 7 to 36, inclusive (unsurveyed); township 24 north, range 6 west, sections 3 to 10, 15 to 22, and 27 to 34, inclusive (unsurveyed); townships 25, 26, and 27 north, range 6 west (unsurveyed); township 28 north, range 6 west, sections 7 to 36, inclusive (unsurveyed); townships 24, 25, 26, and 27 north, range 7 west (unsurveyed); township 28 north, range 7 west, sections 5 to 36 inclusive (unsurveyed); township 24 north, range 8 west, sections 1 to 18, inclusive (partly surveyed); townships 25, 26, 27, and 28 north, range 8 west (unsurveyed); township 29 north, range 8 west, sections 6, 7, 18, 19 to 21, and 28 to 33, inclusive (unsurveyed); township 30 north, range 8 west, sections

Olympic
National Park,
Wash.,
established.
Mount Olympus
National Monument
abolished.
35 Stat. 2247.
Lands transferred
to park.

18, 19, 30, and 31 (partly surveyed); township 24 north, range 9 west, sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13 and 14 (partly surveyed); township 25 north, range 9 west (unsurveyed); township 26 north, range 9 west, sections 1 to 18, inclusive (unsurveyed), each half of section 19 (unsurveyed), sections 20 to 29, and 32 to 36, inclusive (surveyed); townships 27 and 28 north, range 9 west (unsurveyed); township 29 north, range 9 west (partly surveyed); township 30 north, range 9 west, sections 13, 14, and 23 to 36, inclusive (partly surveyed); township 26 north, range 10 west, sections 1, 12, and 13 (surveyed); township 27 north, range 10 west, sections 1 to 6, inclusive, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36 (surveyed); township 28 north, range 10 west, south half section 7, south half section 8, south half section 9, south half section 10, south half section 11, south half section 12, sections 13 to 36, inclusive (unsurveyed) all west of the Willamette meridian, in Washington, are hereby reserved and withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or disposal under the laws of the United States and dedicated and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Olympic National Park, and all lands formerly included in the Mount Olympus National Monument and not included in the above description are hereby transferred to and made a part of the Olympic National Forest. (16 U.S.C. sec. 251.)

Lands transferred to Olympic National Forest.

SEC. 2. That in the areas of said park lying east of the range line between ranges 9 and 10 and north of the seventh standard parallel, and east of the range line between ranges 4 and 5 west, Willamette meridian, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States shall be, exclusive of the land containing them, subject to disposal under such laws for a period of five years from the date of approval of this ACT, with rights of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals and under such general regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. (16 U.S.,C. sec. 252.)

Mineral deposits.

SEC. 3. The income of each county receiving moneys from the Olympic National Forest, under the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, ch. 192), as amended, shall be proportional to the total area of each county in the Olympic National Forest and the Olympic National Park combined. (16 U.S.C. sec. 253.)

Division of receipts for schools and roads.
16 U.S.C. sec. 500.

SEC. 4. The administration, protection, and development of the Olympic National Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park

Administration, etc.

Service, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended (16 U.S.C. sec. 254.)

16 U.S.C., ch. 1.

SEC. 5. Nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry made under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land, nor the rights reserved by treaty to the Indians of any tribes.

Existing claims, etc., not affected.

The President may after eight months from the approval of this Act by proclamation add to the Olympic National Park any lands within the boundaries of the Olympic National Forest, and any lands which may be acquired by the Government by gift or purchase, which he may deem it advisable to add to such park; and any lands so added to such park shall, upon their addition thereto, become subject to all laws and regulations applicable to other lands within such park: *Provided*, That the total area of the said park shall not exceed eight hundred and ninety-eight thousand two hundred and ninety-two acres: *Provided further*, That before issuing any such proclamation, the President shall consult with the Governor of the State of Washington, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture and advise them of the lands which he proposes to add to such park, and shall afford them a reasonable opportunity to consult with and communicate to him their views and recommendations with respect to the addition of such lands to such park.¹ (16 U.S.C. sec. 255.)

