Appendix A: Special Recreation Management Areas Comparison Tables

Table 44. Delta Range SRMA - Alternative Comparison.....A-3
Table 45. Delta River SRMA - Alternative Comparison.....A-5
Table 46. Denali Highway SRMA - Alternative Comparison.....A-9
Table 47 Tiekel SRMA - Alternative Comparison.....A-13

Table 44. Delta Range SRMA - Alternative Comparison

Management Action	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Special area decision	No SRMA would be designated.	No SRMA would be designated.	Area designated as SRMA as shown on Map 9, page 81 (360,000 acres).	Area designated as SRMA as shown on Map 9, page 81 (276,000 acres).
Trails/OHV management	No current BLM restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Area designated as limited. The Delta Mountain Sub-unit (58,000 acres) would be closed to motorized use.	Area designated as limited. The Delta Mountain Sub-unit (44,000 acres) would be closed to snowmachines 10/15 – 5/15 except to provide access to subsistence resources.
Construction of new airstrips	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Allowed.	Not permitted.	Permitted within the transportation and utility corridor.
Construction of new roads	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Allowed. Access across the Delta River to support mineral resource and development would be considered.	Only permitted in support of transportation and utility functions.	Permitted within the transportation and utility corridor and to support resource development. Consideration would be given to retention if consistent with roaded-natural objectives. Mitigate visual impacts.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Currently closed in inner corridor; open to metalliferous metals in outer corridor and elsewhere.	Revoke withdrawals in outer corridor to allow for mineral entry.	Maintain current withdrawals.	Maintain current withdrawals within transportation and utility corridor. Outside corridor, revoke withdrawals (PLO 5180) to allow for mineral entry.
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Currently closed in all portions by withdrawals (PLOs 5150 and 5180).	Revoke withdrawals to allow for mineral leasing.	Maintain current withdrawals.	Maintain PLO 5150 withdrawal against mineral leasing. Revoke PLO 5180 to allow for mineral leasing.

Management Action	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Minerals: Mineral materials	Mineral material sites along the Richardson Highway.	Permit mineral material development.	Permit only within the transportation and utility corridor.	Permit mineral material development.
Public use cabins	None currently in place.	Consider public use cabins in Jarvis Creek area and for dispersed snowmachine use.	Consider hut-to-hut system in Delta Mountains Sub-unit.	Consider public use cabins in Jarvis Creek area.
Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	Prohibit heli-skiing, determine appropriate limit for other SRPs based on objectives.	Consider limits on SRPs, based on management objectives and anticipated encounters.
Recreational facilities	None currently in place.	Consider waysides and parking areas to support growing snowmachine use. Campground in Jarvis Creek area.	None.	Consider trailheads/waysides along Richardson Highway. Utilize trailheads for education/interpretation. Consider facilities to support dispersed recreation at Jarvis Creek.
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No.	No.	No.	No.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	No for occupancy permits in areas being managed for a primitive recreation experience. Case-by-case for non-occupancy permits.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA, R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Allowed, but avoid in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience.
Lands and Realty: Rights of Way (ROW).	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Allow; mitigate as needed.	None considered, except in the transportation and utility corridor.	Allowed in transportation and utility corridor, avoid in areas being managed for a primitive recreation experience.
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Okay, but avoid in areas being managed for a primitive recreation experience.

Table 45. Delta River SRMA - Alternative Comparison

Management Action	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Special area decision	No SRMA designated.	No SRMA designated; manage under existing River Management Plan for the Delta National Wild and Scenic River (BLM 1983a).	Same as Alternative D.	Designation would include ANILCA-designated corridor (44,000 acres). See Map 5, page 67.
Trails/OHV management	Portion within TLAD limited to designated trails (most of scenic and wild portions); otherwise, OHV use limited to existing trails.	Same as Alternative A.	Limited to designated trails summer and winter.	OHVs limited to designated trails. No snowmachine restrictions once adequate snowfall is present (6" frost or 12" snow cover).
Construction of new airstrips	Not permitted within corridor.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, and not permitted within viewshed.	Same as Alternative A.
Construction of new roads	Avoid new construction. Allows for realignment of Richardson Highway adjacent to recreational portion and replacement of Denali Highway bridge in scenic portion.	Same as Alternative A. Consider ROW for access to mining activities in or adjacent to recreational and scenic portions of river corridor.	No new road construction in corridor or in viewshed.	New roads within the scenic and recreational portions may be authorized if no feasible alternative exists and new road would be compatible with values for which the river was established.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Closed in wild segment. Currently closed in wild portion by ANILCA, closed in recreational portion (inner transportation and utility corridor), but open in most portions of scenic segment (PLO 5180 allows for metaliferous metals).	Revoke withdrawals in scenic and recreational portions to allow for mineral entry.	Recommend closures in all segments and in viewshed.	Recommend maintenance of withdrawals in recreational portion and scenic portion. In addition, recommend withdrawal against locatable mineral entry in scenic portions currently open (16,000 acres).

Management Action	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Currently closed in wild segment under ANILCA. Closed in recreational segment under PLO 5150. Closed in scenic segment under PLO 5180.	Revoke current withdrawals in recreational and scenic portions to allow for mineral leasing.	Maintain current closures for corridor and viewshed.	Maintain existing withdrawals against mineral leasing.
Minerals: Mineral materials	Available in recreational portion in support of highway maintenance and reconstruction; discouraged in scenic; not permitted in wild.	Same as Alternative A.	Not permitted in any portion of river corridor or in viewshed.	Available in recreational portion in support of highway maintenance and reconstruction. Not permitted in scenic or wild portions.
Minerals: Access to mining activity	Occurs summer and winter.	Consider potential for future ROW in recreational or scenic portions to access mining activities on west side of river. Construction would be consistent with management of recreational portion of river.	Limit overland access to winter use only.	Overland river crossing only permitted in winter when the river is frozen. Other requests would be considered based on conditions to minimize disturbance to the river.
Public use cabins	None authorized.	Consider public cabins in scenic and recreational portions.	None considered.	None considered. This includes administrative or emergency use cabins.
Special Recreation Permits (SRP)	Permitted on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	Determine appropriate limit of SRPs in corridor and viewshed.	Determine appropriate limit for SRPs in corridor, based on management objectives and anticipated encounters.
General visitor use	No visitor use limits.	No visitor use limits established.	Determine visitor use limits for general visitor use.	Same as Alternative C, based on management objectives and anticipated encounters.

