



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Glennallen Field Office
P.O. Box 147
Glennallen, Alaska 99588
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

Richard Ivan's Right-of-Way
Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AK-020-2014-0001-DNA

Case File, AA-093743

DECISION RECORD

Background

Applicant owns a 5-acre parcel of private property which he is currently developing and accesses approximately 1 to 4 times per year. Applicants' access begins from a boat landing and trail head for Suslositna Valley on the Slana River and follows the same overland route used by all other area users to access the Suslositna Valley. At the end of a boardwalk structure built by Suslositna Valley residents, approximately ½ mile from the boat landing, the applicant overland route turns to the right and travels in a southwesterly direction for approximately ½ mile on an existing trail that terminates on the private property. This portion of trail was inadvertently not included in the routes authorized to the Suslositna Home Owners Association for maintenance. The applicant would like to perform maintenance and make minor improvements as necessary for safe travel and to prevent resource damage from trail braiding. The applicant also would like to secure the access to his parcel through the issuance of a right-of-way to him, should the land be conveyed from Federal ownership.

Decision

It is my decision to implement the Proposed Action, as described in the attached DNA.

Specifically, it is my decision to issue a right-of-way for access to Mr. Ivan's who has applied for and expressed a need to perform routine and regular trail maintenance to facilitate his access to his private parcel within the North Slana, Suslositna settlement area.

This decision is based on site-specific analysis in the Documentation of National Environmental Policy Act Adequacy (DNA), Ivan's Right-of-Way, DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2014-0002-DNA, and the management decisions contained in the East Alaska Approved Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (BLM 9/2007).

The attached Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) indicates that the selected action has been analyzed in a DNA and has been found to have no significant environmental effects. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared.

Rationale for the Decision

The Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA) and the East Alaska Resource Management Plan (EARMP) authorize the proposed action. Taking No Action would not apply the best application of guidance found in FLPMA and other regulations which govern the administration of public lands.

The guidance found within FLPMA is to manage the lands with multiple use and sound stewardship practices to the fullest extent possible with the public's interest in mind. Taking No Action, or denying the request, would not meet this guidance.

Laws, Authorities, and Land Use Plan Conformance

The DNA and supporting documentation have been prepared consistent with the requirements of various statutes and regulations:

The Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA), section 302;

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable land use plan because it is specifically provided for in section I-2 of the East Alaska Resource Management Plan, page 19:

“Land use authorizations include various authorizations and agreements to use BLM lands such as right-of-way grants, road, temporary use permits under several different authorities; leases, permits and easements under section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA); airport leases under the Act of May 24, 1928; and Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) leases.”

Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination

The Glennallen Field Office conducted an Inter-Disciplinary Team (IDT) meeting on March 4, 2014 to discuss the details of this proposal as well as in the original EA approved July 6, 2012. BLM Staff who have reviewed the proposed action:

Joseph Hart, Realty Specialist
Molly Cobbs, NEPA Coordinator
Sarah Bullock, Wildlife Specialist
John Jangala, Archaeologist
Dennis Teitzel, Field Manager
Marnie Graham, Public Affairs
Ben Seifert, Natural Resource Specialist
Cory Larson, Recreation Planner, Trails
Mike Sondergaard, Hydrologist

No public scoping specific to this DNA was conducted and no further consultation was conducted.

DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2011-0026-EA - Public notice for this EA was posted on October 17, 2011, on the BLM Glennallen Field Office Website NEPA log:

http://www.blm.gov/ak/st/en/info/nepa/gfo_nepa_register.html. No comments have been received.

An interdisciplinary team (IDT) was assembled and initially met on September 26, 2011. A field visit by the IDT was conducted on October 4, 2011 and a second internal scoping meeting on October 18, 2011 revealed the following as issues to be addressed in the EA:

- Cultural Resources;
- Travel management – trail widening to reach the site, trail reroutes to reach the site, improved access throughout the area;
- Riparian, Fisheries, and Hydrology.

