

1 HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2
3
4
5

6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT TACOMA

9 WILDERNESS WATCH, INC.,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 SARAH CREACHBAUM, in her official
13 capacity as the Superintendent of the
14 Olympic National Park; and the
15 NATIONAL Park Service,

16 Defendants,

17 NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC
18 PRESERVATION, et al.,

19 Intervenor-Defendants.

CASE NO. C15-5771-RBL

ORDER ON CROSS-MOTIONS FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

DKT. ##21, 42

20 THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Wilderness Watch's [Dkt. #21] and
21 Defendants Creachbaum and National Park Services' [Dkt. #42] Cross-Motions for Summary
22 Judgment. Intervenor-Defendants National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington Trust for
23 Historic Preservation, and Friends of Olympic National Park [Dkt. #43] also submitted briefing.
24 Olympic National Park encompasses nearly one million acres of diverse landscape, protecting a
vast wilderness and years of human history. Within its 876,669 acres of wilderness, it houses 40

1 | historic structures. Since 2011, the Park Service has repaired five structures. The parties ask the
2 | Court to review the Park Service’s decisionmaking record to assess whether it arbitrarily and
3 | capriciously repaired these structures under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 701–
4 | 06.

5 | This case has implications greater than a record review typically suggests, however, as it
6 | will influence the Park Service’s management of wilderness areas. The Park Service has a
7 | longstanding policy of preserving historic structures in wilderness. Wilderness Watch claims the
8 | Park Services’ “plan to perpetuate the existence of numerous man-made structures within the
9 | Olympic Wilderness” violates the Wilderness Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1131–36. Dkt. #21 at 10. It
10 | argues the Act prohibits the Park Service from preventing structures’ natural deterioration.
11 | National Trust claims Wilderness Watch promotes a dogmatic and restrictive interpretation of
12 | the Act because it wants to eradicate Olympic National Park’s cultural heritage. The Park
13 | Service assumes a position between these two extremes and defends its maintenance work,
14 | arguing the Act allows it to maintain “historically used” structures so long as the preservation
15 | work is the minimum necessary.

16 | Wilderness Watch argues the Park Service failed to make this showing because it
17 | presumed the structures and the repair work were necessary. National Trust contends the Park
18 | Service properly assessed the work necessary to preserve each structure’s historic integrity
19 | through its General Management Plan, which included an Environmental Impact Statement, and
20 | individualized Minimum Requirements Worksheets. The Park Service suggests the MRWs alone
21 | supply the requisite analysis.

22 | Wilderness Watch also argues the Park Service improperly exempted its repair work from
23 | review under the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4321–70h. National Trust and
24 |

1 the Park Service respond that the work was “routine,” and so fell within a categorical exclusion.

2 The Court takes seriously the effect its decision will have on the Park Service’s and other
3 agencies’ wilderness management approaches and NEPA review processes, but, as always, limits
4 its consideration to the facts before it.

5 **BACKGROUND**

6 **A. Wilderness Act.**

7 Congress enacted the Wilderness Act to ensure our “increasing population, accompanied
8 by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas
9 within the United States.” 16 U.S.C. § 1131(a). It intended “to secure for the American people of
10 present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness,” defining
11 wilderness as “an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammled by man, where
12 man himself is a visitor who does not remain”; as an area of land “retaining its primeval
13 character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation.” *Id.* at § 1131(a),
14 (c). These areas offer “outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type
15 of recreation” and “may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific,
16 educational, scenic, or historical value.” *Id.* They are “devoted to the public purposes of
17 recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use.” *Id.* at § 1133(b).

18 The Act requires agencies to administer these areas “in such manner as will leave them
19 unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, ... so as to provide for the protection of
20 these areas [and] the preservation of their wilderness character.” *Id.* at § 1131(a). It “in no
21 manner” lowers the applicability of another statute’s standards evolved for the use and
22 preservation of the area. *Id.* at § 1133(a)(3). Each agency retains authority to administer the
23 wilderness area for any other purpose for which it may have been established, although it must
24

1 do so in a manner that preserves the area’s wilderness character. *See id.* at § 1133(b). Unless
2 explicitly preserved, the Act prohibits the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, aircraft,
3 and any structures or installations from wilderness, “except as necessary to meet minimum
4 requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose [of securing the benefits of an
5 enduring wilderness].” *Id.* at § 1133(c).

6 **B. Olympic National Park.**

7 Congress dedicated Olympic National Park in 1938. *See Pub. L. 75-778, 52 Stat. 1241*
8 (June 29, 1938). It protects 922,651 acres, which include three ecosystems: glacier-capped
9 mountains, coastline, and old-growth and temperate rain forest. It houses 29 species of native
10 freshwater fish, 70 mammalian species, 300 bird species, and over 1,100 species of native plants.
11 Included in these numbers are tens of endemic species and several threatened species, such as the
12 bull trout, the northern spotted owl, and the marbled murrelet. The Park also protects 876,669
13 acres of wilderness—one of the largest wilderness areas in the contiguous United States. *See*
14 *Wash. Park Wilderness Act, Pub. L. 100-668, 102 Stat. 3961 (Nov. 16, 1988).*

15 This diverse landscape includes an array of cultural and historic sites, providing a
16 glimpse at 200 years of exploration, homesteading, and community development in the Pacific
17 Northwest. The Park contains 128 historic structures, 44 of which are in wilderness. Many
18 represent the activities of the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service, and others
19 embody the perseverance of homesteaders and settlers and recreational development in the
20 Peninsula.