Management Action	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Recreational facilities	Limited to Tangle Lakes campground, portage, and take-out.	Develop more pit toilets. Delta wayside upgrade. Consider acquisition of Lodge for education/ visitor center, campground renovation, develop take-out with outhouse, signage.	Maintain existing facilities.	Delta wayside upgrade. Consider acquisition of Lodge for education/visitor center. Tangle Lakes campground renovation. Improve signage at take-out.
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No.	No.	Yes.	Yes.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA, R&PP leases	Consider on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Avoid in this area.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Consider on a case-by-case basis.	Yes, on a case-by-case basis.	None considered.	No for occupancy type permits. Non-occupancy considered if consistent with objectives identified for this SRMA.
Lands and Reality: Rights-of-way (ROW)	Utility corridor an existing land use allocation. Allow with protection of scenic and other values.	Allow on a case-by-case basis.	None considered in corridor or in viewshed.	Same as Alternative A for the recreational portion, which falls within the transportation and utility corridor. Avoid in wild and scenic segments.
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	None considered.
Fire	Currently managed under limited suppression class.	Same as Alternative A.	Use fuels treatment projects and wildland fire to achieve resource objectives, protect human life and property and to reduce risk and costs of unwanted wildland fires.	Same as Alternative C, but move corridor into modified suppression class based on visual resource management.

Management Action	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Forestry	1983 Plan allows personal use firewood gathering.	Same as Alternative A.	No forestry practices or firewood permits allowed in corridor or viewshed.	No commercial forestry or firewood sales. Personal firewood allowed under permit.
Visual resources	Managed as Class I.	Manage as Class II.	Manage within corridor and viewshed as Class I.	Manage as Class I. Viewshed on BLM-managed lands outside SRMA would be managed as Class II. Activities within the viewshed should be designed to protect the area's scenic quality, such as minimizing vegetation clearing, using landforms to screen structures and guide road alignment.

Table 46. Denali Highway SRMA - Alternative Comparison

Note: Within this table, "interim" refers to management of State- or Native-selected lands until conveyed; "long-term" refers to management of lands if they are retained in Federal ownership.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Special area decision	No SRMA designated.	No SRMA. This is priority area for State selection. Pursue designation as Backcountry Byway.	Designate area as SRMA as shown on Map 6, page 69 (559,000 acres).	No SRMA designated. Measures described below would apply.	If large contiguous blocks of land are retained in Federal ownership, designate as SRMA.
Trails/OHV management	Only limited to designated trails in TLAD. No other restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	OHVs within this area would be limited, with goal to stop unmanaged proliferation of trails that cause soil and vegetation degradation.	Designated as limited to OHVs, consistent with State's Generally Allowed Uses. BLM would emphasize education and interpretation regarding staying on existing trails. No snowmachine restrictions.	Same as Alternative C.
Construction of new airstrips	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No new airstrips considered.	Avoid construction of new airstrips.	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.
Construction of new roads	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Permit new road construction. Consider retention of roads constructed for resource development to expand/enhance a roaded natural recreation experience.	No new road construction.	Permit new road construction only when necessary for resource development. Utilize specific guidelines for minimizing impacts to visual resources identified in "Denali to Wrangell-St. Elias" (Alaska DNR 1982)	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Under PLO 5180, open to metalliferous metals.	Keep open to locatable minerals.	Recommend closure of entire SRMA to protect recreation and viewshed values.	Closed to mineral entry by State and Native selections.	Area would remain open to locatable mineral entry. Mitigate visual impacts consistent with recommendations in "Denali to Wrangell-St. Elias." (Alaska DNR 1982)
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Currently closed under PLO 5180.	Revoke withdrawal and open to leasable minerals.	Maintain withdrawal.	Closed to mineral leasing by State and Native selections.	Revoke withdrawal and open to leasable minerals. Area is low potential for oil and gas development.
Minerals: Mineral materials	Some gravel sites currently present along Denali Highway.	Allow on a case-by-case basis.	Do not permit.	Avoid development of mineral material sites. Any development should follow guidance for mineral material development in "Denali to Wrangell-St. Elias" (Alaska DNR 1982).	Same as Alternative D – Interim management.
Public use cabins	None currently available.	Should be considered.	None.	Would not be considered under interim management.	Would be considered if lands retained in long-term Federal ownership.
Special Recreation Permits (SRP)	Permitted on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	Determine appropriate limit for all SRPs in corridor.	Permitted on case-by-case basis.	Determine appropriate limit for all SRPs in area if lands are retained in contiguous, manageable blocks.
General visitor use	No visitor use limits.	No visitor use limits established.	Determine visitor use limits for general visitor use, based on management objectives.	No visitor use limits established.	No general visitor use limits established.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Recreational facilities	BLM currently manages Tangle Lakes campground, Delta wayside, Brushkana campground, and some trailheads.	Follow direction for recreational facilities described in "Denali to Wrangell-St. Elias" (Alaska DNR 1982).	No new facilities until visitor use limits have been determined. Limit facilities to those necessary to handle capacity.	No investment in new facilities until land status is resolved. Consideration would be given to development of facilities on recreational withdrawals described in Alternative D – Long-term management.	The following recreational withdrawals would be considered for recreational facilities: 1. 39-mile or Maclaren River (wayside) 2. Clearwater (wayside) 3. Susitna (wayside). Consider boat launch Utilize other recreation withdrawals for trailheads or for education/ interpretation sites. Develop some trailheads.
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No.	No.	Yes.	No, but do not preclude from possible acquisition.	Yes, if contiguous blocks of land are retained in Federal ownership.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA, R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Considered if consistent with management objectives for the area.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	None considered.	No occupancy permits considered. Non-occupancy permits considered on a case-by-case basis if consistent with objectives of the area.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Lands and Reality: Rights-of-way (ROW)	Evaluate on a case-by-case basis.	Allow on a case-by-case basis.	None considered.	Okay with mitigation measures to minimize visual impacts.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	None considered.	None considered.
Fire	Limited or modified suppression classes; full suppression around lodges, campgrounds, waysides, or developed recreation sites/facilities.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.	Same as Alternative A, but suppression tactics would be used that minimize visual impacts. Prescribed fire burn plans should address visual resources, air quality, and buffers for water quality. Use fuels treatment projects to achieve resource objectives, protect human life and property, and to reduce risk of unwanted wildland fires.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.

