

My preference of the A/B/C/D plans is the "No-Action Alternative (A)" .

The Grizzly Bears have had many decades to self-re-introduce to the North Cascades region now mainly classified as the North Cascades National Park (NCNP) and the Ross and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas. So WHY forcefully bring them to a region they have, apparently, elected to NOT permanently occupy ?

Here are my main reasons for NOT re-introducing Grizzly Bears into the NCNP/LCNRA region :

1 - They have self-selected to NOT remain after wandering thru the area for decades

2 - WHY re-create the Grizzly Bear problems that have plagued Glacier National Park for years

3- The small community of Stehekin (not mentioned as a Gateway City/ Town in your doct) located near the Southern boundary of the NCNP is already plagued by Black Bear predation on, among other things, fruit trees and poultry pens. Since Male Grizzly predate upon Black Bears, we will probably see increased Black Bear activity in our community as they are driven out of their normal habitat.

4 - In their infinite wisdom, I highly fear the NPS will use a Bear introduction to continue stonewalling the community plan to reopen the presently damaged Upper Stehekin Valley Road to Cottonwood Camp. The \$\$\$ spent managing a Grizzly Bear re-introduction program could be better spent re-opening this road so the handicapped and youth visitor to the Stehekin Gateway village can better access their National Park.

5 - <http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/species/uplisting/doc4834.pdf> indicates there is a problem with plans to re-introduce the Grizzly Bear (as of February 24, 2017) into the NCNP and LCNRA, specifically ==>

"_X__Listed species petitioned for uplisting for which we have made a warranted-but-precluded finding for uplisting (this is part of the annual resubmitted petition finding)".

This preclusion has been on-going apparently since the 1990's. It would seem these issues would have been resolved after nearly 27 years. That the issues have not been resolved, why do you continue to try forcing the re-introduction of these Bears into an area where they are - mostly - not wanted by many resident human families and into a region the Bears, on their own, have elected to not accept as a good place to call "home" ? (still in effect today !)

6 - As far as I know, there has not been a survey of camper-tourists visiting the Gateway village of Stehekin to determine their comfort level about having introduced Grizzlies close by. I suspect it will not have a positive-impact result. This survey would be easy to accomplish by including a survey sheet when Backpackers and campers apply for their Back-Country Camping Permit at the NPS' Golden West Office. Such information from those who will be MOST affected by G-Bear presence will be very illuminating !

7 - The Stehekin community will most certainly experience increased Black Bear activity and property damage. Why have not Stehekin's vulnerabilities been acknowledged in the DEIS ?

8 - I know that my back-country camping in the NCNP will probably stop IF Grizzly Bears are introduced and NOT GPS-Tracked to allow forewarning back country users of their presence. Introducing Grizzly Bears and restricting those areas to humans flies in the face of the NCNP's Enabling Legislation that defines RECREATIONAL USE is the number-1 priority of that Park-Unit. I do not want that - maybe - one-in-a-trillion chance of being attacked/eaten to be that "one" person.

9 - The Grizzly Bear is doing fine where THEY have chosen to live and are not endangered. Leave them alone and if some should decide voluntarily to live in the NCNP region, fine, we can live with that possibility.

10- How has the NCNP environment been damaged by the non presence of the Grizzly and would be repaired by its presence ? Again I vote for Alternative "A" . . .

J. R. (Dick) Bingham - w7wkr Stehekin, WA