21 The five structures at the center of this case are in wilderness and are either listed on the
22 National Register of Historic Places or are eligible for listing: Botten Cabin (also known as
23 Wilder Patrol Cabin), Canyon Creek Shelter (also known as Sol Duc Falls Shelter), Wilder
24

1 Shelter, Bear Camp Shelter, and Elk Lake Shelter. Grant Humes constructed Botten Cabin,
2 which is listed, in 1928 in a remote location in the Park. The Civilian Conservation Corps
3 constructed Canyon Creek Shelter in 1939. It is the only remaining building of its kind. Wilder
4 Shelter is a “small footprint log shelter” that was constructed in 1952 in a remote location. It is
5 one of the few remaining trailside shelters in Olympic National Park. A quarter-mile away from
6 Wilder, the Park Service also constructed Bear Camp Shelter in 1952. Elk Lake Shelter was
7 constructed in 1963. It represents “the fourth variation of NPS designed shelters.”

8 **C. Preservation Maintenance Decisionmaking Process.**

9 In 2008, the Park Service completed a General Management Plan/Environmental Impact
10 Statement with a signed Record of Decision that included interim determinations about its
11 management of historic structures pending completion of a Wilderness Stewardship Plan. *See*
12 AR 2833–3365. The General Plan examined multiple strategies and set forth the Park Service’s
13 selected management plan: “Where historic structures or cultural landscapes have been included
14 within designated wilderness, they will be protected and maintained using methods that are
15 consistent with preservation of wilderness character and values and cultural resource
16 requirements.” AR 3322. Tiered to the General Plan, the Park Service also completed a
17 programmatic categorical exclusion. *See* AR3546. The programmatic exclusion decided routine
18 repair work on cultural structures—including basic seasonal maintenance and roof and structural
19 maintenance—was exempt from NEPA analysis from 2008 to 2011 because no “extraordinary
20 circumstances” causing significant impacts on natural resources, cultural resources, or wilderness
21 areas existed.

22 In 2011, the Park Service decided Botten Cabin, Wilder Shelter, and Bear Camp Shelter
23 needed preservation maintenance. Decay and deterioration had left Botten Cabin in poor
24

1 | condition and needing roof repairs and new logs. *See* AR 6103. Wilder Shelter’s roof had
2 | collapsed. *See* AR6009. Only 10% of its materials were salvageable. *See id.* Many of Bear
3 | Camp’s logs had deteriorated, and because of heavy snow loads, it needed a new roof. *See* AR
4 | 6202. The Park Service issued a Minimum Requirements Worksheet for each structure to
5 | determine if repair work was necessary, and if so, how to minimize its impacts. *See* AR6105
6 | (Botten) (“The minimum requirement concept [is] applied as a two-step process that determines
7 | whether the proposed management action is appropriate or necessary for administration of the
8 | area as wilderness and does not cause a significant impact to wilderness resources and character,
9 | in accordance with the Wilderness Act; and the techniques and types of equipment needed to
10 | ensure that impacts on wilderness resources and character are minimized.”); *see also*
11 | AR6011(Wilder); AR6204 (Bear Camp). The Park Service determined the work was necessary
12 | for each. After analyzing alternatives, it concluded the least impacts in time, to wilderness, and
13 | to park resources would result if helicopters delivered supplies to Botten Cabin in five loads or
14 | less and crews hiked in. It authorized the use of motorized tools for less than one hour per day.
15 | The Park Service authorized the same plan for Wilder and Bear Camp, although it only permitted
16 | three or fewer helicopter trips for each. Finally, the Park Service determined the minimum
17 | necessary repair work for each fell within the programmatic exclusion, so it did not conduct a
18 | NEPA review.

19 | In March 2013, the Park Service notified the public of its intent to prepare a Wilderness
20 | Stewardship Plan. It has received comments on draft alternatives, and after reviewing them, will
21 | release a draft Stewardship Plan and EIS for public comment. The Court’s decisions in this case
22 | will also inform the Park Service’s Stewardship Plan decisions.

1 In the interim, in 2015, the Park Service identified the Canyon Creek and Elk Lake
2 Structures as needing preservation maintenance. Time and weather caused Canyon Creek's logs
3 to naturally deteriorate and decay and its chimney flue to rust. Winter wind caused a falling snag
4 to damage Elk Lake. For each, the Park Service used an MRW to conclude the repair work was
5 necessary. It decided the best plan of action was to disallow motorized tools and helicopter trips.
6 It permitted the Canyon Creek crew to use a dolly to transport materials. Finally, the Park
7 Service issued a categorical exclusion for each structure, deciding the routine maintenance
8 exemption excused the projects from NEPA review. *See* AR6458 (Canyon Creek); *see also*
9 AR6742 (Elk Lake). It supplemented these documents with analyses of what impacts to
10 environmental and historic resources would result. *See* AR6458 (Canyon Creek Environmental
11 Screening); AR6454 (Canyon Creek Historic Properties); AR6728 (Elk Lake Environmental
12 Screening); AR6738 (Elk Lake Historic Properties).

13 Wilderness Watch argues the Park Service has failed to preserve Olympic National
14 Park's wilderness character and improperly rebuilt the five historic structures without first
15 demonstrating their necessity, in violation of the Wilderness Act. It also argues that by relying on
16 a categorical exclusion, and so failing to prepare an environmental assessment or impact
17 statement taking a "hard look" at the effects of its construction, the Park Service violated the
18 NEPA. Wilderness Watch asks the Court to conclude the Park Service acted arbitrarily and
19 capriciously under the APA and to reverse its decisions.