Table 47. Tiekel SRMA - Alternative Comparison

Note: Within this table, "interim" refers to management of State- or Native-selected lands until conveyed; "long-term" refers to management of lands if they are retained in Federal ownership.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Special area decision	No SRMA designated.	No SRMA designated.	Designate SRMA as shown on Map 7, page 70. Includes 848,000 acres, predominantly State- and Native-selected.	Designation includes only unencumbered BLM lands (120,000 acres). Map 7, page 70.	Lands within the area described in Alternative C retained in long-term Federal ownership would be designated as an SRMA with measures described below.
Trails/OHV management.	No restrictions on BLM-managed lands.	Open.	Area designated as limited to OHVs with objectives and specific limitations outlined in implementation level plans. The Tonsina sub-unit would be designated as described in Alternative D - Interim management.	Area designated as limited to OHVs just as other unencumbered BLM lands. State- and Native-selected lands under area described in Alternative C would be designated as limited consistent with the State's Generally Allowed Uses. BLM would emphasize education/ interpretation regarding staying on existing trails.	Area would be designated as limited to designated trails just as other unencumbered BLM lands and on any lands retained in long-term Federal ownership.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Trails/OHV management: Tonsina Sub-unit (motorized closure)	No current restrictions.	No OHV closures.	Trails within this sub-unit would be designated. The northern portion of the sub-unit would be closed to motorized vehicles in the summer, open to snowmachines in the winter. Southern portion would be closed year-round (includes helicopter-supported SRPs). Sub-unit does not include the transportation and utility corridor and is buffered off the highways to exclude most existing motorized trails.	The Tonsina sub-unit (north and south) would not be designated. No area closures to OHVs considered. Area would be managed as described for rest of area.	If lands within Tonsina subunits (north or south) were retained in long-term Federal ownership, closures and limitations on motorized use would be considered as outlined under Alternative C.
Construction of new airstrips	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No new airstrips.	Consider on a case-by-case basis.	Avoid construction of new airstrips in areas being managed for a primitive recreation experience. Otherwise, consider on a case-by-case basis.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Construction of new roads	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Explore potential of new roads in roaded natural areas to increase opportunities for dispersed recreation, with secondary goal of facilitating forestry practices. ROW applications for new roads outside of roaded natural areas would be considered.	No new road construction outside of transportation and utility corridor. Avoid inside transportation and utility corridor.	Consider on a case-by-case basis. Roads within transportation and utility corridor for other practices (forestry, utility) would be considered to retain if consistent with roaded natural recreation experience. In other areas, use of temporary and winter roads should be emphasized, with measures identified to mitigate visual impacts.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Closed within portions of transportation and utility corridor (inner portion) by PLO 5150. Open in most of the rest of the area due to PLO 6329.	Keep open to locatable minerals.	Recommend closure of entire SRMA to mineral entry to protect recreation and viewshed values.	Closed to mineral entry by State and Native selections.	Maintain withdrawals within inner portion of transportation and utility corridor. Other lands (outside corridor, retained in long-term Federal ownership) would be open.
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Closed within PLO 5150. Open in most of the rest of the area due to PLO 6329.	Open all except inner corridor of 5150.	Maintain PLO 5150 withdrawals.	Closed to mineral leasing by State and Native selections.	Maintain PLO 5150 withdrawals.
Minerals: Mineral materials	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Allow on a case-by-case basis.	Do not permit.	Consider on a case-by-case basis.	Avoid development of mineral material sites in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Public use cabins	None currently in place.	Should be considered.	Do not permit.	Consider on unencumbered BLM lands.	Would be considered within this area, with emphasis on semi-primitive motorized and roaded natural areas.
Special Recreation Permits (SRP)	Permitted on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	Determine appropriate limits for all SRPs, based on management objectives and anticipated encounters.	Determine appropriate limits for heli-ski operations on BLM-managed lands, based on management objectives and anticipated encounters.	Determine appropriate limits for SRPs, based on management objectives and anticipated encounters.
General visitor use	No visitor use limits.	No visitor use limits.	Determine general visitor use limits.	No visitor use limit determination.	No visitor use limit determination.
Recreational facilities	A few trailheads currently exist.	Work with ADOT to develop two waysides (preferably at trailheads) within this SRMA. Waysides would provide educational/ interpretive signs and outhouses. Also consider bicycle route on old Richardson Highway.	Do not develop trailheads that access areas managed for a primitive experience.	Same as Alternative B and Alternative D – Long-term management. Give consideration to not developing trailheads that access areas managed for a primitive experience.	Update, develop selected trailheads. Use trailheads for education/interpretation regarding land status, Leave No Trace, and cultural resources.
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No.	No.	Yes.	No.	No.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	None considered.	No for occupancy permits in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience. Consider on a case-by-case basisfor non-occupancy permits, but avoid in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA, R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Okay, except avoid in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Lands and Reality: Rights-of-way (ROW)	Evaluate on a case-by-case basis.	Allow on a case-by-case basis.	None considered, except in the transportation and utility corridor.	Allowed in transportation and utility corridor, avoid in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Okay, but avoid in areas being managed for primitive recreation experience.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.
Fire	Currently in limited and modified suppression classes.	Same as Alternative A.		All lands within transportation and utility corridor would be managed under modified or full suppression classes. Use fuels treatment projects and wildland fire to achieve resource objectives and protect life and property.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.

Management Action	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-term Management
Forestry	Some sales have occurred.		Allow personal use and commercial firewood permits and sales.	Portions of this SRMA are a Forestry emphasis area. Most forestry activities would take place within the transportation and utility corridor (PLO 5150). Forestry activities would meet VRM objectives for the area.	Same as Alternative D - Interim management.

Appendix B: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Research Natural Area (RNA) Comparison Tables

Table 48. Delta Bison Calving ACEC - Alternative Comparison Table.....B-3
Table 49. Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC - Alternative Comparison.....B-6
Table 50. West Fork ACEC - Alternative Comparison.....B-10
Table 51. Bering Glacier RNA - Alternative Comparison.....B-15

Table 48. Delta Bison Calving ACEC - Alternative Comparison Table

Management Actions	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Decision	No ACEC designation.	No ACEC designation.	Designate calving area of the Delta bison herd as an ACEC (19,000 acres). See Map 10 on page 89.	No ACEC would be designated. Area described would be managed under measures described below. In addition, a cooperative Habitat Management Plan with ADF&G would be developed.
OHV use	No restrictions.	No restrictions.	OHVs restricted to designated trails 4/15 to 10/15.	OHVs restricted to designated trails during snow-free months. Goal to minimize disturbance to calving bison.
New road construction	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Allowed for resource extraction.	No new road construction.	Road construction allowed but limited to those necessary for resource development or extraction. Closed seasonally (5/1 to 6/15) except for emergency purposes.
New airstrip construction	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	No new airstrip construction.	No new airstrip construction unless to support resource development or extraction. Such airstrips would be closed (except for emergency purposes) 5/1 to 6/15.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Under PLO 5150, open to locatable mineral entry in outer corridor, closed in inner corridor.	Revoke withdrawals to open to locatable mineral entry.	Maintain existing PLO 5150 withdrawals and recommend withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Maintain existing withdrawals. Mining operations subject to seasonal restrictions 5/1 to 6/15.
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Under PLO 5150, closed to mineral leasing.	Revoke withdrawal and open.	Maintain existing closure.	Maintain existing closure.
Minerals: Mineral materials	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Make available.	Do not permit.	Open with stipulations for no activity during bison calving from 5/1 to 6/15.

Management Actions	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Public use cabins	None currently authorized.	Consider.	Do not permit.	Any new public use cabins should be located along designated trails, closed 5/1 to 6/15.
Special Recreation Permits (SRP)	No current limits.	No limits.	Limit number issued in area and include stipulations to seasonally limit use.	SRP permits would adhere to general guidelines listed above.
Recreation facilities	None currently in the area.	Work with ADOT to develop a wayside/interpretive sign to highlight bison.	No new facilities.	No new BLM campgrounds. Other recreation facilities (such as outhouses) would be associated with public use cabins.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA and R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	FLPMA and R&PP leases would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	Occupancy type permits, such as commercial use cabins, would be authorized under the following conditions: 1) no new structures within the area; 2) Existing structures would be authorized only if they can clearly be tied to a commercial enterprise, such as guiding or trapping. Other occupancy permits (non-cabin) would be allowed if consistent with protection of values identified.
Lands and Reality: Rights-of-Way (ROW)	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	Avoid.	ROWs would be permitted, with mitigation to minimize impacts to bison (utilize underground powerlines or pipelines whenever possible).