Additions to park.

Provisos.
Limitation

Consultation before issuance of proclamation.

Excerpt from an Act of the Legislature of Washington, approved March 8, 1941, ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the territory then included in the Olympic National Park. (Chapter 51 of the Laws of 1941 of the State of Washington)

¹ See proclamations No. 2380 of January 2, 1940 (3 CFR, CUM.SUPP., 140), and No. 2587 of May 29, 1943 (3 CFR, CUM.SUPP., 333), adding land to the park.

Exclusive jurisdiction shall be, and the same is hereby ceded to the United States over and within all the territory that is now included in that tract of land in the State of Washington, set aside for the purposes of a national park, and known as the Olympic National Park; saving, however, to the said state, the right to serve civil and criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid park, in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said state, but outside of said park; and saving further to the said state the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property on the lands included in said park: PROVIDED HOWEVER, This jurisdiction shall not vest until the United States through the proper officer, notifies the Governor of this state that they assume police or military jurisdiction over said park.

An Act To accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes, approved March 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 135)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the act of the Legislature of the State of Washington, approved March 8, 1941 (Chapter 51 of the Laws of 1941 of the State of Washington), ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over and within all the territory included on March 8, 1941, in the tract of land in the State of Washington, set aside for the purposed of a national park and known as the Olympic National Park, are hereby accepted. Subject to the reservations made by the State in the act of cession, the United States hereby assumes sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such territory. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256.)

SEC. 2. The park shall constitute a part of the United States judicial district for the western district of Washington, and the district court of the United States in and for said district shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed within the boundaries of the park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in the park shall be subject to the same laws as refugees from justice found in the State of Washington. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256a.)

SEC. 3. All hunting or the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any wild bird or animal, except dangerous animals when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying human lives or inflicting personal injury, is prohibited within the limits of the park, nor shall any fish be taken out of any of the waters

Olympic National Park,
Wash. Cession of
jurisdiction to U.S.

Assignment to
Washington western
judicial district.

Hunting, fishing, etc.
prohibitions.

of the park, except at such seasons and at such times and in such manner as may be directed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such general rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the management and care of the park and for the protection of the property therein, especially for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within the park, and for the protection of the animals and birds in the park from capture or destruction, and to prevent their being frightened or driven from the park; and he shall make rules and regulations governing the taking of fish from the waters in the park. Possession within the park of the dead bodies or any part thereof of any wild bird or animal shall be prima facie evidence that the person or persons having the same are guilty of violating this Act. Any person or persons, stage or express company, railway or other transportation company, who knows or has reason to believe that such wild birds, fish, or animals were taken or killed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, and who receives for transportation the dead bodies or any part thereof of the wild birds, fish, or animals so taken or killed, or who shall violate any of the other provisions of this Act, or the rules and regulations, with reference to the management and care of the park, or for the protection of the property therein, for the preservation from injury or spoliation of timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within the park, or for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in the park, or who shall within the park commit any damage, injury, or spoliation to or upon any building, fence, sign, hedge, gate, guidepost, tree, wood, underwood, timber, garden, crops, vegetables, plants, land, springs, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or other matter or thing growing or being thereon, or situated therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both, and be adjudged to pay all the costs of the proceedings. (16 U.S.C. sec 256b)

SEC. 4. All guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or means of transportation of every nature or description used by any person or persons within the limits of the park when engaged in killing, trapping, ensnaring, taking, or capturing such wild birds, fish, or animals contrary to the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior shall be forfeited to the United States and may be

Rules and Regulations.

Penalties.

Forfeiture of property used for unlawful purposes.

seized by the officers in the park and held pending prosecution of any person or persons arrested under the charge of violating the provisions of this Act, and upon conviction under this Act of such person or persons using said guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or other means of transportation, such forfeiture shall be adjudicated as a penalty in addition to the other punishment prescribed in this Act. Such forfeited property shall be disposed of as accounted for by and under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the forfeiture of teams, horses, or other means of transportation shall be in the discretion of the court. (16 U.S.C. sec 256c.)