20 Intervener National Trust suggests the crux of Wilderness Watch's arguments stem from
21 the Park Service's 2008 General Plan, which it may not timely challenge. It also argues the
22 Wilderness Act does not require the Park Service to perform a minimum necessity analysis
23 before performing historical maintenance, because the Act promotes historical preservation and
24

1 law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a); *see also Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247, 106
2 S.Ct. 2505 (1986).

3 The Administrative Procedure Act governs Wilderness Watch’s Wilderness Act and
4 NEPA claims. Under the APA, a court may set aside an agency’s action only if it determines the
5 action was “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with
6 law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(a). It must carefully review the record to ensure the agency’s action was
7 founded on a reasoned evaluation of the relevant factors. *See Friends of Yosemite Valley v.*
8 *Norton*, 348 F.3d 789, 793 (9th Cir. 2003). An agency acted arbitrarily and capriciously if it
9 relied on factors Congress did not intend for it to consider, entirely failed to consider an
10 important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation running counter to the evidence, or is so
11 implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or as the product of agency
12 expertise. *See Motor Vehicles Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43,
13 103 S. Ct. 2856 (1983). Although a court may not substitute its judgment for an agency’s, it may
14 not rubber-stamp administrative decisions inconsistent with a statute’s mandate or that frustrate
15 its underlying congressional policy. *See id.*

16 An agency’s decision not to prepare an EIS is typically reviewed under the arbitrary and
17 capricious standard too; however, where an agency has decided a project requires no EIS without
18 first conducting an EA, courts review the action under the reasonableness standard. *See High*
19 *Sierra Hikers Ass’n v. Blackwell*, 390 F.3d 630, 640 (9th Cir. 2004). Courts defer to the agency’s
20 decision if it is “fully informed and well considered.” *See id.* (quoting *Save the Yaak Comm. v.*
21 *Block*, 840 F.2d 714, 717 (9th Cir. 1988). When an agency has taken action without observance
22 of the procedure required by law, the Court must set it aside. *See id.* (quoting *Idaho Sporting*
23 *Congress, Inc. v. Alexander*, 222 F.3d 562, 567 (9th Cir. 2000).

1 **D. Historical Preservation as a Purpose of the Wilderness Act.**

2 The Wilderness Act prohibits structures in Olympic National Park’s wilderness unless
3 they are the minimum necessary for administering the area in accordance with the Act’s purpose.
4 *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1133(c). The Court must determine if historical preservation is unambiguously
5 contrary to the Act—if it contradicts the Act’s mandate to preserve wilderness or frustrates its
6 underlying congressional policy.

7 Wilderness Watch argues loftily that the Park Service’s decision to preserve historical
8 structures violates the Wilderness Act because the Act only permits structures in wilderness if
9 they further the Act’s singular purpose: wilderness preservation. It argues that as a “public
10 purpose” of wilderness, “historical use” is subservient to the Act’s overarching ambition of
11 preserving wilderness as wilderness. It also argues “historical use” refers to valuing past natural
12 uses of the land, not manmade buildings.

13 National Trust argues the Ninth Circuit already rejected this argument in *Wilderness*
14 *Watch v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 629 F.3d 1024, 1032–40 (9th Cir. 2010) (“*Kofa*
15 *Wilderness*”), which held another public purpose—“conservation”—to be a valid goal of the Act.
16 It argues the Wilderness Act promotes historic preservation and mandates that a wilderness
17 designation may not discharge the preservation requirements of other statutes, such as the
18 Historic Sites Act, the Antiquities Act of 1906, the National Park Service Organic Act, and the
19 NHPA. It also argues the Act’s legislative history demonstrates Congress never intended it to be
20 a tool against historic preservation.

21 The Park Service argues that although historic preservation is subject to the Wilderness
22 Act, it is indeed a purpose of the Act. It argues that because the Act charges it with preserving
23 Olympic National Park’s wilderness character, which includes a devotion to its “historical use,”
24

1 and with complying with cultural resource preservation statutes, it can maintain historic
2 structures in wilderness, so long as the means used are “necessary to meet the minimum
3 requirements for administration of the Olympic Wilderness for the purpose of the Wilderness
4 Act.” *See* Dkt. #49 at 6. The Park Service suggests congressional intent and its own guidance
5 documents support its interpretation.

6 Wilderness Watch responds that resorting to the Act’s legislative history and intent is
7 inappropriate because the statutory language is unambiguous, but even if the Court concludes the
8 statutory language is ambiguous and accepts the Park Service’s interpretation, the Park Service
9 had an obligation to demonstrate how the structures meet the Act’s purpose, which it failed to do.

10 The Ninth Circuit has not had occasion to address whether Section 1133(b)’s reference to
11 “historical use” makes preservation of historic structures a valid, or at least ambiguous, purpose
12 of the Wilderness Act, but the Eleventh Circuit has. It concluded the Act unambiguously
13 prohibited the Park Service from transporting visitors across wilderness to historic areas,
14 reasoning “the need to preserve historical structures may not be inferred from the Wilderness Act
15 nor grafted onto its general purpose.” *See Wilderness Watch v. Mainella*, 375 F.3d 1085, 1092
16 (11th Cir. 2004) (“*Cumberland Island*”); *see also Olympic Park Associates v. Mainella*, No.
17 C04-5732FDB, 2005 WL 1871114, at *6 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 1, 2005) (“*Olympic Park*”)
18 (concluding the Park Service acted arbitrarily and capriciously under *Cumberland Island* by
19 replacing two historic structures with new structures flown into the Olympic National Park
20 Wilderness). The Ninth Circuit has, however, addressed a related question: whether
21 “conservation” is an unambiguous purpose of the Act under Section 1133(b).