Management Actions	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Military permits, activities.	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	Recommend overflights limited to greater than 1500 feet 5/1 to 6/30. Ground-based activities not permitted 5/1 to 6/15.
Fire	Area is currently managed under a limited suppression class.	Same as Alternative A.	No change in suppression class. Prescribed burning activities not permitted 5/1 to 6/15. Primary objective for prescribed or wildland fire will be improvement of forage production and palatability.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 49. Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC - Alternative Comparison

Note: Within this table, "interim" refers to management of State- or Native-selected lands until conveyed; "long-term" refers to management of lands if they are retained in Federal ownership.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Decision	No ACEC designation.	No ACEC designation. Area is already covered by Nelchina Public Use Area.	Designate calving habitat for the Nelchina caribou herd as an ACEC (389,000 acres) See Map 11 on page 90. Includes State and Native-selected lands.	No ACEC designation. Area identified under Alternative C would be managed under measures described below.	If sizeable contiguous blocks of land are left in Federal ownership after conveyance, consider for ACEC designation with measures described below.
OHV use	No restrictions.	No restrictions.	OHVs restricted to designated trails 5/1 to 6/15. Purpose of designation to minimize impact to calving caribou.	OHVs limited consistent with State's Generally Allowed Uses, which requires OHVs to use existing trails whenever possible.	Same as Alternative C. Work with State of Alaska to designate trails with goal to minimize impacts to calving caribou.
New road construction	Considered case-by-case.	Allowed.	No new construction.	Road construction limited to those necessary for resource development or extraction. Closed seasonally (5/1 to 6/15) except for emergency purposes.	Same as Alternative D - Interim Management.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
New airstrip construction	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Allowed.	No new construction.	Airstrips and appropriate landing patterns shall be established in consultation with DNR and ADF&G to minimize effects on caribou. Such airstrips would be closed (except for emergency purposes) 5/1 to 6/15.	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Currently closed based on ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals.	Revoke ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals to open.	Maintain ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals.	Closed to mineral entry based on State or Native selection.	Open to mineral entry. Mining operations would be restricted seasonally 5/1 to 6/15.
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Currently closed based on ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals.	Revoke existing ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals to open.	Maintain ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals.	Closed to mineral leasing based on State or Native selection.	Open for leasing with seasonal or minor constraints. See stipulations under *Oil and Gas Stipulations.*
Minerals: Mineral materials	Permitted on a case-by-case basis.	Permit, consistent with protection of values identified.	Do not permit.	Open with stipulations for no activity during caribou calving from 5/1 to 6/15.	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.
Public use cabins	Nothing currently authorized.	Develop public use cabins.	No public use cabins.	Not in interim management.	Would consider public use cabins, located to minimize impacts on calving caribou.
Special Recreation Permit (SRP)	No limits.	Same as Alternative A.	Limit number of SRPs issued in the area, based on management objectives and protection of habitat.	SRP permits would aim to protect calving caribou, no surface disturbing activities or activities exceeding fourteen days would be permitted from 5/1 to 6/15.	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.
Recreation facilities	Nothing currently in area.	Okay to consider if needed in future.	None considered.	None considered.	No new campgrounds. Consider interpretive signs at trailheads regarding calving area.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA, R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	FLPMA leases would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management, consistent with protection of values identified.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	Occupancy type permits, such as commercial use cabins and subsistence cabins, would be authorized under the following conditions: 1) no new structures within the area; 2) existing structures would be authorized only if they can clearly be tied to a commercial enterprise, such as guiding or trapping. Other (non-cabin) permits would be considered if consistent with protection of identified values.	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.
Lands and Realty: Rights-of-Way (ROW)	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	ROW avoidance area.	ROWs would be permitted, with mitigation to minimize impacts to caribou (no activity during 5/1 to 6/15, utilize underground powerlines or pipelines whenever possible).	Same as Alternative D – Interim Management.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	None considered.	Ground-based activities not permitted 5/1 to 6/15.	Ground-based activities not permitted 5/1 to 6/15. Recommend overflights should be greater than 1,500 feet 5/1 to 6/15.
Fire	Limited suppression class.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	No change in suppression class. Prescribed burning activities not permitted 5/1 to 6/15. Primary objective for prescribed or wildland fire will be improvement of caribou habitat. If large-scale wildland fires occur in area, consider changing suppression class in order to maintain long-term mosaic.	Same as Alternative D - Interim Management.

Table 50. West Fork ACEC - Alternative Comparison

Note: Within this table, "interim" refers to management of State- or Native-selected lands until conveyed; "long-term" refers to management of lands if they are retained in Federal ownership.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Decision	No ACEC Designation	No ACEC designation.	In cooperation with State of Alaska, designate wetland area around the West Fork of the Gulkana River as an ACEC (490,000 acres). See Map 12 on page 91.	No ACEC designation. Area identified under Alternative C would be managed under measures described below.	If sizeable contiguous blocks of land are left in Federal ownership after conveyance, consider for ACEC designation with measures described below.
OHV use	Currently no restrictions.	No restrictions.	OHVs limited to designated trails 5/1 to 8/31. Designated trails should avoid nesting or staging areas. Stream crossings will be coordinated with ADF&G and permitted by DNR. Cooperate with State of Alaska on restricting aircraft landings on critical staging areas. No snowmachine restrictions.	Designated as "limited" to OHVs, consistent with State's Generally allowed Uses, which requires OHVs to utilize existing trails whenever possible.	Same as Alternative C. BLM would work with State of Alaska to identify trails network for designation with designation goal of minimizing impact to swans and swan habitat.
Construction of new airstrips	Construction of new airstrips considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No new construction of airstrips.	Same as Alternative A.	No new construction within primary trumpeter swan breeding habitat.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
New road construction	Construction of new roads and trails considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No new road construction.	Considered if necessary for resource development. Seasonal restrictions would be applied (5/1 to 8/31).	Considered if necessary for resource development, with seasonal restrictions. Temporary and winter roads utilized whenever possible. Roads in this area will not be retained long term.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Currently closed under a ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals. PLO 6329 specifically did not open this area to locatable minerals because of resource values and lack of mineral potential.	Revoke withdrawals and open.	Maintain PLO 6329. Closed to entry under the mining laws.	Closed to mineral entry by State or Native selection.	Modify PLO 6329 to allow for mineral entry.
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Open to mineral leasing, based on PLO 6329, with exception of Gulkana WSR corridor.	Keep open, with seasonal stipulations to protect trumpeter swan nesting and staging areas.	Recommend closure to mineral leasing.	Closed to mineral leasing by State or Native selection.	Open to mineral leasing, with seasonal stipulations as described in *Oil and Gas Stipulations* to protect swan and moose habitat.
Minerals: Mineral material	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No mineral material development.	Consider on a case-by-case basis, with seasonal restrictions (5/1 to 8/31).	No mineral material development.
Public use cabins	No public use cabins currently in area.	Develop public use cabin system for winter use. Close seasonally as needed for protection of values.	No public use cabins.	No public use cabins.	May be considered for winter use.

