

Voice of the Wild Olympics

Vol. 2, No. 2 (June 1994)

Contents

- [The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary](#)
 - [History: Protecting the Wild Olympic Coast](#)
 - [No Goats in the Olympics: Examination of the Evidence](#)
 - [Park Permits Lake Crescent Tour Boat](#)
 - [Tour-boat plan makes waves on Lake Crescent](#)
 - [Unique Plants of the Olympic Mountains ---Part 1](#)
 - [WA Coastal Sanctuaries: Review and Update](#)
 - [Endowment Fund](#)
-

The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

Celebrate the Olympic Coast Sanctuary!

Dedication Set for July 16, 1994, at Kalaloch

by Fred Felleman, M.Sc., Conservation Consultants, Inc.

On Saturday, July 16, at Kalaloch we will mark an historic occasion: the public dedication of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, the 14th such sanctuary in the nation. Come, join the celebration!

The process of creating the Olympic Coast Sanctuary began in 1988 when, under the leadership of Congressman Mike Lowry and with the support of the entire Washington delegation, Congress directed NOAA to create a sanctuary off the Olympic Coast by June, 1990. Four years behind schedule, the concept finally has become a reality. (See the [related story](#) on page 6 for a review/update on Olympic and Straits sanctuary status.)

The boundaries of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary extend from the Canadian border in the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the south end of Copalis Wildlife Refuge just north of Gray's Harbor. This covers a north-south distance of 135 miles. The western boundary follows the 100 fathom isobath, which extends 30 to 40 miles offshore, bisecting the mouths of the Juan de Fuca, Nitinat, and Grays submarine canyons. The eastern boundary follows the high tide line along the Park and the low tide line along tribal lands. In all, the Sanctuary encompasses 3,310 square miles, more than twice the size of Yosemite National Park.

In addition to providing resources for research and education on the Olympic Coast Marine environment and coordinating the various agencies responsible for coastal management, the Sanctuary brings with it the following additional regulations: 1) no oil, gas, mineral exploration; 2) no overflights under 1000 feet within a mile of the National Wildlife Refuges, including the Navy's bombing practice on Sea Lion Rock; 3) new limitations on dredging, dumping, and alterations of the seabed; 4) no removal or damage to historical or cultural resources; and 5) the scope of regulations includes the possibility to regulate marine traffic.

NOAA has hired a Sanctuary Manager, Todd Jacobs, who previously served as the research and education coordinator of the Channel Islands Sanctuary off Santa Barbara, California. The Sanctuary office will be in the Federal Building in Port Angeles, with a field office at the Soleduck Ranger Station near Forks. NOAA also has contracted to have a vessel constructed for research and enforcement activities.

The Pacific Northwest has a wide diversity of issues affecting its coasts and oceans. If sanctuaries are to flourish in the Pacific Northwest, they must serve as models of how we can sustain our coastal communities by protecting the marine ecosystems upon which they depend. As the first sanctuary in Washington State, the Olympic Coast Sanctuary will establish important precedents that the public will use to base their impression of the national program and its ability to work with coastal communities, both on the Peninsula and surrounding the Straits.

We should be particularly grateful for the vision of Mike Lowry who as congressman and governor has assured that the extraordinary marine productivity of this region is finally being recognized for its unique biogeographic representation.

About the Author: Fred Felleman is an environmental consultant and wildlife photographer who studied the feeding ecology of killer whales for his M.Sc. in fisheries at the University of Washington. He has spent six years working on the marine sanctuary proposals as a consultant to environmental groups and to county, state, and tribal governments. He serves on the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Washington Maritime Commission, the Office of Marine Safety's Advisory Committee and Emergency Response Vessel Task Force, and the Board of the Washington Environmental Council

History: Protecting the Wild Olympic Coast

by Polly Dyer

1953: President Truman, by executive order, adds ocean strip and Queets River to Olympic National Park.

1956: Pressure increases for a road along coast. OPA consults Howard Zahnizer, Exec. Sec, The Wilderness Society, who proposes a special hike to dramatize ecological & recreational values of this roadless coast.