Appeal Opportunities

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR § 4. To appeal you must file a notice of appeal at the BLM Glennallen Field Office, P.O. Box 147, Milepost 186.5 Glenn Highway, Glennallen, Alaska 99588, within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appeal must be in writing and delivered in person, via the United States Postal Service mail system, or other common carrier, to the Glennallen Field Office as noted above. *The BLM does not accept appeals by facsimile, email, or other electronic means.* The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR § 4.21 (58 FR 4939, January 19, 1993) for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards: (a) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied, (b) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits, (c) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and (d) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR § 4.413); Office of the Regional Solicitor, Alaska Region, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4230 University Drive, Suite 300, Anchorage, Alaska 99508; at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

/s/ Dennis C. Teitzel

July 15, 2014

Dennis C. Teitzel
Glennallen Field Manager

Date

Attachments

DOI-BLM-AK-020-2014-0001-DNA



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Glennallen Field Office
P.O. Box 147
Glennallen, Alaska 99588
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

Richard Ivan's Right-of-Way
Environmental Assessment, **DOI-BLM-AK-020-2014-0001-DNA**
Case File, **AA-093743**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Background

Applicant owns a 5-acre parcel of private property which he is currently developing and accesses approximately 1 to 4 times per year. Applicants' access begins from a boat landing and trail head for Suslositna Valley on the Slana River and follows the same overland route used by all other area users to access the Suslositna Valley. At the end of a boardwalk structure built by Suslositna Valley residents, approximately ½ mile from the boat landing, the applicant overland route turns to the right and travels in a southwesterly direction for approximately ½ mile on an existing trail that terminates on the private property. This portion of trail was inadvertently not included in the routes authorized to the Suslositna Home Owners Association for maintenance. The applicant would like to perform maintenance and make minor improvements as necessary for safe travel and to prevent resource damage from trail braiding. The applicant also would like to secure the access to his parcel through the issuance of a right-of-way to him, should the land be conveyed from Federal ownership.

Finding of No Significant Impact

This action and its effects have been evaluated consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for determining *significance*. Per 40 CFR § 1508.27, a determination of *significance* requires consideration of both context and intensity. The former refers to the relative context in which the action would occur such as society as a whole, affected region, affected interests, etc. The latter refers to the severity of the impact.

Context

The assessment of this project has allowed a determination that the action would have little to no significance on the environment. The actions within the project are being performed to reduce the amount of resource damage to the environment that can occur. No major alterations to the existing trail are proposed, just routine trail maintenance that is likely to occur without authorization.

Intensity

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

The proposed action is not considered to be adverse in any manner, residents of this area all participate in routine and seasonal trail maintenance to enhance their access to and from their private properties. Overall the maintenance being proposed would be considered a benefit as it will contribute to the reduction of resource damage in the form of trail braiding.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.

The action has no anticipated negative impacts to public health, but could have a positive impact to public safety, by ensuring an improvement to the ease of travel on the trail system through routine maintenance.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

A cultural review has determined this action will have no impacts to historic or cultural resources.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

The residents of this area have a common goal to improve their access. It is not anticipated that this proposed action will be received by anyone as highly controversial. Past observations of trail maintenance for this area have proven that these residents tend to assist each other especially in the worst sections of trail when the task to repair or improve the access is a large task.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The proposed action has no unique or unknown risk; it is not likely to impact any human environment negatively. It is expected to have positive impacts and be received well within the community of this area.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

The BLM issues rights-of-way for access everyday across the United States. This action is routine and a normal business action of the BLM and it is not establishing any precedent for any future actions or considerations.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

The assessment performed did not find the individual action or any foreseeable future actions having a significant impact to other related actions of the area. It is a very minimal impact and likely to occur without this authorization.

8. *The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.*

This action is not going to have an adverse effect on such resources. This review has ensured that specialist in such areas considering the proposed action and alternatives, the geographic location and known such resources and have determined none will be adversely effected by this action.

9. *The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.*

The proposed action was reviewed and determined to have no effect on any endangered or threatened species or their habitat, the review was documented as a portion of the process of the Environmental Assessment required by law. No impacts are expected. Stipulations and reporting requirements are included in the authorization if any future discovery of such habitat or species should occur.

10. *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.*

The issuance of this right-of-way poses no threat or violation of law at any level, nor to the protection of the environment.

Conclusion

Therefore, on the basis of the information contained in the EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that:

1. None of the environmental effects identified meet the definition of significance as defined by context and intensity considerations at 40 CFR § 1508.27;
2. The alternatives are in conformance with East Alaska Resource Management Plan; and
3. The Proposed Action and alternatives do not constitute a major federal action having a significant effect on the human environment.