SEC. 5. Upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington shall appoint a park commissioner, who shall have jurisdiction to hear and act upon all complaints made of any violations of law or of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish, and objects of interest therein, and for other purposes authorized by this Act. Such commissioner shall have power, upon sworn information, to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with a violation of the rules and regulations, or with a violation of any of the provisions of this Act prescribed for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in the park, and to try the person so charged, and, if found guilty, to impose punishment and to adjudge the forfeiture prescribed. In all cases of conviction an appeal shall lie from the judgement of the commissioner to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington; and the district court shall prescribe the rules of procedure and practice for the commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to the district court. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256d.)

SEC. 6. The park commissioner shall also have power to issue process, as herein, before provided, for the arrest of any person charged with the commission within the park of any criminal offense not covered by the provisions of section 3 of this Act, to hear the evidence introduced, and, if he is of the opinion that probable cause is shown for holding the person so charged, for trial, shall cause such person to be safely conveyed to a secure place of confinement within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, and certify a transcript of the record of his proceedings and the testimony in such case to the said district court, which court shall

Provisio.

Park commissioner.

Appointment and jurisdiction.

Judicial powers.

Appeals.

Procedure in other cases.

have jurisdiction of the case. The park commissioner shall have authority to grant bail in all cases according to the laws of the United States. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256e.)

SEC. 7. The park commissioner shall be paid an annual salary as appropriated for by Congress. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256f.)

SEC. 8. All fees, costs, and expenses arising in cases under this Act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as are like fees, costs, and expenses in the courts of the United States. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256g.)

SEC. 9. All fees, fines, costs, and expenses imposed and collected shall be deposited by the commissioner, or by the marshal of the United States collecting the same, with the clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256h.)

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior shall notify in writing the Governor of the State of Washington of the passage and approval of this Act, and of the fact that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the park. Upon the acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior of further cessions of jurisdiction over lands now or hereafter included in the Olympic National Park, the provisions of sections 2 to 9, inclusive, shall apply to such lands. (16 U.S.C. sec. 256i.)

An act To authorize the exchange of lands not in Federal ownership within the Olympic National Park, Washington, for national forest lands in the State of Washington, approved December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1070)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title to State, county, and private lands situated north of the line between townships 27 and 28 north, Willamette base and meridian, Washington, and within the boundaries of the Olympic National Park as now or hereafter established by proclamation of the President of the United States, shall be subject to acceptance under the provisions of the Act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465; 16 U.S.C. 485), and such lands when vested in the ownership of the United States shall be a part of the Olympic National Park subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto. (16 U.S.C. sec. 251a.)

Bail.

Pay of commissioner.

Fees, costs, and expenses.

Deposit of collections.

Notice of acceptance of jurisdiction.

Olympic National Park, Wash. Exchange of lands.

Olympic National Park ¹

Enlarging the park: Proclamation (No. 2380) of January 2, 1940
Enlarging the park: Proclamation (No. 2587) of May 29, 1943

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

[No. 2380—Jan. 2, 1940—54 Stat. 2678]

WHEREAS the act of June 29, 1938, (ch. 812, 52 Stat. 1241), established the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington, and authorizes the enlargement thereof by proclamation under the terms and conditions set forth in said act; and

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to add certain lands as hereinafter described to the said park; and

WHEREAS the terms and conditions of section 5 of the said Act of June 29, 1938 have been fully complied with:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 5 of the aforesaid act of June 29, 1938, do proclaim that subject to all valid existing rights, the following described lands, in the State of Washington, are hereby added to and made a part of the Olympic National Park:

WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN—WASHINGTON

T.25 N.,R.4W. Secs. 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 21 those parts of
Secs. 1, 12 and 13 west of a line between the south
peak of

¹ Act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1241) established the park and abolished the Mount Olympus National Monument. See Vol II p. 77. Four proclamations had been issued relating to the monument, as follows: No. 869 of March 2, 1909 (35 Stat. 2247); No. 1191 of April 17, 1912 (37 Stat. 1737); No. 1293 of May 11, 1915 (39 Stat. 1726); and No. 1862 of January 7, 1929 (45 Stat. 2984).