1958: U. S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas leads a hike from Cape Alava to Rialto Beach, and turns back proposals for a road along the wild Olympic coast.

1964: Justice Douglas leads a second hike from the Hoh to Third Beach, laying to rest forever the road threat.

1976: Congress adds seven miles of roadless coast north of Ozette River, including Point of Arches and Shi Shi Beach, to park.

1988: Congress adds to ONP the intertidal area (to extreme low tide, not part of the original ocean strip), plus Destruction Island, the wildlife refuges and the offshore rocks and islands adjacent to the ocean strip.

No Goats in the Olympics: Examination of the Evidence

Excerpted from a review of historic data by OPA Board Member Randy Payne

Part 1: Background

In 1925, four adult mountain goats (*Oreamnos americanus*) were brought into the Lake Crescent area from the Selkirk Mountains in eastern British Columbia by local sportsmen. Eight more were brought in 1927 and 1929 from Alaska. From these twelve animals, the herds grew in size to about 1,200 individuals by 1983.

The effects the mountain goats were having on their newfound habitat were recognized in the late 1960's. Visible damage of vegetation was observed in the Klahhane Ridge/Mt. Angeles area near Hurricane Ridge. In 1973 the first research began to measure those impacts. These preliminary findings revealed extensive occupation by the mountain goat throughout Olympic National Park and adjoining National Forest lands. A five-year study commenced in 1977 to better identify the habitat requirements of these animals and their effects on that habitat.

It was determined that the mountain goats inhabited 30%-40% of Olympic National Park: 100% of the park's alpine zone and 70% of the subalpine zone. These studies found that the habitat and forage requirements of

these animals coincided with that of rare or endemic species of plants such as Olympic Mt. groundsel, Piper's bellflower, [see [Tisch article](#), p. 5 of this issue] and Olympic Mt. aster.

At the end of this study it was determined that, if left unchecked (as the goats have no known predators on the Olympic Peninsula), the effects of these animals on the biotic community would be devastating. So a five-year experimental management program was initiated in 1981. The goal of this effort was to determine what program could be implemented to "manage" this population of animals to reduce resource damage. During this study, numerous live capture techniques were employed resulting in over 300 animals captured and relocated to neighboring states. About an equal number were captured, tagged, and released for further studies. Some animals were killed for research purposes, others underwent experimental sterilization procedures to determine if this was an effective tool to control the population.

At the conclusion of this research project, a Mountain Goat Management plan was released in 1987. The determination was to live-capture all goats from the core of the park and employ control measures for those remaining animals around the periphery. In 1988, 80 goats were captured with an 8.7% mortality rate. In 1989, only 67 goats were captured, but the mortality rate had climbed to 19%. It was evident that live capture methods were quickly becoming ineffective in moving the goats, and the program was canceled in 1990.

In 1991, a renewed effort commenced, this time in cooperation with the U. S. Forest Service and Washington Department of Wildlife, to address the goat management issue for the whole of the Olympic Peninsula. By early 1993, these two agencies pulled out of the interagency committee, once again restricting the goat management issue to only the park. In 1993, Olympic National Forest began a five-year study on mountain goat impacts on eastside forest lands.

Part 2: Ethnographic Data

Ethnographic data show that mountain goats are not native to the Olympic Peninsula.

Early explorers recorded abundant evidence that Native tribes manufactured blankets and clothing with the wool of mountain goats. Was this material obtained locally? If not, where did it come from?

The historic literature also contains extensive reference to a now extinct dog which possessed a wool-like coat and was raised for its wool by some Native tribes.

Woven items were of great value, often indicating high rank or status, and were widely traded among the various tribes, as were bowls and spoons made from the horns of both mountain sheep and mountain goat.

George Gibbs (1877) states:

The Indians of the Sound and the Straits of Juan de Fuca attained considerable skill in manufacturing a species of blanket from a mixture of the wool of the mountain-sheep and the hair of a particular kind of dog. The wool is obtained from the hunting tribes next to the Cascade Mountains, and is an article of trade.

