

From: Williams, Timothy
To: [Bowman, Randal](#)
Subject: Fwd: National Monument Reviews - The Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument
Date: Wednesday, June 07, 2017 7:23:21 AM
Attachments: [KNM 6.6.17 to Secretary Zinke.docx](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <(b) (6)>
Date: Tue, Jun 6, 2017 at 6:28 PM
Subject: National Monument Reviews - The Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument
To: Timothy_Williams@ios.doi.gov

Dear Mr. Williams:

At the suggestion of Anne Williams of the Maine Woods Coalition, I am attaching a copy of the letter I had earlier sent to Secretary Zinke. Thank you for your help in getting this information to others who are concerned.

Sincerely,
William Peet

--

Department Of The Interior

External and Intergovernmental Affairs

Timothy Williams

timothy_williams@ios.doi.gov

Office: (202) 208-6015

Cell: (202) 706-4982

June 6, 2017

Secretary Ryan Zinke
Department of the Interior
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington DC 20240

Dear Secretary Zinke:

As a Trustee of the Maine Woods Coalition and a northern Maine property owner for almost 50 years, I have closely followed the Katahdin Woods and Waters Monument issue and have concluded that this particular Monument designation was unwarranted and improper, for the reasons enumerated below. I hope you find these facts helpful.

The [Antiquities Act](#) authorizes National Monuments in order to protect “*historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest.*”

- **The Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument land does not need protection - yet.**
The establishing [proclamation](#) promises “protection” numerous times, but it does not specify the endangered historic objects or the threats, because there really aren’t any. However, a very real threat to any historic objects may arise from heavy national promotion of the Monument, together with the lure of snowmobiling, fishing and ice fishing within Monument grounds.
- **This Monument may not comply with the Antiquities Act’s “smallest area” requirement.**
Text of the establishing Proclamation does not disclose that the Monument is comprised of several non-contiguous parcels. These separate parcels are not individually identified and there is no explanation as to why each parcel requires monument status. Apart from not needing protection, some of these parcels may not even possess qualifying historic or scientific objects.
- **This Monument has the appearance of memorializing a generous gift of land and money.**
For many years the National Park Service had tried to accept a donation of about 87,500 acres, together with an attached forty million dollar maintenance fund. The donor required that the land be used to establish a new National Park and Recreation Area - which the local populace as well as state and national legislators steadfastly refused to accept. The donor’s response was to donate the land and supporting funds to create a National Monument, which required only a Presidential Proclamation confirming that the Monument complies with requirements of the Antiquities Act. That’s how the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument deal was struck.
- **The possibility of economic benefit must not be allowed to mask a serious misapplication of National Monument status.**
In recent testimony before a congressional committee, former governor Angus King [said](#), “*the monument has already begun to yield real economic benefits to the region*” and “*I am deeply concerned that this review will stifle that progress by threatening future investments and hampering economic growth when it is needed there now more than ever before.*”

I am not a lawyer, but it does seem clear that this monument designation is badly flawed and should be reversed. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William J. Peet II (wpeet@wpeet.com)
M.I.T Alum.; former Naval Reserve Officer; Young Presidents Org.; patents holder, etc.