22 The Eleventh Circuit considered whether transporting tourists across wilderness to two
23 historic areas in Cumberland Island was necessary for meeting the minimum requirements for
24

1 administering the area under the Wilderness Act. *See Cumberland Island*, 375 F.3d at 1088–94.
2 Cumberland Island features some of the last-remaining undeveloped land on the Atlantic Coast’s
3 barrier islands. *See id.* at 1088. Congress designated some of it as wilderness or potential
4 wilderness. *See id.* The Island hosts two historical areas listed in the National Register of
5 Historic Places: Plum Orchard, just outside the wilderness boundary, and the Settlement, located
6 in potential wilderness. *See id.* The Park Service used a one-lane dirt road to access these areas,
7 claiming it needed to do so to meet its obligations to restore, maintain, preserve, and curate
8 historic resources. *See id.* at 1089. It allowed tourists to “piggyback” onto these trips. *See id.* It
9 eventually acquired a fifteen-person van and offered transportation across the Island to these
10 sites at regular intervals (three times per week and once per month, respectively). *See id.* at 1090.

11 Wilderness Watch argued the Wilderness Act prohibited the Park Service from offering
12 these piggyback-tours because they were not the minimum necessary for the agency to meet its
13 administrative needs or for any other purpose. *See id.* The Park Service argued the preservation
14 of historic structures was in fact administration to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act,
15 referencing the NHPA and Section 1133(b)’s mention of “historical use” as a public purpose of
16 the Act for support. *See id.*

17 The Eleventh Circuit disagreed with the Park Service, concluding preservation of
18 historical structures does not further the goals of the Wilderness Act. *See id.* at 1091, 1094. It
19 pointed out that the Park Service must carry out any historic-preservation obligation deriving
20 from the NHPA in such a way as to preserve the Island’s wilderness character. *See id.* at 1021
21 (citing 16 U.S.C. § 1133(b)). It reasoned Section 1133(b)’s list (devoting wilderness areas to the
22 public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use)
23 tracks the definition of wilderness areas in Section 1131(c) (describing wilderness as an area for
24

1 recreation and with ecological, geological, scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value), so,
2 given the Act’s prohibition on structures, “the only reasonable reading of ‘historical use’ ...
3 refers to natural, rather than man-made features.” *Id.* at 1092. It concluded Congress
4 “unambiguously prohibited the Park Service from offering motorized transportation to park
5 visitors through the wilderness area.” *See id.* at 1094. Therefore, transporting visitors across
6 wilderness could not be “necessary” for administering the area for the purpose of the Wilderness
7 Act. *See id.* at 1092.

8 This Court adopted the Eleventh Circuit’s reasoning in *Olympic Park*—a case nearly
9 identical to the one before the Court. *See* 2005 WL 1871114, at *6. Two shelters eligible for
10 listing on the National Historic Register collapsed under heavy snow loads. *See id.* at *2. The
11 Park Service reconstructed them in a maintenance yard and flew them back into Olympic
12 National Park, bringing the values of historic preservation and wilderness preservation into
13 conflict. *See id.* The Court reasoned that the designation of the Park as wilderness placed on the
14 land an overarching value of preserving its primeval character devoid of permanent
15 improvements or human habitation. *See id.* at *6. It concluded the Park Service erred by failing
16 to properly consider this value—to properly consider the Act’s “mandate to preserve the wild
17 and primitive character of the Olympic Wilderness.” *See id.* at *6, 8 (“The [two] shelters have
18 collapsed under the natural effects of weather and time, and to reconstruct [them] by means of a
19 helicopter is in direct contradiction of the mandate to preserve” the Park’s wilderness character.).

20 Six years later, the Ninth Circuit considered a similar question: whether constructing two
21 structures to conserve bighorn sheep qualified as the minimum necessary for the administration
22 of the Kofa Refuge and Wilderness. *See Kofa Wilderness*, 629 F.3d at 1032–40. The Kofa
23 Wilderness is in the Sonoran Desert in southwest Arizona. *See id.* at 1026. A principal reason for
24

1 its establishment was preservation of bighorn sheep. *See id.* Approximately 82% of it is
2 wilderness. *See id.* The United States Fish and Wildlife Service must comply with both the
3 Wilderness Act and the Refuge Act. *See id.* at 1027.

4 Since the 1950s, the State of Arizona, non-profit organizations, and the federal
5 government developed water sources, such as catchments, wells, and tanks, to augment the
6 availability of water for the sheep. *See id.* Over 100 water sources exist. *See id.* When the
7 sheep’s population declined, Fish & Wildlife investigated. *See id.* at 1029. It used mechanized
8 means to construct two PVC-pipe water structures designed to catch rainwater and to run it into
9 concrete weirs or troughs. *See id.* at 1032. Wilderness Watch argued the structures violated the
10 Act’s prohibition on structures. *See id.* at 1032. Fish & Wildlife argued “conservation” was a
11 valid purpose of the Act under Section 1133(b). *See id.* at 1032–34.