These objects were traded from the northern Northwest Coast (probably the tribes north of Vancouver Island, such as Tlingit, Bella Coola, and Tsimshian) as far south as California.

Of the Makahs' use of goat wool, noted ethnologist Erna Gunther states (1936):

Although the mountain goat does not occur on the Olympic peninsula the informant was familiar with the animal. Mountain goat-wool was bought in Victoria through the Klallam. Finished blankets were bought more often than raw wool.

The Klallams' role in the trading of mountain goat wool was further recorded by Gunther (1927):

Mountain goat wool was brought by the Klallam from the Songish of Vancouver Island, who in turn secured it from the Cowichan of the mainland. Occasionally it was gotten from the Skagit and Snuqualmi who were good hunters.

Edward Curtis (1917) adds:

The works (goat-hair blankets) of the Clallam were supplied by the Skikwamish.

Mythology and the strong oral traditions of Native American tribes are valuable sources of historic evidence. In this case, no mountain goat myths exist in the tribes of the Olympic Peninsula, except among the Twana, whose tradition states:

"He (the Transformer) put no goats in our mountains here but he gave the Skagit goats in their mountains, to eat and use the wool of." (William Elmendorf, 1961).

Elmendorf further states:

The Twana bought or traded for most of their goat-wool blankets; the mountain goat did not occur locally. Goat wool was sometimes obtained as a potlatch gift by women or in trade, and woven locally.

Gunther specifically notes that those coastal tribes possessing wool dogs (Quinault, Quileute, Makah, Klallam, Twana) did not hunt mountain goats, and those that did hunt mountain goats (Snoqualmie, Skykomish, and Nisqually) did not keep wool dogs.

Draft EIS Delayed *Yet Again*

Olympic National Park projects that the DEIS on non-native goats will be released in late summer or early fall, 1994.

Park Permits Lake Crescent Tour Boat

by Norm Winn

On May 20, 1994, an Olympic National Park concessionaire will inaugurate service of a 68 foot, 149 passenger excursion boat on Lake Crescent. The vessel will be based on a new floating dock located at the Storm King Ranger Station on the southeastern shore of Lake Crescent. The plan calls for the vessel to operate from May 1 through October 2, with five tours per day through Labor Day and four tours per day after that date. The present plan calls for the vessel to make a circular tour of the lake without any stops and then return to the Ranger Station.

Park Service documents show that the plan for the tour boat concession began in February, 1993. The concession was approved on March 16, 1993, a relatively short period for consideration of a project of this type. The Park Service initially planned to do an Environmental Assessment (EA), but later determined that it was not necessary because the parking lot for the tourists was located on private land. This decision was made although the dock where the 149 passengers will embark is located at the Storm King Ranger Station and the vessel will travel on Lake Crescent, which is entirely within the Park. The decision to proceed without an EA was made without the knowledge of the Regional Office, which assumed that an EA had been done.

The Park issued a press release on March 10, 1993, announcing plans to issue a concession permit for the tour boat service on Lake Crescent. Another press release was issued on February 15, 1994, announcing the signing of the four year concession permit. Although OPA is on the mailing list for all Olympic National Park

press releases, the March 10, 1993 press release was not sent to OPA. Further, that press release was not sent to the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), another organization that closely follows Park Service activities. The staff person from NPCA was told that he and OPA President Polly Dyer were "accidentally" left off the mailing list for that Press release. OPA has had several Board of Directors meetings during the past year at which park personnel were present, and the Park Service has never disclosed its intention to issue the concession permit.

The Park press release said that the vessel will be modeled after the MV Storm King, which operated on the lake from 1914 to 1921. In fact, the new vessel will be much larger than the earlier vessel. Park Service documents show that initially the planning concept was for a boat with a capacity of between 60 and 90 passengers and not exceeding 60 feet in length. Some staff comments suggested a 40-50 foot boat. The planning review document suggested a 60 foot boat with 60-120 passenger capacity. The prospectus for the concession permit issued March 15, 1993, stated that the vessel should not exceed 60 feet in length, with a preferred range of 40-50 feet overall length. Nevertheless, the press release issued February 15, 1994, stated that the boat would be 64 feet long, or four feet longer than the maximum stated in the prospectus. In fact, the boat as constructed is 68 feet long, eight feet longer than the maximum length, and almost 40% greater than the recommended length in the prospectus.