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Special Recreation Permits (SRP)	Currently no limits.	Same as Alternative A.	Determine appropriate limits for SRP permits within the area, based on management objectives.	SRP permits would adhere to *Required Operating Procedures*. No limits developed for SRPs.	Same as Alternative C.
Recreation facilities	No facilities currently exist within the area.	No new recreational facilities.	No new recreational facilities.	No new facilities would be considered on selected lands.	No new recreational facilities.
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No, except within Gulkana WSR corridor.	No.	Yes, for entire ACEC.	No.	No, except within Gulkana WSR corridor.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA and R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	FLPMA and R&PP leases would be granted on a case-by-case basis, only if consistent with protection of values identified.	Same as Alternative D - Interim Management .

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A. New occupancy permits (for cabins) should be allowed if justified for legitimate commercial (trapping) use.	No cabins. Consider other permits only if proposal is consistent with protection of values identified.	New occupancy permits considered if justified for legitimate commercial use, such as trapping. Other permits considered, with seasonal (5/1 to 8/31) restrictions.	Occupancy type permits, such as commercial use cabins, would be authorized under the following conditions: 1) no new structures within the area; 2) Existing structures would be authorized only if they can be clearly tied to a commercial enterprise, such as guiding or trapping. Permits other than cabins would be considered if consistent with protection of values identified.
Lands and Realty: Rights-of-Way (ROW)	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	Avoid.	ROW avoidance area. Overhead powerlines will be avoided.	ROW avoidance area. Overhead powerlines will be avoided and not permitted in primary trumpeter swan habitat.
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	None considered.	Recommend overflights limited to above 1,500 feet from 5/1 to 8/31.	Recommend overflights limited to above 1,500 feet from 5/1 to 8/31. Ground-based activities should be seasonally restricted (5/1 to 8/31).

Management Actions	Alternative				
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP Interim Management	D: Proposed RMP Long-Term Management
Fire	Mostly limited suppression class.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	No problem with current suppression classes. Prescribed burning and wildland fire may be used to improve moose habitat in the area and should consider buffer on anadromous streams to protect water quality.	Same as Alternative D - Interim Management.
Forestry	No guidelines. Some personal firewood gathering takes place, consistent with River Management Plan for the Gulkana National Wild River (BLM 1983b).	Allowed. Harvesting activities would take place in winter and any roads would be temporary (winter).	No commercial logging or firewood gathering should occur in the area.	Same as Alternative D - Long-term. Potential for commercial harvest poor due to low timber production and poor access (swamp).	Primary objective of any forestry practices in the area will be protection or enhancement of the values identified. Harvesting activities would take place in winter and any roads would be temporary (winter).

Table 51. Bering Glacier RNA - Alternative Comparison

Management Actions	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Decision	No RNA designation	Same as Alternative A.	Designate unencumbered BLM and State- and Native- selected lands in the Bering Glacier area as a RNA (940,000 acres). See Map 13 on page 92.	Designate RNA on only unencumbered BLM land in the Bering Glacier area (827,000 acres). See Map 13 on page 92. Interim management of State- and Native-selected lands within the area would follow guidelines and measures identified below. Selected lands retained in long-term Federal ownership would be included in RNA.
OHV use	No current restrictions on BLM-managed lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Trails designated year-long. Designate nunataks non-motorized, at least seasonally.	OHVs limited to designated trails during snow-free months. Goals of designation: 1) prevent un-managed proliferation of trails; 2) avoid waterfowl staging and nesting areas; and 3) protect nunataks.
Construction of new airstrips	Construction of new airstrips authorized by permit.	Same as Alternative A.	No new construction.	Consider only if consistent with protection of values identified.
New road construction	Construction of roads and trails would be allowed, considered on case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No new construction.	Construction of roads and trails would be authorized by ROW only, consistent with protection of values identified.
Minerals: Locatable minerals	Bering sub-region currently closed to locatable entry under PLO 5179.	Open for locatable minerals.	Maintain withdrawal.	Maintain withdrawal identified under Alternative A on western two-thirds of area. In eastern one-third, revoke withdrawal to allow for mineral entry.

Management Actions	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Minerals: Oil and gas leasing	Bering sub-region currently closed to leasable entry under PLO 5179.	Open for leasable minerals, subject to seasonal stipulations to protect values identified.	Maintain withdrawal.	Maintain PLO 5179 in western 2/3 of area. Revoke PLO in 5179 in eastern one-third to allow for mineral leasing. Leases would be subject to stipulations identified in *Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations* to protect resource values.
Minerals: Mineral materials	Location and operation of mineral material extraction would be according to an approved plan.	Same as Alternative A.	No new mineral material sites permitted.	Same as Alternative C.
Public use cabins	No current guidance. State currently has two public use cabins in the area.	Consider.	None considered.	Public use cabins may be considered, consistent with objectives of the RNA. None in moose winter range and none on nunataks.
Special Recreation Permits (SRP)	No limits currently identified for number of SRP permits. Current SRPs for the area contain stips for mitigation of impacts.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	Appropriate visitor use limits will be developed for the area for SRPs, consistent with managing for a primitive recreation experience and protection of resource values identified. No heli-skiing or helicopter-supported heli-tours.
Recreation facilities	No facilities exist.	Considered if need was demonstrated in an increase of recreational use of the area.	No new facilities.	No new facilities.
Lands and Realty: Emphasis area for acquisition?	No.	No.	Yes.	Non-Federal and private lands within the ACEC would be identified for possible future acquisition.
Lands and Realty: FLPMA and R&PP leases	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	No, only when associated with research activities.	R&PP and FLPMA leases considered on a case-by-case basis. Approval contingent on proposal being consistent with protection of values identified.

Management Actions	Alternative			
	A: No Action	B: Resource Development	C: Resource Conservation	D: Proposed RMP
Lands and Realty: FLPMA 302 permits	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Consider.	No, only when associated with research activities.	Occupancy type permits, such as commercial use cabins, would be authorized under the following conditions: 1) no new structures within RNA; 2) Existing structures would be authorized only if they can clearly be tied to a commercial enterprise, such as guiding or trapping. Other occupancy permits (non-cabin) considered case-by-case, if consistent with protection of values identified.
Lands and Realty: Rights of Way (ROW)	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	No, only if associated with research activities.	ROW avoidance area. If allowed, mitigate to protect identified values.
Military permits, activities	Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	Do not permit.	Same as Alternative C.
Forestry	No current activities.	Consider.	No commercial timber or firewood sales permitted.	Forestry practices allowed if primary objective is enhancement of identified values (such as moose winter range). Contingent on utilizing existing or temporary roads.