The Brothers and Mt. Constance and those parts of Secs 14, 22, 23, 27, 28, and 33 west of a line connecting the south peak of The Brothers and the southeast corner of Sec 32 (unsurveyed).

T.26 N.,R.4.W. Secs 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35 and those parts of Secs. 13, 24, 25 and 36 west of a line connecting the south peak of The Brothers and Mt. Constance (unsurveyed).

T.28 N.,R.4W. Secs. 6 and 7 (unsurveyed).

T.29 N.,R.4W. Sec. 31 (unsurveyed).

T.23 N.,R.5W. Sec. 3 W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$, Sec. 4 All (unsurveyed)

T.24 N.,R.5W. Secs. 4 to 9, 16 to 21, 28 to 33, inclusive (unsurveyed).

T.28 N.,R.5W. Secs. 1 to 3, inclusive (unsurveyed).

T.29 N.,R.5W. Secs. 21 to 28, 35 and 36 (unsurveyed).

T.24 N.,R.6W. Secs. 1, 2, 11 to 14, 23 to 26, 35 and 36 (unsurveyed).

T.28 N.,R.6W. Secs. 2 to 6, inclusive (unsurveyed).

T.29 N.,R.6W. Secs. 4 to 9, 16 to 21, 29 to 34, inclusive (partly surveyed).

T.30 N.,R.6W. Secs. 15 NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, except the following described portions thereof:

Beginning at the quarter section post between sections 10 and 15; thence south along the West line of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 15, for a distance of 208.7 feet; thence East on a line parallel to the North line of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 15 for a distance of 208.7 feet; thence North on a line parallel to the West line of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 15, to the South line of Tax No. 260; thence Westerly along the South line of Tax No. 260 to the place of beginning, being one acre, more or less (Shown on the county Assessor's Rolls as Tax No. 1058)

Beginning at the SW corner of the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 15; thence easterly along the southerly line of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$, 827 thence easterly along the southerly line of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$, 827 feet; thence at right angles northerly 206 feet; thence at right angles westerly 360 feet; thence at right angles southerly 194 feet; thence at right angles westerly 467 feet to the westerly line of said NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$; thence southerly 10 feet to the point of beginning.

Beginning at the quarter section post between Sections 10 and 15; thence in an easterly direction along the section line 1327.2 ft.; thence S. 00° 57' 25" W. 30 feet; thence west on a line

parallel with the section line 734 feet; thence in a straight line to the beginning.

T.23 N.,R.7W. Secs. 5, 6 and those parts of Secs. 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 north of the divide between Quinault River and Humptulips and Wynoochee Rivers (unsurveyed).

T.28 N.,R.7W. Secs. 1 to 4 (unsurveyed).

T.29 N.,R.7W. Secs. All (partly surveyed).

T.23 N.,R.8W. Secs. 1, 2, 3, and those parts of Secs 10, 11 and 12 north of the divide between Quinault and Humptulips Rivers (unsurveyed).

T.24 N.,R.8W. Secs. 19 to 27, 34 to 36 and those parts of Secs 28, 29, 30 and 33 north of Quinault River (partly surveyed).

T.29 N.,R.8W. Secs. 1 to 5, 8 to 17, 22 to 27, 34 to 36, inclusive (unsurveyed).

T.23 N.,R.9W. Secs. 3, 4, 5, E $\frac{1}{2}$ and SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 6, Secs. 7, 8, 18 and those parts of Secs. 2, 9 and 10 west and north of Quinault River.

T.24 N.,R.9W. Secs. 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 34, 35 and those parts of Secs. 25 and 36 north and west of Quinault River.

T.30 N.,R.9W. Secs. Those parts of Secs. 19, 20, 21, and 22 south of the divide between Lyre and Twin Rivers and Lake Crescent, (partly surveyed).