12 The Ninth Circuit began as the Eleventh Circuit did: by deciding whether “conservation”
13 of bighorn sheep is unambiguously a purpose of the Act. *See id.* at 1032. The Court reasoned the
14 Act includes strongly worded phrases suggesting wilderness areas are to remain untouched, like
15 a museum diorama. But, it also states that the wilderness is to be preserved as wilderness devoted
16 to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical
17 use—uses “incompatible with a museum notion of wilderness.” *See id.* The Ninth Circuit
18 concluded “the Act gives conflicting policy directives” to Fish & Wildlife, which “must preserve
19 the wilderness character of the area while at the same time providing for ‘recreational, scenic,
20 scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. *See id.* at 1033. It therefore held that “the
21 purpose of the Wilderness Act with regard to conservation is ambiguous.” *See id.* at 1033 (citing
22 *High Sierra Hikers Ass’n v. Blackwell*, 390 F.3d 630, 647–48 (9th Cir. 2004) (“Although we
23 believe that Congress intended to enshrine the long-term preservation of wilderness areas as the
24

1 ultimate goal of the Act, the diverse, and sometimes conflicting list of responsibilities imposed
2 on administering agencies renders Congress’s intent arguably ambiguous.”)). It ultimately
3 deferred to Fish & Wildlife’s interpretation that conservation of bighorn sheep follows the
4 purposes of the Wilderness Act. *See id.* at 1036 (applying *Skidmore* deference).

5 This Court considered how the conflicting holdings in *Cumberland Island* (and *Olympic*
6 *Park*) and *Kofa Wilderness* should influence its analysis of whether the Forest Service violated
7 the Wilderness Act and the NEPA by extensively rebuilding a fire lookout in the Glacier Peak
8 Wilderness Area in *Wilderness Watch v. Iwamoto*, 853 F.Supp.2d 1063, 1070–74 (W.D. Wash.
9 2012) (“*Glacier Peak*”). The lookout was a frequent destination for day-hikers that the Forest
10 Service planned to staff. *See id.* at 1065, 1068. To avoid losing it after a winter of heavy
11 snowfall, the Forest Service disassembled it, removed it from Green Mountain by helicopter,
12 salvaged original materials where possible, and repaired it. *See id.* at 1067–68. Years and 67-
13 helicopter turns later, the Forest Service reassembled the lookout in Glacier Peak on a newly-laid
14 foundation. *See id.* at 1068. The lookout did not meet the criteria for historic listing under the
15 NHPA, yet the Forest Service argued the steps it took to preserve the lookout were appropriate
16 given the Wilderness Act’s devotion to historical uses of wilderness areas. *See id.* at 1069.

17 The Court decided that although *Cumberland Island* and *Olympic Park* were directly on
18 point, the Ninth Circuit’s intervening analysis of the tension between the Act’s conflicting policy
19 directives was instructive, and so should be followed. *See id.* at 1072–74. It reasoned that to the
20 extent Section 1133(b)’s reference to “conservation” creates an instruction that conflicts with an
21 agency’s obligation to preserve wilderness character, Section 1133(b)’s reference to “historical
22 use” would logically create the same conflict. *See id.* at 1074. “Indeed, one might imagine that
23 agency action furthering the goals of conservation would be less likely to conflict with the
24

1 | overriding goal of wilderness preservation than action furthering other referenced uses.” *Id.*

2 | Therefore, the Court deferred to the Forest Service’s interpretation that historical use is a valid
3 | goal of the Act. *See id.*

4 | The Court agrees with the *Glacier Peak* Court. The tension the Ninth Circuit observed
5 | between the Act’s conflicting policy directives in Sections 1131 and 1133 creates an ambiguity
6 | warranting deference to the Park Service’s interpretation. While the Act’s overarching ambition
7 | is the preservation of “land retaining its primeval character and influence,” it does not require an
8 | agency to forfeit its other management values. *See* 16 U.S.C. §§ 1131(c), 1133(b). It simply must
9 | administer those values in a way that preserves an area’s wilderness character, such as by leaving
10 | it unimpaired and by ensuring it is devoted to recreational, scenic, scientific, educational,
11 | conservation, and historical use. *See* 16 U.S.C. §§ 1131(c), 1133(b). The Eleventh Circuit’s
12 | understanding of “historical use” as referring to former uses of the land, rather than preservation
13 | of man’s presence, is compelling when considering the Act as a whole. *See Cumberland Island*,
14 | 375 F.3d at 1092. But, as the Ninth Circuit reminds us, “Congress did not mandate that the
15 | Service preserve the wilderness in a museum diorama.” *Kofa Wilderness*, 629 F.3d at 1033. It’s
16 | guidance leads the Court to conclude that the phrase “historical use” is ambiguous; the Park
17 | Service’s understanding of historical preservation as furthering a goal of the Wilderness Act is a
18 | plausible-enough interpretation of “historical use” that it can be ascribed to a difference in view
19 | or the product of agency expertise.

20 | The Court applies *Skidmore* deference to the Park Service’s interpretation of the phrase.
21 | *See Kofa* at 1035. Under this standard, the deference accorded depends “upon the thoroughness
22 | evident in [the agency’s] consideration, the validity of its reasoning, its consistency with earlier
23 | and later pronouncements, and all those factors that give it power to persuade, if lacking power
24 |

1 to control.” *Id.* (quoting *United States v. Mead Corp.*, 533 U.S. 218, 228, 121 S. Ct. 2164
2 (2001)).

3 The Park Service has a longstanding approach of preserving historic structures, subject to
4 wilderness concerns. Even before Congress designated the Olympic Wilderness, the Park Service
5 exercised its discretion under the Organic Act in removing structures that compromised the
6 Park’s wilderness character and preserving others. *See* AR1992 (explaining that the Park Service
7 needed to remove some structures to uphold wilderness ideals and to halt ecological devastation).
8 It used the minimum tools necessary to perform this work. *See* AR489-92 (1976/80 Backcountry
9 Management Plan). And despite pushback from environmentalists, allowed backcountry
10 structures to remain extant. *See* AR1993. In its 2008 General Plan, the Park Service evaluated its
11 management approach under the Wilderness Act. It reiterated a version of its earlier approach,
12 declaring it would protect and maintain historic structures “using methods that are consistent
13 with preservation of wilderness character and values.” AR 3322. The Park Service’s
14 consideration of how to best manage manmade structures and wilderness in Olympic National
15 Park, both before and after the Wilderness Act, has been thorough and consistent. Therefore, the
16 Court defers to the Park Service’s conclusion that historic preservation furthers a goal of the
17 Wilderness Act, and the Park Service’s actions here were appropriate if they were the minimum
18 necessary. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1133(c).