Appendix C: Required Operating Procedures (ROPs), Stipulations (Stips), and Standard Lease Terms

A. Introduction C-3
1. Required Operating Procedures C-3
2. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations C-3
a) Exceptions, Modifications, and Waivers C-4
3. Standard Lease Terms C-5
B. Required Operating Procedures C-6
1. Soils C-6
2. Fish and Wildlife Habitat C-8
3. Riparian Areas and Water Quality C-11
4. Wetlands C-15
5. Vegetation C-15
6. Cultural and Paleontological Resources C-17
7. Visual Resources C-19
8. Hazardous Materials and Waste Handling C-20
C. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations C-23
D. Standard Lease Terms (BLM Form 3100-11) C-26

APPENDIX C: REQUIRED OPERATING PROCEDURES (ROPS), LEASE STIPULATIONS (STIPS), AND STANDARD LEASE TERMS

A. Introduction

These Required Operating Procedures (ROPs) and Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations (Stips) were developed through the EIS process. They are based on knowledge of the resources of the planning area and current industry practices, and are consistent with existing policies and laws.

1. Required Operating Procedures

ROPs are requirements, procedures, management practices, or design features that the BLM adopts as operational requirements. They would apply to the action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D). ROPs would apply to all permitted activities, including FLPMA leases and permits, special recreation permits, oil and gas operations, mining Plans of Operation, and Right-of-Way authorizations. All vegetation management practices would be conducted consistent with these guidelines. Obviously, not all ROPs would apply to all permitted activities. ROPs have been developed to ensure that objectives identified within the Alaska Land Health Standards are met in carrying out permitted activities and management practices.

ROPs are selected as part of the site-specific analysis that occurs during activity level planning. They are applied as stipulations to permits. The Authorized Officer (AO) or his/her representative is responsible for seeing that the permittee is complying with stipulations of the permit. Non-compliance is documented on a Compliance Review form and sent to the permittee, along with corrective actions and a time frame in which to complete them. If corrective actions are not taken, the Authorized Officer has the discretion to cancel or suspend the permit.

2. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations

Stipulations are specific to oil and gas exploration, development, and production. They constitute significant restrictions on the conduct of operations under a lease. For example, a stipulation that does not allow permanent facilities within one-fourth mile of a

bird nest could result in a well being located far enough from the (lessee's) optimum site to prevent an oil reservoir from being fully developed. Such restrictions must be attached to the lease. As part of a lease contract, lease stipulations are specific to the lessee. All oil and gas activity permits subsequently issued to a lessee would comply with the lease stipulations appropriate to the activity under review.

The AO may add additional or more-restrictive stipulations as determined necessary through further NEPA analysis and as developed through consultation with other Federal and State regulatory and resource agencies. Laws or regulations may require other Federal, State, and local government permits for an oil and gas project to proceed. Specific State permits are required when the State has authority, under federal or State law or regulation, to enforce provision in question. Specific permits issued by Federal agencies other than BLM may include permit conditions that are more stringent than those included in this appendix.

Compliance with stipulations is monitored by the AO or his/her representative. Non compliance is documented in an Incident of Non-Compliance. Based on the nature of the non-compliance, a time-frame may be established to correct the problem. If the non-compliance is not corrected, the AO has discretion on penalties, dependent on the nature of the problem. Non-compliance can result in monetary fines or operation shut-down.

a) Exceptions, Modifications, and Waivers

Surface stipulations could be excepted, modified, or waived by the AO. An exception exempts the holder of the land use authorization document from the stipulation on a one-time basis. A modification changes the language or provisions of a surface stipulation, either temporarily or for the term of the lease. A waiver permanently exempts the surface stipulation. Substantial modification or waiver subsequent to lease issuance is subject to public review for at least a 30-day period in accordance with the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.

The environmental analysis document prepared for oil and gas development (e.g., Applications for Permit to Drill [APD] or sundry notices) would also address proposals to exempt, modify, or waive a surface stipulation. To exempt, modify, or waive a stipulation, the environmental analysis document would need to show that: 1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area had changed following issuance of the lease; 2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern; 3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts; and 4) the resource value of concern does not occur within the lease area. The environmental analysis document would also determine the need for an RMP amendment.

3. Standard Lease Terms

The Standard Lease Terms are contained in Form 3100-11, Offer to Lease and Lease for Oil and Gas, United States Department of the Interior, BLM, October 1992 or later addition (BLM 1992). The Standard Lease Terms provide the lessee the right to use the leased land as needed to explore for, drill for, extract, remove, and dispose of oil and gas deposits located under the leased lands. Operations must be conducted in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to the land, air, water, cultural, biological, and visual elements of the environment, as well as other land uses or users. Federal environmental protection laws such as the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and Historic Preservation Act will be applied to all lands and operations and are included in the Standard Lease Terms. If threatened or endangered species; objects of historic, cultural, or scientific value; or substantial unanticipated environmental effects are encountered during construction, all work affecting the resource will stop and the land management agency will be contacted.

Standard Lease Terms provide for reasonable measures to minimize adverse impacts to surface resources. These include, but are not limited to, modifications to the siting or design of facilities, timing of operations, and specifications of interim and final reclamation measures. Standard Lease Terms may not require the lessee to relocate drilling rigs or supporting facilities by more than 600 feet, require that operations be sited off the leasehold, or prohibit new surface-disturbing operations for more than 60 days each year (43 CFR part 3101.I-2).

Form 3100-11 is standard nationwide and is applied to every lease issued by the BLM.

B. Required Operating Procedures

1. Soils

Objective

ROP-Soils-a Minimize soil erosion by stabilizing disturbed soil as soon as possible. Where permitted operations result in surface disturbance, land is returned as closely as possible to its pre-disturbed condition.

Requirements

ROP-Soils-a-1 Ditch roadways on the uphill side and install culverts or low water crossings at suitable intervals. Spacing of drainage devices will be dependent on road gradient and soil erodibility.

ROP-Soils-a-2 Design roads for minimal disruption of natural drainage patterns.

ROP-Soils-a-3 Roads shall avoid areas with unstable or fragile soils.

ROP-Soils-a-4 Place water bars across reclaimed roads having grades in excess of 2 percent. Spacing will be dependent on road gradient and soil erodibility.

ROP-Soils-a-5 Save all organic material for future use in an area separate from overburden.

ROP-Soils-a-6 Stockpile and save all overburden for respreading over tailings.

ROP-Soils-a-7 Shape and stabilize all overburden piles to prevent erosion.

ROP-Soils-a-8 Final shape of respread tailing and overburden will approximate the shape of the surrounding terrain.

ROP-Soils-a-9 Recontour and revegetated roads, well pads, and other disturbed areas as per an approved reclamation plan or Plan of Operations. Revegetation will occur through seeding of native seed or by providing for soil conditions that allow the site to revegetate naturally, whichever provides the most effective means of reestablishing ground cover and minimizing erosion. Scarify the final land surface to provide seed traps and erosion control.