T.23 N.,R.W.S $\frac{1}{2}$ Secs 1 and 2, Secs. 11 to 14, and lots 1, 2, 3, 4 in Sec. 23.

T.24 N.,R.10W. Those parts of Secs. 3, 4, 5 and 6 north of Sams River (unsurveyed).

T.25 N.,R.10W. Secs. 12, 13, E $\frac{1}{2}$ and SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 14, S $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 15, S $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 21, Secs. 22 to 28, Sec. 36 and those parts of Secs. 33, 34 and 35 north of Sams River.

T.27 N.,R.10W. Secs. 7 to 11, 14 to 18, 20 to 23, Sec 26 and N $\frac{1}{2}$ of Secs. 27, 28 and 29.

T.28 N.,R.10W. That part of Sec. 1 east of Alckee Creek; those parts of Secs. 4, 5 and of the N $\frac{1}{2}$ of Secs. 7, 8, 9 and 10 south of the divides between Soleduck and Calawah Rivers and between Sitkum and South Fork Calawah Rivers, N $\frac{1}{2}$ of section 12 (unsurveyed).

T.29 N.,R.10W. Secs. 1, 2 and 12 except those parts south and west of Soleduck River; those parts of Secs. 32 and 33 south of the divides between Soleduck and Calawah Rivers and between Sitkum and South Fork Calawah Rivers; those parts of Secs. 25 and 36 east of Alckee Creek (partly surveyed).

- T.30 N.,R.10W. That part of Sec. 13 south of divide between East Twin River and Lake Crescent, Sections 24, 25, 36; sections 23, 26, 27 and 28 except those parts lying north and west of the Olympic Highway and Soleduck Road and Sections 33, 34 and 35 except those parts south and west of the Soleduck River (partly surveyed).
- T.27 N.,R.11W. Secs. 7 to 13, N½ of Secs 14, and 15, Sec. 16, N½ Sec. 17 (partly surveyed).
- T.28 N.,R.11W. Those parts of Secs 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 south of the divide between Sitkum and South Fork Calawah Rivers, Secs. 19 to 36, inclusive (partly surveyed).
- T.27 N.,R.12W. N½ Sec. 10, N½ and SE¼ Sec. 11 and Sec. 12.
- T.28 N.,R.12W. Those parts of Secs. 10, 11, 12 and 13 south of the divide between Sitkum and South Fork Calawah Rivers; Secs. 14, 15, 22, to 27, 34, 35 and 36, also that part of Section 10-south of the Sough Fork Calawah River, containing approximately 187,411 acres.

The administration, protection, and development of the lands within this area shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An Act To establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; U.S.C., title 16, secs. 1 and 2). and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof, and to all other laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the said park.

Nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry made under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land, nor the rights reserved by treaty to the Indians of any tribes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this 2d day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty
 [SEAL] and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fourth.

By the President: FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
 Cordell Hull,
The Secretary of State.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

[No. 2587—May 29, 1943—57 Stat. 741]

WHEREAS the Act of June 29, 1938, c. 812, 52 Stat. 1241 (U.S.C., title 16, secs. 251-255), established the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington, and authorizes the enlargement thereof by proclamation under the terms and conditions set forth in said act; and

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to add to the said park certain hereinafter-described lands now within the boundaries of the Olympic National Forest; and

WHEREAS the terms and conditions of section 5 of the said act of June 29, 1938, have been fully complied with in respect of such lands:

NOW THEREFORE, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 5 of the aforesaid act of June 29, 1938, do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following-described lands, in the State of Washington, are hereby added to and made a part of the Olympic National Park:

WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, WASHINGTON

T.28 N.,R.5W., secs. 4, 5, and 6, unsurveyed.

T.29 N.,R.5W., sec. 7, $W\frac{1}{2}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$, partly unsurveyed; sec. 17, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $S\frac{1}{2}$; secs. 18 to 20, inclusive, and 29 to 34, inclusive, unsurveyed.

T.28 N.,R.6W., sec. 1, unsurveyed.