19 **D. The Wilderness Act’s Exception for Structures that are the Minimum Necessary for**
20 **Preserving Olympic National Park’s Historical Use.**

21 Wilderness Watch argues the Park Service violated the Wilderness Act by failing to
22 demonstrate that reconstruction of each of the five structures “was necessary, and the minimum
23 necessary, for administration of the Wilderness in light of all of the other structures in the
24 Wilderness, in light of the five structures at issue in this case, and in light of each structure’s

1 individual and cumulative impact on wilderness character.” Dkt. #21 at 28. It argues that without
2 this analysis—that by presuming the structures and work done to preserve them were necessary
3 individually and cumulatively—the Park Service’s decision to rebuild was arbitrary and
4 capricious, in violation of the APA. It argues neither the Park Service’s General Plan nor its
5 MRWs include a reasoned finding of necessity. Rather, the MRWs focus on the structure’s
6 historical significance, refer back to the Park Service’s broad cultural resource management
7 policies, and then presume the structures are necessary.

8 National Trust argues the Act does not require the Park Service to conduct a minimum
9 necessity analysis when considering whether to reconstruct historic structures. It asserts such a
10 requirement would force the Park Service to hinge its determination of whether to preserve a
11 historic building on the structure’s location, rendering Section 1133(a)(3)’s mandate that a
12 wilderness designation cannot lower preservation standards meaningless. But, if the Act requires
13 such an analysis, the Park Service met this obligation through its General Plan and individualized
14 MRWs.

15 The Park Service argues that the relevant inquiry is whether it made an adequately
16 reasoned determination that the maintenance of these five structures was necessary to preserve
17 historical uses of the Olympic Wilderness. *See* Dkt. #49 at 12. For each structure, the Park
18 Service argues it properly determined maintenance work was “appropriate and necessary for
19 administration of the area as wilderness,” because it exercised its Organic Act and NHPA
20 authority to determine preservation maintenance was required, performed a minimum
21 requirements analysis, and selected the least harmful alternative. It suggests the MRWs supplied
22 the proper analysis because in them it (1) addressed why the repairs sought were “necessary or
23 appropriate to meet wilderness management objectives or the requirements of other laws,
24

1 policies[,] and directives,” and (2) it considered and dismissed educational and no action
2 alternatives.

3 Because the Court owes deference to the Park Service’s interpretation of historic
4 structures as a benefit offered by an enduring wilderness, the operative question is whether the
5 Park Service made an adequately reasoned determination of necessity. *See Kofa*, 629 F.3d at
6 1036 (citing *High Sierra*, 390 F.3d at 646–47). “A generic finding of necessity does not suffice.”
7 *See id.* at 1037 (citing *High Sierra*, 390 F.3d at 647). The Park Service must engage in a two-part
8 analysis, (1) determining whether the structures are necessary to preserve historic values, (2) and
9 if so, what work to rehabilitate them, including the use of motorized equipment and
10 transportation, is the minimum needed. *See Kofa Wilderness*, 629 F.3d at 1037; *see also*
11 *Olympic*, 853 F.Supp.2d at 1075. The “Act does not specify any particular form or content for
12 such an assessment.” *Kofa Wilderness*, 629 F.3d at 1036 (quoting *High Sierra Hikers Ass’n v.*
13 *Blackwell*, 390 F.3d 630, 647 (9th Cir. 2004)). Courts defer to the form selected by the agency.
14 *See id.*

15 **A. Necessity.**

16 At the least, the agency must first explain why its chosen action is necessary when
17 compared to other courses of action not prohibited by the Act. *Kofa*, 629 F.3d at 1039. In *Kofa*
18 *Wilderness*, Fish & Wildlife failed to make an initial finding that the rain structures were
19 necessary for the conservation of bighorn sheep. *See* 629 F.3d at 1037 (“The Service
20 undoubtedly found that, *assuming that improvements to water facilities were necessary*, the
21 development of the two water structures was necessary.... But the key question—whether water
22 structures were necessary at all—remains entirely unanswered and unexplained by the record.”)
23 (emphasis in original). Without first eliminating other strategies that could have helped to
24

1 conserve the sheep (temporarily closing trails and reducing mountain lion predation,
2 translocations, and hunting), Fish & Wildlife presumed improvements to water facilities were
3 necessary and reasoned from that faulty position. *See id.* The Court explained, “It is beyond
4 dispute that, if addressing other variables will lead to satisfactory sheep recovery, then a new
5 structure is not ‘necessary.’” *Id.* at 1039. The Service’s failure to “provide enough evidence and
6 explanation in the record to assure [the Court] that it fully considered those avenues and
7 nevertheless rationally concluded that new water structures are, in fact, necessary,” was fatal to
8 its conclusion. *Id.* at 1039–40. The agency should also consider whether repairs are necessary.
9 *See Glacier Peak*, 853 F.Supp.2d at 1075 (“The essential question ... is whether the ... decision
10 to engage in extensive rehabilitation and reconstruction ... and the related use of mechanized
11 transport [i]s ‘necessary’ for the ‘minimum administration’ of the area for historical use.”).