Although various Park documents refer to the historic ferry service on Lake Crescent, the Master Plan for Olympic National Park contains no references to tour boats on Lake Crescent. The concession permit is not in accord with the governing document for Park operations and facilities.

The tour boat will generate additional traffic at the Storm King Ranger Station. Although parking for the facility is off site, passengers will be brought to the dock in two school buses operating as shuttles periodically during the day. In addition, trucks will come to the dock to provide fuel for the vessel and to pick up trash and sewage. Safeguards for refueling and sewage pumping are not specified in the operating plan.

The planning for this concession permit and the circumstances under which the permit were issued are not compatible with the standards that the public expects from Olympic National Park.

Tour-boat plan makes waves on Lake Crescent

by Eric Pryne. [Excerpted from Seattle Times, May 16, 1994.]

Beginning May 23, a 68-foot double-deck tour boat will offer visitors 75-minute narrated cruises on Lake Crescent...

Tourism interests on the Olympic Peninsula, hit hard by downturns in logging and fishing, are excited about the new attraction; which will be operated by a private company....

But several environmental groups say the 149-passenger vessel is an unwelcome commercial intrusion that could pose risks to the park's delicate environment.

"It's like 'pirates of the Caribbean' on Lake Crescent," says Sean Cosgrove of the National Parks and Conservation Association....

The park ... signed a four-year contract with Mosquito Fleet Enterprises earlier this year. The Everett-based company operates sightseeing tours of the San Juan Islands....

On board, uniformed Park Service interpreters will talk about the geology, flora, fauna and history of the lake and park.... The boat will offer five cruises daily ... charging \$15 for adults, \$10 for children, \$14 for seniors.

Rather than paying a fee,.. Mosquito Fleet will pay the salaries of four seasonal Park Service interpreters and

rangers, who will be employed not only on and around the boat but throughout the park.

Environmentalists who keep an eye on the park say they were taken by surprise by the permit...[and] question the park's failure to conduct an environmental review.

"It's probably a violation of federal law," says Norm Winn, a Seattle lawyer and board member of Olympic Park Associates....

Water lobelia, an aquatic plant on the state's list of threatened species, grows near the boat dock. The Park Service plans to monitor its health, but Winn and other environmentalists say the impact of the tour boat on the plant should have been analyzed before a permit was issued.

Lake Crescent, while beautiful, isn't untouched.... But environmentalists say the tour boat is way out of scale with what's happening on or around the lake today.

Unique Plants of the Olympic Mountains --- Part 1

by Ed Tisch

Reprinted by permission of Outdoors West, Vol. XVI, No. 2 (Winter 1993-1994).

Mountains have remarkable ways of shaping the life in and around them. By virtue of their great heights and distinctive geologic and topographic features, they create complex habitat mosaics with numerous ecological niches, all of which contribute to biodiversity. In addition, their locations relative to prevailing winds, large bodies of water, and adjacent land masses, exert considerable influence on regional weather patterns. The Olympic Mountains of Washington State combine all of the above in shaping the biology of their particular locality.

In general, the major Olympic peaks are 6,000-7,000 feet high. Mount Olympus, in the west Olympic Bailey Range, is the tallest, approaching 8,000 feet. Geologically, the range includes a mixture of igneous rocks derived from submarine lava flows; sandstones, shales, conglomerates and siltstones of sedimentary origin; and a variety of unconsolidated materials transported by glaciers, water, wind, and gravity.

A strong rain-shadow effect, produced by the mountains themselves, contributes to climatic and biological diversity. The gradually ascending western slopes of the Olympics gather and condense vast amounts of moisture from the Pacific, generating local precipitation in excess of 200 inches per year. Much of this falls as wet snow on the massive, glaciated summits of the Bailey Range. Situated to the leeward side of the Baileys, the northeastern corner of the range is much drier, with well-developed alpine tundra and adjacent lowlands, near the town of Sequim, where rainfall approaches that of the arid grasslands in eastern Washington.