T.29 N.,R.6W., secs. 1 and 2; sec 3, $S\frac{1}{2}$ lot 4, $S\frac{1}{2}N\frac{1}{2}$, $S\frac{1}{2}$, and that part of lot 1 within the following described boundaries:

Beginning at the northeast corner of sec. 3, thence

S. $89^{\circ}09'$ W., approximately 450 ft.;

S. $1^{\circ}11'$ W., approximately 640 ft.;

N. $89^{\circ}21'$ E., approximately 230 ft.;

$S.0^{\circ}56'$ W., approximately 280 ft., to north line of county road;

S. $85^{\circ}44'$ W., approximately 505 ft., along north line of county road;

S. $65^{\circ}11'$ W., approximately 120 ft., along north line of county road;

S. 44° 30' W., approximately 136 ft.;
N. 69° 15' W., 77.3 ft.;
S. 46° 45' W., 83 ft.;
S. 29° 09' E., 58.2 ft.;
S. 43° 00' W., approximately 170 ft., to the south boundary of
lot 1;
N. 89° 27' E., approximately 1150 ft., to the east boundary of
sec. 3;
N. 0° 56' E., 1306.8 ft., to the place of beginning;
secs. 10 to 15, inclusive, and 22 to 28, inclusive, partly
unsurveyed; secs 35 and 36, unsurveyed.

The areas described aggregate approximately 20,600 acres.

The administration, protection, and development of the lands within this area shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916, 39 Stat. 535 (U.S.C. title 16, secs. 1 and 2), and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof, and to all other laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the said park.

Nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry made under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land, nor the rights reserved by treaty to the Indians of any tribes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this 29th day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-seventh.

By the President:

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Cordell Hull,

The Secretary of State.

Acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of facilities for the public in
 park authorized Act of December 6, 1944
 Commissioner to be appointed solely by the United States District
 Court Act of April 21, 1948
 Fishery facilities, exchange authorized Act of June 8, 1949
 Secretary of the Interior authorized to exchange lands adjacent to portions of the park
 Act of June 11, 1958

**An Act to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and
 operation of the facilities for the public in the Olympic
 National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other
 purposes, approved December 6, 1944 (58 Stat. 793)**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of
 the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the
 Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion,
 to acquire by purchase at prices deemed by him reasonable, the
 buildings, structures, furniture, fixtures, and any other real or
 personal property of the Olympic Recreation Company and the
 Olympic Chalet Company within the Olympic National Park in
 the State of Washington.*

Olympic National Park,
 Wash.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this Act, there is hereby
 authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$35,000.
 (See 16 U.S.C. 251 note)

Appropriation
 authorized.

**An Act to provide that appointments of United States
 commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth
 Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the
 United States district courts without the recommendation
 and approval of the Secretary of the Interior, approved
 April 21, 1948 (62 Stat. 196)**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of
 the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first
 sentence of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to accept the
 cession by the State of Michigan of exclusive jurisdiction over the
 lands embraced within the Isle Royale National Park, and for
 other purposes", approved March 6, 1942 (U.S.C., 1940 edition,
 Supp. V, title 16, sec., 408m), is amended by striking out "upon
 the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the
 Interior of a qualified candidate".*

U.S. commissioners.
 Appointments to certain
 national parks.

56 Stat. 134.

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 6 of the Act
 entitled "An Act to provide for the exercise of sole and exclusive

jurisdiction by the United States over the Hawaii National Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes", approved April 19, 1930, as amended (U.S.C., 1940 edition, title 16, sec. 395e), is amended by striking out "upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate".

46 Stat. 228.

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes", approved June 5, 1942 (U.S.C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 16, sec. 404c-5), is amended by striking out "Upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, the" and serving in lieu thereof "The".

56 Stat. 318.

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Olympic National Park, and for other purposes", approved March 6, 1942 (U.S.C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 16, sec. 256d), is amended by striking out "Upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The". (See 28 U.S.C. 631 note.)