12 The Court is loath to engage in a “magic words review,” where the propriety of the Park
13 Service’s analysis hinges on whether it included the correct words in its MRWs, rather than
14 whether its analysis carried the substantive weight arbitrary and capricious review demands.
15 Indeed, the record as a whole—what the Court is charged with reviewing—demonstrates the
16 agency made a reasoned finding of necessity by determining both that the structures are
17 necessary to preserve historic values in Olympic National Park and that it was necessary to repair
18 each one.

19 In its General Plan/EIS, the Park Service decided to “protect and maintain” historic
20 structures in wilderness, even though doing so could produce minor adverse impacts on
21 wilderness character. *See* AR2784–87; *see also* AR3322. It reached this conclusion after
22 thoroughly evaluating and comparing four management approaches and considering over 500
23 comments, including a submission by the Wilderness Watch. *See* AR3238; *see also* AR 3321. By
24

1 deciding it best to protect and maintain historic structures in wilderness, the Park Service
2 inherently found them necessary to preserve Olympic National Park’s history.

3 It considered to what degree each structure needed to be repaired in part one of its
4 MRWs. In the MRW for each structure, the Park Service decided reconstruction was necessary
5 to preserve the structure’s longevity, to prevent it from deteriorating over time. *See, e.g.*,
6 AR6016 (Wilder); AR6110 (Botten); AR6209 (Bear Camp); AR6467 (Canyon Creek); AR6715
7 (Elk Lake). In the main, this analysis involved three steps. The agency first considered whether
8 reconstruction was necessary given wilderness management objectives or Park Service policy. It
9 reasoned repair was necessary under its management policies, because the structure-to-be-
10 repaired either was listed on the National Register of Historic Places or was eligible for listing.
11 *See id.* (referencing Park Service Management Policies, which direct cultural resources “included
12 within wilderness ... to be protected and maintained”). The agency then considered and
13 dismissed a non-prohibited alternative: educating visitors about each structure’s history. Third,
14 the Park Service considered whether the work could occur outside of wilderness. For all five
15 structures, the Park Service decided it could not because the structures are in wilderness and
16 educating visitors was an insufficient alternative. *See* AR6017 (Wilder); AR6111 (Botten);
17 AR6210 (Bear Camp); AR6468 (Canyon Creek); AR6716 (Elk Lake).

18 Together, the Park Service’s General Plan and five MRWs demonstrate it reasonably
19 concluded each structure was necessary to preserve historical values, and so warranted repair.
20 The Park Service therefore made an adequately reasoned determination of necessity for each.

21 **B. Minimum Tools Required.**

22 The Park Service answered the second minimum necessity question—what are the
23 minimum tools, techniques, and actions needed to repair each structure—in part two of its
24

1 MRWs. Wilderness Watch argues the Park Service arbitrarily rejected “no action” alternatives
2 that could have maintained the structures’ cultural integrity without disturbing the Park’s
3 wilderness character. It also argues the Park Service failed to justify its use of motorized tools
4 and helicopters to repair Botten Cabin, Wilder, and Bear Camp Shelter, considering it
5 acknowledged the availability of less intrusive means. The Park Service supports its decision to
6 use motorized tools and helicopters by arguing that for each structure, it chose the alternative that
7 would create the least impacts in time and duration, on wilderness, and to park resources.

8 When an agency evaluates its available alternatives, it must address why its repair plan
9 includes no more work than necessary. *See Olympic*, 853 F.Supp.2d at 1076. In general,
10 “machinery as intrusive as a helicopter is rarely necessary to meet minimum requirements for the
11 administration of [an] area [because] helicopters carry man and his works[,] and so are
12 antithetical to a wilderness experience.” *Olympic*, 853 F.Supp.2d at 1076 (internal punctuation
13 omitted).

14 The Park Service always considered at least three alternatives, including a “no action”
15 alternative and usually including a non-motorized alternative, though it did not consider an
16 alternative without motorized tools and without a helicopter for Bear Camp. *See* AR6212–13. It
17 assessed each alternative’s positive and negative effects on the surrounding area’s wilderness
18 character. When justifying its selection, it set forth the chosen alternative’s advantages and ways
19 to mitigate its environmental impacts. *See* AR6025 (Wilder); AR6119 (Botten); AR6219 (Bear
20 Camp); AR6478 (Canyon Creek); AR6725 (Elk Lake).

21 Although the Court might disagree with the Park Service’s ultimate conclusions, such as
22 its decision to repair Bear Camp before assessing the viability of an alternative without
23 motorized tools and without a helicopter, it cannot say that the agency arbitrarily and
24

1 capriciously determined what tools and techniques constituted the minimum necessary. The Park
2 Service considered the positive and negative effects of multiple alternatives and selected the
3 option that in its expert opinion would affect wilderness the least. It relied only on factors that
4 Congress intended for it to consider, and it evaluated all important aspects of the problem. The
5 Park Service therefore reasonably determined the minimum tools and techniques needed.

6 **E. The Park Service’s Adoption of its Routine Maintenance Categorical Exclusion.**

7 Next, Wilderness Watch argues the Park Service wrongly applied the routine
8 maintenance categorical exclusion because its actions had, and have, the potential to significantly
9 affect the environment. It argues that to be excludable, an action must easily fit within the
10 exclusion and clearly have no potential for environmental impact. It also argues numerous
11 “extraordinary circumstances” exist, precluding the Park Service from using this exclusion.