The Olympics exhibit interesting examples of floristic overlap with the Wenatchee Mountains of eastern Washington, as well as with the northern Rockies -- as far east as Montana -- and with the Blue Mountains of Northeastern Oregon. Past biogeographic continuity between the Olympics and these surrounding regions permitted the introduction of a number of plants which persist in the Olympics to this day, widely separated from their ancestral populations. These "disjunct" species include the blunt sedge, Brewer's cliff-brake, lance-leaved draba, the least bladderly milk-vetch, moonwort grape-fern, sagebrush buttercup, and the soft-leaved sedge.

While the Olympic biota reflect a general convergence of organisms from the north, south and east, they have, by virtue of their geographic isolation, evolved a relatively large number of "endemics" -- native species found only on the Olympic Peninsula.

During the Pleistocene, massive ice sheets surrounded the Olympics on essentially all sides. The current

distribution of glacially deposited rocks -- particularly granite "erratics" rafted in from Canada -- indicates that the northern Olympics were flanked by glaciers several thousand feet thick! These great walls of ice blocked off north-flowing rivers and created elongated lakes which stretched southward into their respective valleys. Fortunately, however, many Olympic peaks extended well above the surrounding glaciers and evidently provided snow-free environments during the Pleistocene summers. These high-elevation mountain tops served as "refugia" for plants and animals trapped by the encroaching glaciers. The Olympic endemics may have become distinct during the Pleistocene; however, it seems just as likely that some had begun their evolutionary divergence before the onset of the ice ages.

As climates warmed, about 12,000 years ago; the refugial survivors probably retreated higher and higher in search of compatible environments near the rocky summits of the tallest Olympic peaks. With the gradual disappearance of the glaciers, additional plants and animals began to invade the bare lowlands, some arriving from the south during warm post-glacial interludes. These fairly recent arrivals include : a number of Californian species, such as bristly manzanita, Garry oak, madrona trees, Pacific rhododendron, poison oak, and Whipplevine. The native Olympic reptiles probably arrived from the south during these warm climatic periods.

With the exception of certain extreme environments, such as rock outcrops, cliffs, and very dry sites, most Olympic terrain below 5,000 feet is now blanketed by forests. These range in age from very young "second growth" stands to "ancient forests" of gigantic trees dating back many hundreds of years. Olympic forests are essentially continuous with those from surrounding portions of coastal Washington, and in general contain relatively few rare species and essentially no endemics. The drier forests of the northeastern Olympics tend to have higher percentages of southern plants and animals, whereas the "rain forests" to the west draw more heavily from forest regions to the north. Rare Olympic forest plants include the boreal bedstraw, fringed-pinesap, ground cedar, phantom-orchid, pine broomrape, spleenwort leaved goldthread, and tall bugbane.

Watch for [Part 2](#) of this article in the next issue of the *Voice of the Wild Olympics*.

WA Coastal Sanctuaries: Review and Update

by Fred Felleman

Under title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, the Secretary of Commerce may designate National Marine Sanctuaries "so as to ensure comprehensive management, conservation, and protection of their recreational, ecological, historical, research, educational or aesthetic resources and qualities:" The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) administers the Sanctuaries Act.

In 1988, Congress directed NOAA to create an Olympic Coast Sanctuary by June, 1990, and review the possibility of creating a sanctuary in the Straits by March, 1991.

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

The public review process for this sanctuary proposal began in April, 1989. Since then more than 1500 people provided written and verbal comments to NOAA. Although the vast majority of these comments were supportive, not until July, 1991, did the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) release the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Management Plan (MP) for the sanctuary.

The document was held up for at least a year in the political morass of OMB by oil interests in the Bush Administration. Ultimately it took an amendment to the Sanctuaries Act by Congresswoman Unsoeld to assure that the sanctuary's permanent protection was not compromised.