ROP-Soils-a-10 Seed and plant with native species. Where native species are not available in sufficient quantities or where they are incapable of maintaining or achieving the objective, or where non-native species are essential to the functional integrity of the site, non-native vegetation may be used with specific approval from the AO.

ROP-Soils-a-11 Respread vegetation removed during pipeline installation to provide protection, nutrient recycling, and seed source.

ROP-Soils-a-12 Operators will prevent and control noxious weed infestations. Noxious weeds in Alaska are listed under Alaska Statute 11 AAC 34.020.

Objective

ROP-Soils-b Minimize soil disturbance and compaction associated with overland moves, forestry operations, and seismic exploration.

Requirements

ROP-Soils-b-1 Whenever possible, overland moves that are part of permitted operations will occur when frost and snow cover is sufficient to minimize soil disturbance and compaction. For proposed operations during snow-free months, permittee will work with the AO on specifying vehicle types and methods to minimize vegetation and soil disturbance, such as use of air or water craft, utilizing existing roads or trails, or use of low ground pressure vehicles.

ROP-Soils-b-2 Bulldozing of tundra mat and vegetation is prohibited unless project objectives call for scarification of the site to improve sprouting or seeding success. In situations where pipeline or electric line requires burial, use equipment designed specifically for trenching that minimizes disturbance of vegetation mat.

ROP-Soils-b-3 Off-highway vehicle (OHV) use associated with permitted activities will comply with trail limitations in the area. The use of OHVs associated with permitted activities will be allowed under appropriate stipulations as approved by the AO.

2. Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Objective

ROP-F&W-a Maintain and protect fish and wildlife habitat on public lands, and provide the habitat needs of fish and wildlife resources necessary to maintain or enhance such populations.

Requirements

ROP-F&W-a-1 Utilize existing roads and trails whenever possible. Use off existing roads and trails shall require a site-specific exception from the AO.

ROP-F&W-a-2 No road crossings are permitted in crucial spawning habitat unless no feasible alternative exists and it can be demonstrated that no adverse effects will occur.

ROP-F&W-a-3 Avoid stream crossings. When a stream must be crossed, make the crossing as close as possible to a 90 degree angle to the stream. Make stream crossings at stable sections in the stream channel.

ROP-F&W-a-4 Bridges and culverts will be large enough, or will be positioned, to 1) avoid altering the direction and velocity of stream flow and 2) avoid interfering with migrating, rearing or spawning activities of fish and wildlife. Bridges and culverts should span the entire non-vegetated stream channel.

ROP-F&W-a-5 Recontour and revegetated disturbed stream banks, or take other protective measures to prevent soil erosion into adjacent waters.

ROP-F&W-a-6 Roads, well pads, and other oil and gas facilities will not be allowed within 500 feet of fish-bearing rivers and lakes unless the lessee can demonstrate (through a site-specific analysis that considers species of fish present, slope, vegetation, and other conditions) that the impacts to fish habitat are minimal. Exploratory drilling will be permitted within 500 feet under frozen conditions.

ROP-F&W-a-7 Travel up and down stream beds is prohibited.

ROP-F&W-a-8 Water intakes will be screened and designed to prevent fish intake.

ROP-F&W-a-9 Timber sales will provide buffers to prevent disturbance of fish habitat and possible sedimentation into streams. Buffer widths will be dependent on harvest method, season of harvest, equipment used, slope, vegetation, and soil type. Winter operations will be encouraged in order to minimize impacts to riparian areas.

ROP-F&W-a-10 Prescribed burn ignition patterns will allow for stream buffers. Lighting at stream's edge will be avoided.

ROP-F&W-a-11 Overhead powerline construction will be avoided in primary trumpeter swan breeding habitat.

ROP-F&W-a-12 Recreational developments, permits, or leases on lakes or lakeshores with historically active trumpeter swan nest sites or staging areas will only be allowed if the lessee or permittee can demonstrate on a site-specific basis that impacts will be minimal or it is determined that there is no feasible or prudent alternative.

ROP-F&W-a-13 Consistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, operations that require vegetation removal will avoid the migratory bird nesting period of April 15 to July 15; these avoidance timing dates will be refined per specific region and habitat type (of individual projects) within GFO based on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's recommended guidelines. (FWS 2005) If no feasible alternatives exist, an assessment will be conducted to determine bird species present, significance of potential impacts, and possible mitigation measures.

Objective

ROP-F&W-b Avoid activities in sensitive wildlife and plant habitats.

Requirements

ROP-F&W-b-1 Within one-fourth mile of lakes, ponds, or marshes with trumpeter swan nests, the following uses will not be permitted from May 1 to August 31: a) ground disturbance or surface use exceeding 14 days; b) FLPMA leases; c) FLPMA permits where surface use exceeds 14 days; or d) overland access to permitted activities. Stipulations regarding oil and gas exploration, development, and production are described in the *Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations* section beginning on page C-23. Exceptions to this ROP may be granted for mining operations where no feasible alternative exists and where mitigation measures can be identified to minimize impacts.

ROP-F&W-b-2 Within defined caribou and bison calving areas, the following uses will not be permitted from May1 to June 15: a) surface disturbing activities; b) FLPMA leases or permits that exceed 14 days of activity; or c) mining exploration. Aircraft associated with permitted activities will maintain an altitude of at least 1,000 feet. Exceptions to this ROP may be granted for mining operations where no feasible alternative exists and where mitigation measures can be identified to minimize impacts. Stipulations regarding oil and gas exploration, development, and production are described in the *Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations* section beginning on page C-23.

ROP-F&W-b-3 Within defined moose winter range, the following uses will not be permitted from October 15 to March 31: a) surface disturbing activities; or b) FLPMA leases or permits that exceed 14 days of activity. Aircraft associated with permitted activities will maintain an altitude of 1,000 feet. Exceptions to this ROP may be granted for mining operations where no feasible alternative exists and where mitigation measures can be identified to minimize impacts. Exceptions may also be granted for other activities based on site-specific analysis and documented non-occupancy of the specific area by moose. Stipulations regarding oil and gas exploration, development, and production are described in the *Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations* section beginning on page C-23.

ROP-F&W-b-4 Within one-fourth mile of bald eagle nests, the following uses will not be permitted from April 1 to August 31: a) surface disturbing activities; or b) FLPMA leases or permits. Aircraft associated with permitted activities will maintain an altitude of 1,000 feet within one-half mile of documented eagle nests. Exemptions to this ROP may be granted for mining operations where no feasible alternative exists and where mitigation measures can be identified to minimize impacts. Appropriate buffers around other raptor nests will be determined based on site-specific analysis. Stipulations regarding oil and gas exploration, development, and production are described in the *Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations* section beginning on page C-23.