56 Stat. 137.

An Act To authorize the exchange of certain fishery facilities within the State of Washington, approved June 8, 1949 (63 Stat. 159)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept from the State of Washington on behalf of the United States title to the land and facilities located in Clallam County, Washington, known as the Lake Crescent Hatchery, and in exchange therefor to convey by deed on behalf of the United States to the State of Washington the fish hatchery facilities in Skagit County, Washington, designated as the Birdview Fish Cultural Station.

Washington Exchange of certain fishery facilities.

SEC. 2. The lands and facilities acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under the terms of this Act shall become a part of

the Olympic National Park and shall be administered under the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes, approved June 11, 1958 (72 Stat. 185)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to exchange approximately six thousand six hundred eight and ninety-six one hundredths acres of land adjacent to the Queets Corridor and Ocean Strip portions of Olympic National Park, which were originally acquired by the Federal Government for public works purposes, for lands and interest in lands not in Federal ownership within the exterior boundaries of the park: Provided That the lands so exchanged shall be of approximately equal value. (16 U.S.C. 251b.)

SEC. 2. Lands acquired pursuant to the exchange authority contained herein shall be administered as part of Olympic National Park in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable to the park. (16 U.S.C. 251c.)

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall not be applicable with respect to any privately owned lands lying within the exterior boundaries of the Olympic National Park which are within township 23 north, range 10 west; township 23 north, range 9 west; township 24 north, range 9 west; and township 24 north, range 8 west, West Willamette meridian; and lot 5 of the July Creek lot survey consisting of .15 acre, and lot 12 of the July Creek lot survey consisting of .35 acre. (16 U.S.C. 251d.)

Olympic National Park.
Exchange of lands.

Appendix C

Olympic National Park Number of Visits

Total Park Travel

1988	3,519,181
1987	3,362,535
1986	3,474,720
1985	3,052,470
1984	3,260,632
1983	2,874,958
1982	2,953,210
1981	2,754,514
1980	2,482,305
1979	2,589,420
1978	2,996,565
1977	2,658,922
1976	2,672,458
1975	2,654,726
1974	2,479,266
1973	2,817,040
1972	3,031,653
1971	1,859,742
1970	2,283,071
1969	2,135,917
1968	2,013,810
1967	1,905,281
1966	1,751,951
1965	2,058,042
1964	1,343,570
1963	1,576,161
1962 World's Fair Year	2,044,422
1961	1,519,514
1960	1,160,429
1959	1,077,420
1958	1,181,325
1957	864,849
1956	864,599
1955	774,885

Total Park Travel (continued)

1954	663,120
1953	625,703
1952	449,117
1951	414,999
1950	405,347
1949	392,508
1948	189,164
1947	182,164
1946	121,712
1945	103,817
1944	58,414
1943	53,257
1942	75,890
1941	92,986
1940	91,863
1939	40,650

Appendix D

PUBLIC LAW 99-635—NOV. 7, 1986

100 STAT. 3527

Public Law 99-635
99th Congress

An Act

To revise the boundaries of Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

Nov. 7, 1986
[S. 2351]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) The boundary of Olympic National Park, Washington, is hereby revised to include within the park—

(1) all submerged lands and waters of Lake Ozette, Washington, and the Ozette River, Washington;

(2) all surveyed and unsurveyed islands lying off the coast of the State of Washington in the Pacific Ocean between latitudes 48 degrees 23 minutes north and 47 degrees 38 minutes north;

(3) those lands between mean high tide and the lowest low tide beginning in section 22, township 24 north, range 13 west Willamette meridian, at the common boundary between the Olympic National Park and the Quinault Indian Reservation, to section 18, township 32 north, range 15 west Willamette meridian, at the common boundary between the Olympic National Park and the Makah Indian Reservation, except those lands directly adjacent to and west of the Hoh, Ozette, and Quillayute Indian Reservations: *Provided*, That such lands as are identified in this paragraph shall continue to be open to fishing and to the taking of shellfish in conformity with the laws and regulation of the State of Washington; and

(4) approximately nine thousand six hundred and thirty-eight acres, and to exclude from the park approximately three thousand three hundred and fifty-two acres, as generally depicted on the maps entitled "Boundary Modifications, Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park", numbered 149/60,030A, sheets 1 through 9, and dated September 1986, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior.