Therefore, neither Environmental Impact Statement nor a supplement to the existing EA is necessary and neither will be prepared.

/s/ Dennis C. Teitzel

July 15, 2014

Dennis C. Teitzel
Glennallen Field Manager

Date

Attachments - DOI-BLM-AK-020-2014-0001-DNA



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Glennallen Field Office
P.O. Box 147
Glennallen, Alaska 99588
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) WORKSHEET

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grant of right-of-way for access and trail maintenance on public lands to facilitate access to private property.

NEPA Register Number: DOI-BLM-AK-020-2014-0001-DNA

Case File Number: AA-093743

Location / Legal Description: CRM, T. 12 N., R. 9 E., portions of sections 22 and 27

Applicant (if any): Richard Ivans

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Bureau of Land Management is proposing to grant a right-of-way across BLM-managed lands to secure access to private property within the Suslositna Valley, Slana, Alaska, CRM, T.12 N., R. 9 E., portions of sections 22 and 27. The applicant would also like authorization to perform trail maintenance on this established trail to his property. The applicant intends to utilize ATV's for access. Common maintenance actions being requested are brushing, digging drainage ditches, placement of gravel material and other products to allow passage in wet areas.

The applicant's right-of-way would begin from the landing point for Suslositna Valley on the East bank of the Slana River and follow an established route that all Suslositna Valley residents utilize to access their private parcels. The applicant's right-of-way would turn right off of the main trail and travel in a southwesterly direction, approximately ½ mile, within section 22 and terminate on the applicant's private property in the NW quarter of section 27. This portion of trail was not included in routes authorized to the Suslositna Home Owners Association for maintenance. The applicant would like to perform maintenance and make minor improvements as deemed necessary on this portion of the trail.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable land use plan because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decision(s):

This proposal is in conformance with section I-2 of the East Alaska Resource Management Plan found on page 19.

“Land use authorizations include various authorizations and agreements to use BLM lands such as right-of-way grants, road, temporary use permits under several different authorities; leases, permits and easements under section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA); airport leases under the Act of May 24, 1928; and Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) leases.”

C. IDENTIFY APPLICABLE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) DOCUMENTS AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS THAT COVER THE PROPOSED ACTION.

An Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2011-0026-EA, for a right-of-way in the Suslositna Valley was completed on July 6, 2012 by the Glennallen Field Office which analyzed trail maintenance and improvements on the existing trail system in the Suslositna Valley to access private parcels and public land. Trail maintenance, access, improvements, new trail segments and construction of a bridge for a stream crossing were reviewed along and over Suslositna Creek.

D. NEPA ADEQUACY CRITERIA

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

The proposed right of way would be located on existing trails in the same area previously analyzed. The geographic and resource conditions are similar to what was previously analyzed. A portion of the trail located in CRM, T.12 N., R. 9 E., section 27, was not previously analyzed, but is sufficiently similar. Additional cultural clearances and subsistence impacts analyses for this action conclude that no known impacts would occur with the additional of this trail segment. Proposed trail maintenance and improvements will have fewer impacts than what was proposed and analyzed in the EA, as there will be no large equipment used for maintenance or bridge construction.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes, in reviewing the range of alternatives in the EA, the alternatives analyzed are appropriate and sufficient. The “No Action Alternative” demonstrated that more damage to the public land could result in trail braiding and widening of access routes to reach the private property. Construction of new trails would duplicate access. Allowing the applicant to perform necessary maintenance and maintain the existing trails may prevent trail braiding and widening, and reduce the potential for damage to public lands through minor improvements and maintenance.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-

sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

In the three years since the original analysis was completed, no new circumstances or information has come to light to alter our findings. No new endangered species, no new sensitive areas or resources were identified. Conditions and circumstances remain the same as when the EA was processed.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

The effects for both proposals as they relate to trail maintenance and minor improvements on existing trails within Suslostitna Valley are the same. The original analysis reviewed wet and muddy areas along the trail system. The new proposal will have the same conditions to consider when conducting minor improvements and maintenance.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the public involvement and interagency reviewed for both are adequate. The Glennallen Field Office conducted an Inter-Disciplinary Team (IDT) meeting on March 4, 2014 to discuss the details of this proposal as well as in the original EA approved July 6, 2012.

DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2011-0026-EA - Public notice for this EA was posted on October 17, 2011, on the BLM Glennallen Field Office Website NEPA log: http://www.blm.gov/ak/st/en/info/nepa/gfo_nepa_register.html. No comments have been received.

An interdisciplinary team (IDT) was assembled and initially met on September 26, 2011. A field visit by the IDT was conducted on October 4, 2011 and a second internal scoping meeting on October 18, 2011 revealed the following as issues to be addressed in the EA:

- Cultural Resources;
- Travel management – trail widening to reach the site, trail reroutes to reach the site, improved access throughout the area;
- Riparian, Fisheries, and Hydrology.

E. PERSONS, AGENCIES, AND BLM STAFF CONSULTED

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

The following specialists have reviewed this proposed action:

Joseph Hart, Realty Specialist
Molly Cobbs, NEPA Coordinator
Sarah Bullock, Wildlife Specialist
John Jangala, Archaeologist
Dennis Teitzel, Field Manager

Marnie Graham, Public Affairs
Ben Seifert, Natural Resource Specialist
Cory Larson, Recreation Planner, Trails
Mike Sondergaard, Hydrologist
Elijah Waters, Assistant Field Manager

F. CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation identified in Part C of this DNA Worksheet fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Dennis C. Teitzel

July 15, 2014

Dennis C. Teitzel, Field Manager

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR § 4 and the program-specific regulations.

Attachments:

DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2011-0026-EA

Exhibit A – Grant Stipulations

Exhibit A
07-08-2014

1.0 Definitions

- 1.1 The Glennallen Field Office Manager or its designees is the Authorized Officer (AO), as defined by 43 CFR 2920.0-5(c).
- 1.2 "Grantee" means Richard Ivans, and any and all assignees that may be of record, including all agents, contractors, subcontractors, and employees.
- 1.3 "Grant" means the license, lease, permit, or other permissions granted by the United States to the grantee for the use of public lands and resources.

2.0 General

- 2.1 This grant is subject to all prior valid and existing rights, and the United States makes no representations or warranties whatever, neither expressed nor implied, as to the existence, or nature of such valid existing rights.
- 2.2 Any modifications to the proposed activities must be approved in writing by the AO.
- 2.3 It is the responsibility of the grantee to ensure that others performing maintenance on his behalf are familiar with and adhere to these stipulations.
- 2.4 These provisions do not relieve the grantee of any responsibilities or provisions required by any applicable State or Federal law and regulations.
- 2.5 The grantee may be required by the AO to furnish transportation and quarters for designated field representatives or observers while inspecting field operations.
- 2.6 In the advent of a disagreement of the interpretation or implementation of these stipulations the grantee agrees that the AO shall have the final say in how these stipulations are interpreted and implemented.
- 2.7 Grantee shall defend, indemnify and hold the United States, its assigns, agents, employees, representatives and successors in interest harmless from and against any and all actions, fees, for injury to or death of any person, persons, or property arising in connection with and as a direct result of grantee's activities, included but not limited to United States negligence, if any in failing to recognize or remedy a hazardous condition existing on public lands.
- 2.8 Grantee shall comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000 et seq) and the regulations of the Secretary of the Interior issued pursuant thereto.
- 2.9 This grant may not be encumbered, hypothecated, assigned, subleased, or transferred without prior written approval by the AO.
- 2.10 The AO may revoke or terminate this grant in whole, or in part, upon a determination by the AO that the terms, conditions, or stipulations of the grant have been violated, or by determination by the AO that the grantee's actions pose a threat to human health or safety, or irreparable harm to the surrounding environment.
- 2.11 The grantee shall not enclose in any manner, or erect or maintain any signs or structures on roads or trails commonly used for public travel or access to public lands surrounding the grant unless directed to do so by the AO.

- 2.12 This grant does not authorize the grantee to take from the public lands any mineral or vegetative material, including timber, without securing authorization under 30 USC 601 et seq.
- 2.13 This grant does not authorize any other use of the public lands or improvements belonging to the U.S. Government.
- 2.14 Fire suppression or protection shall not be provided by the government. The grantee shall be responsible for taking reasonable precautions to prevent and suppress brush, grass and other fire hazards within the authorized area, extinguishing all fires before departing the premises.