In fact, oil and oil spills have framed the entire history of the Olympic Coast Sanctuary. In April; 1989, on the

heels of the *Nestucca* and *Exxon Valdez* spills, NOAA first held scoping meetings about the Sanctuary. The public repeatedly asked for increased protection from future oil spills. Then in 1991, two months prior to the hearings on the DEIS, the *Tenyo Maru* reminded the public that the proposed sanctuary was still very vulnerable. Finally, no sooner was the Final EIS (FEIS) published (11/93) than the Seattle Times (2/9/94) documented the crash in the breeding population of common murrelets on the coast from 30,000 to 565 during the past 11 years. This news, plus the presence of more than 3,500 pounds of tar balls washing up on Peninsula beaches from unknown sources, further underscores the need for the sanctuary to protect this remote corner of the country from future spills.

There is a proposal to keep tankers and oil barges 25 miles offshore of the coast along the sanctuary. NOAA and the Coast Guard have submitted the Area to Be Avoided (ATBA) to the State Department for adoption by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) by June 1. The ATBA requires only voluntary compliance, and does not apply to freighters or cargo ships; and, as the *Tenyo Maru* demonstrated, it does not take a tanker to make a mess. In fact, the Coast Guard's 1993 data on "unusual incidents" is comprised of 51% freighters, 28% fishing and Naval vessels, 13% tankers, and 8% tugs with tows. We hope to get the ATBA established this year, then amend it next year to include all vessels that should avoid the continental shelf.

Further delays in the sanctuary's progress were due to final negotiations with the Department of Defense over the Navy's bombing of Sea Lion Rock within the Copalis National Wildlife Refuge. On October 22, 1992, a lawsuit was filed against the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Acting Secretary of the Navy. Defenders of Wildlife and the Washington Environmental Council were among the principal plaintiffs, with the Natural Resources Defense Council also serving as our counselor. Due to the presence of federally listed threatened northern sea lions, and nesting seabirds such as the threatened marbled murrelet, the regional office of the USFWS, the Marine Mammal Commission, and the environmental Community urged the Navy to stop this practice which occurred in violation of the Refuge Administration Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

On March 17, 1993, with a fresh administration in office and with strong leadership from Congressman Dicks, the Navy "voluntarily" agreed to stop their bombing and overflights. No sooner was this issue cleared than NOAA announced that the Olympic Coast Sanctuary would be designated in October (another date they could not meet). However, our lawsuit was not withdrawn until Secretary of Interior Babbitt removed the Navy's legal authority to conduct these activities in the future.

The final stumbling block to overcome was within the sanctuary program itself. Congressional pressure from other states with existing sanctuaries had drawn NOAA's efforts elsewhere until Senator Patty Murray attracted NOAA's attention with her appointment to the Commerce Appropriations Committee. This past year we not only increased the budget of the national program from \$7 to \$9 million, but were also able to get NOAA to commit to spend close to three-quarters of a million dollars on sanctuaries in Washington State: still a meager sum, but the trend is in the right direction.

The FEIS and Management Plan for the Olympic Coast Sanctuary finally were published in November, 1993. At this time it appears that NOAA has satisfied the concerns raised by the Washington Environmental Council (WEC) and four coastal tribes (Makah, Quileute, Hoh, Quinault) whose reservations border the sanctuary.

The completion of the Olympic Coast Sanctuary FEIS and MP was an important first step. The next Step involves the actual dynamics of management and the enforcement of regulations. Here it is important to understand that a marine sanctuary is not a marine park or a wilderness area, but rather a multiple use area in which regulatory authority may be weak or strong, and may be used very reluctantly, especially when faced with formidable threats such as military and oil industry activities. We can be proud that we were successful in getting strong regulations for the Olympic Coast Sanctuary. That success was only possible because of widespread, vocal community support for protection, coupled with strong Congressional support from the

Washington delegation.

The primary issue left for discussion is how well NOAA will incorporate public input during the day-to-day implementation of the Program. One sure way for NOAA to alleviate the public's fears of another federal program on the Peninsula is to establish an advisory committee soon after designation and to make good use of their local expertise.