National Forest System.
National parks,
monuments, etc.
National Wilderness
Preservation System.
16 USC 251n.

Indians, Fish and fishing.

Public information.

(b) The boundary of Olympic National Forest, Washington, is hereby revised to include in the national forest approximately three thousand three hundred and fifty-two acres and to exclude from the national forest approximately nine thousand three hundred and twenty-four acres, as generally depicted on the maps entitled "Boundary Modifications, Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park", numbered 149/60,030A, sheets 1 through 10, and dated September 1986, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

Public information. 16
USC 251n note.

(c) Section 3 of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-339, Act of July 3, 1984, 98 Sta. 301) is amended—

98 Stat. 299.

(1) by striking subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(2) certain lands in the Olympic National Forest, Washington, which comprise approximately forty-four thousand four hundred and seventy-four acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Buckhorn Wilderness—Revised', numbered 98-339-3(2), sheets 1 and 2, and dated September 1986, and which shall be known as the Buckhorn Wilderness;"

(2) by striking subsection (13) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(13) certain lands in the Olympic National Forest, Washington, which comprise approximately thirteen thousand and fifteen acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mount Skokomish Wilderness—Revised', numbered 98-339-3(13) and dated September 1986, and which shall be known as the 'Mount Skokomish Wilderness—Revised', dated September 1986, and which shall be known as the Mount Skokomish Wilderness;" and

(3) by striking subsection (19) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(19) certain lands in the Olympic National Forest, Washington, which comprise approximately sixteen thousand six hundred and eighty-two acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "The Brothers Wilderness—Revised', numbered 98-339-3(19) and dated September 1986, and which shall be known as "The Brothers Wilderness;".

SEC. 2. (a) Federal lands, waters, and interests therein formerly within the boundary of Olympic National Forest which are included within the boundary of Olympic National Park pursuant to section 1 of this Act are, subject to valid existing rights, hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for administration as part of the park, and shall be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable to the park: *Provided further*, That within section 15, township 15 north, range 9 west Willamette meridian, and within an area extending not more than one mile north of such section, nothing herein shall be construed to limit or otherwise modify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to design and construct a forest logging road east of the park boundary: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall not construct the road as close as practically possible to the park boundary but not more than five hundred feet east of the divide. Following construction, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to redescribe and relocate the boundary of the park along the eastern clearing limits of the road.

(b) Federal lands, waters, and interests therein formerly within the boundary of Olympic National Park which are excluded therefrom pursuant to section 1 of this Act are, subject to valid existing rights, hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of Olympic National Forest, and shall be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable to the National Forest System: *Provided*, That any lands deleted from the park and included within the Buckhorn Wilderness, Mount Skokomish Wilderness, or The Brothers Wilderness pursuant to this Act shall be managed in accordance with the provisions of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-339, Act of July 3, 1984, 98 Stat. 301).

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, bequest or otherwise any non-Federal lands, waters, and interests therein included within the boundary of Olympic National Park pursuant to section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That any lands, waters, or interests therein owned by the State of Washington or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation or exchange.

Public lands.
Water.
16 USC 251n
note.

98 Stat. 299,
Gifts and property.
Real property.
Water.
16 USC 251N
note.

(b) For the purpose of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 903, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 4601-9), the boundary of the Olympic National Forest, as modified pursuant to section 1 of this Act, shall be treated as if it was the boundary of that national forest on January 1, 1965.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, except that the total amounts authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of acquisition of lands, waters, and interests therein pursuant to this Act shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

Appropriation
authorization.
Real property.
Water.
16 USC 251n
note.

Approved November 7, 1986.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—S. 2351:

SENATE REPORTS: No. 99-510 (Comm. on Energy and Natural Resources).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol 132 (1986):

Oct. 10, considered and passed Senate.

Oct. 15, considered and passed House.