12 National Trust suggests adopting Wilderness Watch’s position would require the Park
13 Service to complete a full NEPA review of its cultural resource policy before performing any
14 maintenance work. It argues the Park Service appropriately used a categorical exclusion because
15 the agency considered any extraordinary circumstances in its General Plan/EIS.

16 The Park Service contends it correctly applied the routine maintenance exclusion. It
17 argues its repair work properly fell within this exclusion because its limitation to “short term
18 effects” regards the maintenance-work’s effects, not the effects of the structure’s resultant
19 durability. At least, the Park Service argues, the Court must defer to the agency’s interpretation
20 of its own regulation, as 43 C.F.R. § 46.210(f) is neither plainly erroneous nor internally
21 inconsistent. The Park Service also argues the environmental screenings for its 2008
22 programmatic exclusion and its Canyon Creek and Elk Lake categorical exclusions demonstrate
23 no extraordinary circumstances existed.

1 NEPA is a procedural statute that ensures federal agencies take a hard look at the
2 environmental consequences of their actions. *See High Sierra*, 390 F.3d at 639. In general, it
3 requires an agency to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact
4 statement before committing its resources to a project, unless a categorical exclusion applies. *See*
5 *California v. Norton*, 311 F.3d 1162, 1175 (9th Cir. 2002). An agency may adopt a categorical
6 exclusion for a category of actions that “do not individually or cumulatively have a significant
7 effect on the human environment.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.4 (2016). The Park Service’s exclusions
8 include one for “routine ... maintenance, renovations, and replacement activities having limited
9 context and intensity (e.g., limited size and magnitude or short-term effects).” 43 C.F.R.
10 § 46.210(f). Although, it may not apply this exclusion if “extraordinary circumstances,” such as
11 production of significant impacts on natural resources, cultural resources, or wilderness areas,
12 would exist. *See* 43 C.F.R. § 46.215.

13 To assess whether an agency properly applied an exclusion, the reviewing court examines
14 the documentation that the agency made contemporaneously with its adoption of the exclusion.
15 *See Bicycle Trails Council of Marin v. Babbitt*, 82 F.3d 1445, 1456 n.5 (9th Cir. 1996); *see also*
16 *California*, 311 F.3d at 1176. The record should “show that the agency considered the
17 environmental consequences of its action and decided to apply a categorical exclusion to the
18 facts of a particular decision. Post-hoc invocation of a categorical exclusion does not provide
19 assurance that the agency considered the effects of its action before deciding to pursue it. *Id.* A
20 brief statement that a categorical exclusion is being invoked will typically suffice, although
21 concern for adequate justification is heightened when “there is substantial evidence in the record
22 that exceptions to the categorical exclusion are applicable.” *Id.* When such evidence exists, “the
23 agency must at the very least explain why the action does not fall within one of the exceptions.”
24

1 *Id.* at 1177; *see also* 49 Fed. Reg. at 21439 (If an exception to the exclusion might exist, the
2 agency must prepare environmental documents).

3 The Park Service concluded in its 2008 programmatic exclusion that routine maintenance
4 on Olympic National Park’s historic structures between 2008 and 2011 was exempt from NEPA
5 review. *See* AR3553–67 (programmatic CE). It defined this work as including “the preparation
6 of logs, timbers, shakes, and other materials, and the replacement of roofs and structural
7 members.” AR 3549. It properly considered the work’s environmental impacts, confirming its
8 effects would be limited in duration, context, and intensity. *See* AR3554 (environmental
9 screening). The Park Service applied this exclusion to its 2011 work on Botten Cabin, Wilder
10 Shelter, and Bear Camp Shelter. Its work on these structures—repairing their roofs and replacing
11 logs—falls within the routine maintenance exclusion. *See, e.g.*, AR6046, 56 (Botten Cabin
12 photos showing deteriorating logs); AR5990 (Wilder Shelter photo showing collapsed roof);
13 AR6145 (Bear Camp Shelter photo of deteriorating logs and damaged roof). The Park Service
14 therefore reasonably exempted this routine, replacement work from an EIS or EA.


15 The Park Service conducted project-specific categorical exclusions for the Canyon Creek
16 and Elk Lake structures. *See* AR6458 (Canyon Creek CE); *see also* AR6742 (Elk Lake CE). It
17 assessed the environmental impacts of its anticipated repair work. *See* AR6436 (Canyon Creek
18 environmental screening); *see also* AR6728 (Elk Lake environmental screening). The Park
19 Service’s replacement of Canyon Creek’s deteriorated logs, rafter tails, and post ends and
20 chimney flue falls within the routine maintenance exception, as does its rehabilitation of Elk
21 Lake’s roof. *See* AR6343 (Canyon Creek photo showing replaced logs); *see also* AR6697 (Elk
22 Lake photo showing damaged roof). The Park Service therefore reasonably exempted this work
23 from a full-fledged environmental assessment.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 The record demonstrates that the Park Service did not arbitrarily and capriciously repair
3 Botten Cabin, Canyon Creek Shelter, Wilder Shelter, Bear Camp Shelter, and Elk Lake Shelter
4 in Olympic National Park’s wilderness. It reasonably determined the minimum amount of work
5 necessary to preserve the structure’s historic integrity, consistent with the Wilderness Act. It also
6 properly exempted this routine, replacement work from environmental review by first
7 considering and dismissing the possibility that it would produce significant environmental
8 impacts. Therefore, Wilderness Watch’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #21] is DENIED,
9 and the Park Service’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #42] is GRANTED. The case is
10 DISMISSED.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated this 14th day of December, 2016.

13 

14 Ronald B. Leighton
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24