NOAA is currently waiting for Dr. James Baker, Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, to sign off on the final regulations before they can be published in the Federal Register. Then a 45 day review by the governor and Congress ensues, during which Governor Lowry may veto or modify any aspect of the sanctuary which applies to State waters (3 miles offshore). The Congress is afforded a similar review of the entire ~3,310 square mile (~2,500 square nautical mile) sanctuary. Regulations should be in place in time for the public dedication July 16 at Kalaloch.

Northwest Straits National Marine Sanctuary

More than 1000 people attended NOAA's eight scoping meetings during November, 1989. Most public comments addressed the need to protect fish and wildlife resources from an oil spill and to coordinate pollution control activities with Canada. Concerns about redundant regulations were also addressed.

A DEIS and Management Plan, which will define the various boundary and regulatory options, was congressionally mandated in March, 1991. Public hearings were to follow shortly thereafter. The DEIS will form the basis for the decision whether NOAA will proceed with the designation, based on the amount of support for the proposal by the public and the Governor's office.

On March 1 Governor Lowry wrote to NOAA administrator Dr. James Baker expressing the State's desire to have NOAA move forward with writing the DEIS for the NW Straits Sanctuary. Lowry wants the State to be equal partners with NOAA, given that the sanctuary is completely within State waters. His vision for the Straits Sanctuary is to foster interagency cooperation, research and education rather than to impose more regulations. The State is working with NOAA to complete a memorandum of understanding.

Unlike the Olympic Coast Sanctuary proposal, which established prohibitions on oil and gas development off the Olympic Coast, there has not been a single issue around which to organize support for the NW Straits Sanctuary. In fact, extensive concern has been raised by fishermen in Friday Harbor regarding the perceived loss of local control that they fear might occur under a federal program established entirely within state waters.

There is some danger that with this general distrust of the Feds we may throw the baby salmon out with the salt water. If we do not learn to take advantage of federal programs such as sanctuaries, that can be used to help us, we will be doing nothing but fighting off bad programs like offshore oil and gas leasing. A sanctuary can be seen not only as a source of revenue for education and research but also as a federal mechanism for protecting the coast from other, less benign federal programs such as the Minerals Management Service, the Department of Defense, and the International Maritime Organization, not to mention unscrupulous industry interests.

The timing of the Olympic Coast Sanctuary designation, coinciding with the closure of the Coastal salmon fisheries and the ongoing debate surrounding Option 9, provides the communities on the Olympic Peninsula a welcome opportunity to market eco-tourism programs nationally under the banner of the sanctuary. This is particularly important for the coastal tribes as they begin to open their doors to visitors.

Similarly, communities surrounding the San Juans might take the opportunity to use the Straits Sanctuary to help monitor and ultimately manage the impact of summer tourists.

Over the coming year we will have the opportunity to see if NOAA will tailor the Straits Sanctuary to the needs of local citizens. A federal sanctuary in the Straits could be a powerful asset, to benefit communications with Canadian resource decisionmakers and to provide political leverage for stronger shipping safety.

One thing is certain: it is up to the affected communities to put the sanctuaries to work and not to expect NOAA to know what is needed locally. Sanctuaries are still only as good as we make them!

It is very encouraging to see both sanctuaries back on track with Governor Lowry at the helm.

See you in Kalaloch on July 16!

Endowment Fund

Olympic Park Associates by the action of its Board of Directors is establishing an endowment fund for its future well being. This was done at the request of OPA member Herpel Keller, of Portland, who also supplied seed money to start the program. In sending the seed money to establish the fund, Mr. Keller stated:

The fruits of this gift will accrue perpetually to the benefit of all those affected by the future of Olympic National Park.

You, too, can perpetually benefit Olympic National Park by contributing to this *Olympic Park Associates Endowment Fund*. Send your endowment contribution to:

Endowment Fund
Olympic Park Associates
13245 40th Avenue N.E.
Seattle, WA 98125

Return to [Newsletter Index](#) | [Olympic Park Associates](#)