3.0 Environmental

- 3.1 All operations will be conducted in such a manner as not to cause damage or disturbance to any fish wildlife, or to impede rural residents from pursuing their traditional subsistence activities (ANILCA, PL 96-487).
- 3.2 All activities shall be conducted so as to avoid or minimize disturbance to vegetation. If it becomes necessary to remove vegetation, prior approval by the AO is required.
- 3.3 All operations shall be conducted with due regard for good resource management and in such a manner as not to block any stream, or drainage system, or cause the pollution of siltation of any stream or lake.
- 3.4 Use of pesticides or herbicides shall comply with the applicable Federal and State laws. Pesticides or herbicides shall be used only in accordance with their registered uses and within limitations imposed by the Secretary of the Interior. Prior to the use of pesticides or herbicides, the grantee shall obtain from the AO written approval of a plan showing the type and quantity of materials to be used, pest(s) to be controlled, method of application, location of storage and disposal of containers, and any other information deemed necessary by the AO. Emergency use of pesticides or herbicides shall be approved in writing by the AO prior to such use.

4.0 Operational

- 4.1 There shall be no disturbance of any archaeological or historical sites, including graves and remains of cabins, and no collection of any artifacts whatsoever. Also, collection of vertebrate fossils, including mammoth and mastodon bones, tusks, etc, is strictly prohibited. Any cultural or Paleontological resources discovered by the holder, or any person working on behalf of the holder, shall be immediately reported to the AO. The holder shall suspend all operations in the immediate area of such discovery until written authorization to proceed is issued by the AO. The grantee shall not occupy or otherwise disturb any cultural sites including historical cabins. The grant holder will be responsible for the cost of any evaluation and mitigating measures determined necessary by the AO.
- 4.2 All solid wastes shall be removed from the public lands to an Alaska State DEC approved solid waste disposal facility.
- 4.3 Areas of operation shall be left clean of all unauthorized foreign objects. This shall include, but is not limited to; wires, pins, flags and reflectors.
- 4.4 All fuel or lubricant spills will be cleaned up immediately, taking precedence over all other matters, except the health and safety of personnel. Spills will be cleaned up utilizing absorbent pads or other Alaska State DEC approved methods. Any such spill sites will be documented so that they can be located during the compliance check.

- 4.5 Recovered spill fluids will be removed and incinerated in approved receptacles.
- 4.6 As soon as possible, but not later than 24 hours, notice of any such discharge as defined in Alaska Statute Title 18, Chapter 75, Article 2 will be given to the AO and any other Federal and State Officials as are required by law.
- 4.7 All State and Federal safety standards and regulations for fuel transportation and handling will be followed. Only fuel products and amounts specifically authorized shall be stored on site, and shall be located a minimum 100 feet away from any source of water. All fuel containers, including barrels and propane tanks, shall be marked with the grantee's name, product type and year filled.
- 4.8 The grantee shall protect all Survey Monuments. In the advent of obliteration or disturbance of a survey monument, the grantee shall immediately notify the AO. The grantee will be financially responsible to re-establish the survey monuments to the Bureau standards.
- 4.9 No hazardous materials shall be transported or disposed within the area of authorized use.
- 4.10 The grantee shall ensure that a copy of the permit and stipulations is present while performing maintenance at all times.
- 4.11 The grantee shall notify the AO 7 (seven) days prior to removal of personal property and abandonment of the area, and shall be responsible for any rehabilitation of the site deemed necessary by the AO. At minimum all disturbed areas shall be re-contoured and re-vegetated using native species.
- 4.12 The holder shall have a representative available to accompany the Bureau's field representative during any compliance inspection, and shall provide the AO with documentation of all work performed. This shall include a description of the work, photographs and maps or charts depicting the specific sites where operations were conducted.
- 4.13 The grant holder will coordinate with the Suslositna Homeowners Association a minimum of seven (7) calendar days prior to any planned maintenance work and make every attempt to avoid potential conflicts in maintenance being performed by either grant holder.
- 4.14 The grant holder will place a sign at the beginning of the trail system that warns the general public: "Not a publically maintained trail system, travel at own risk."

| _____
Grantee Signature

Date