ROP-F&W-b-5 In critical Dall sheep and mountain goat habitat, helicopters used in support of permitted activities will maintain one-half mile horizontal and 1,500 foot vertical distance from goats and sheep. Helicopter landings, unless for emergency purposes, are not permitted in Dall sheep or goat critical ranges, as identified based on ADF&G maps and refined by monitoring.

Objective

ROP-F&W-c Manage fish and wildlife resources and habitat to ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and to ensure progress towards recovery of listed threatened and endangered species.

Requirements

ROP-F&W-c-1 The planning area may now or hereafter contain plants or animals (or their habitats) identified as threatened, endangered, or Sensitive Status Species. The BLM may recommend modifications to proposals to further its conservation and management objective to avoid any BLM-approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. The BLM may require modifications to or disapprove proposed activities that are likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. The BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activities that may affect any such species or critical habitat until the BLM completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the ESA, including completion of any required procedures for conference or consultation.

3. Riparian Areas and Water Quality

Objective

ROP-Water-a Locate new structures away from riparian or wetland areas if they conflict with achieving or maintaining riparian or wetland function. Existing structures are used so as not to conflict with riparian or wetland functions, or they are relocated or modified when incompatible.

Requirements

ROP-Water-a-1 The design and location of permanent oil and gas facilities within 500 feet of fish-bearing waterbodies or within 100 feet of non fish-bearing waterbodies will only be approved on a case-by-case basis if the lessee can demonstrate that impacts to fish, water quality, and aquatic and riparian habitats are minimal.

ROP-Water-a-2 New road construction within floodplains will be avoided. Where necessary, roads will cross riparian areas perpendicular to the main channel.

Objective

ROP-Water-b Minimize disturbance to riparian areas and facilitate rehabilitation of riparian areas associated with mining activities.

Requirements

ROP-Water-b-1 Streams will be diverted around mining operations using an appropriately-sized bypass channel.

ROP-Water-b-2 All process waters and any groundwaters seeping into the operating area will be diverted into the settling pond system for treatment prior to reentering the natural water system.

ROP-Water-b-3 Settling ponds will be cleaned out and maintained at appropriate intervals to comply with water quality standards. Fine sediment captured in settling ponds will be protected from washout and left in a stable condition at the end of each mining season to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation to the environment during periods of non-operation.

ROP-Water-b-4 Riparian areas located between a mined ore deposit and a water course will not be disturbed to serve as a buffer strip to protect integrity of stream banks, provide water temperature control, and provide filtration of sediment from surface runoff. All roads, bunkhouses, offices, equipment storage, and maintenance facilities will be sited in upland areas if possible. Overburden will be placed on the uplands if possible or on the upland side of the mine pit. Application of this ROP is not intended to preclude activities which, by nature, must occur within riparian areas, such as placer mining.

ROP-Water-b-5 Projects will be designed to protect water quality and comply with State and Federal water quality standards.

ROP-Water-b-6 Streams that have been altered by channeling, diversion, or damming will be restored to a condition that will allow for proper functioning condition. Active streams will be returned to the natural water course or a new channel will be created at its lowest energy state (valley bottom) that approximates the old natural channel in shape, gradient, and meander frequency using a stable channel design. The new channel will be designed consistent with the capabilities of the reclaimed site.

ROP-Water-b-7 Riparian vegetation, if removed during operations, will be reestablished.

Objective

ROP-Water-c Provide for maintenance of proper functioning condition in riparian areas and protection of water quality by minimizing impacts of other permitted activities and vegetation treatments.

Requirements

ROP-Water-c-1 Structural and vegetative treatments in riparian and wetland areas will be compatible with the capability of the site, including the system's hydrologic regime, and will contribute to the maintenance or restoration of proper functioning condition. Riparian vegetation, if removed during operations, will be reestablished.

ROP-Water-c-2 Refueling of equipment will not be conducted in riparian areas or within 500 feet of the active floodplain of any fish-bearing waterbody or within 100 feet from non-fish bearing waterbodies. The AO may allow storage and operations at areas closer than the stated distance (such as for placer mining) if properly designed to account for local hydrologic conditions.

ROP-Water-c-3 Water withdrawal from lakes may be authorized on a site-specific basis depending on size, water volume, depth, fish population, and species diversification.

ROP-Water-c-4 If operations occur in winter, crossing of waterway courses will be made using a low-angle approach. Snow and ice bridges will be removed, breached, or slotted before spring break-up. Ramps and bridges will be substantially free of soil and debris.

ROP-Water-c-5 All permitted operations will be conducted in such a manner as to not block any stream or drainage system, and to comply with State and Federal water quality standards. Application of this ROP is not intended to preclude activities which, by nature, must occur within riparian areas, such as hydropower dams or placer mining.

ROP-Water-c-6 Human use will be managed to meet and maintain water quality standards and avoid management problems and water quality impacts. Specific management practices will include education, construction of toilet facilities where appropriate, and encouragement in the use of portable toilet systems.

ROP-Water-c-7 Use of aerial fire retardant near lakes, wetlands, streams, rivers, sources of human water consumption, and areas adjacent to water sources will be avoided to protect fish habitat and water quality. If feasible, use of water rather than retardant is preferred in these areas.

Objective

ROP-Water-d Minimize disturbance to riparian areas from development of mineral materials sites.

Requirements

ROP-Water-d-1 When responding to a request for a material sale or identifying a source for materials on public lands, the highest priority shall be given to using existing upland material sources. Using materials from wetlands, lakes, and active or inactive floodplains will be avoided unless no feasible public upland alternative exists. Sales or permits for gravel extraction will not be permitted in known fish spawning or rearing areas.

ROP-Water-d-2 Where possible, braided or split stream types will be selected for material extraction. Meandering, sinuous, and straight steam channel types should be avoided.

ROP-Water-d-3 Generally, the largest river feasible should be selected for a gravel operation in a given area. Larger rivers have higher volumes of gravel and a wider floodplain more forgiving to in-channel disturbance. The proportionately smaller disturbance in large river systems will reduce the overall effect of gravel removal.

ROP-Water-d-4 Mining gravel from active channels will be avoided to reduce detrimental effects on water quality, aquatic habitat, and biota.

ROP-Water-d-5 When possible, avoid vegetated habitats.

ROP-Water-d-6 When scraping gravel in active or inactive floodplains, maintain buffers that will constrain active channels to their original locations and configurations.

ROP-Water-d-7 Material pits will be designed with high shorelines, water depth diversity, and islands.

ROP-Water-d-8 If mining in vegetated areas, all overburden, vegetative slash, and debris will be saved for use during site reclamation to facilitate vegetative recovery. This material should be piled or broadcast so that it will not be washed away.

4. Wetlands

Objective

ROP-Wetlands-a Direct land management practices to avoid or minimize adverse impacts upon the hydrological, habitat, subsistence, and recreational values of public wetlands.

Requirements

ROP-Wetlands-a-1 Activities in wetlands will comply with Federal and State permit requirements for alteration of wetlands.

ROP-Wetlands-a-2 Utilize winter access whenever possible and avoid road or trail construction in wetlands.

ROP-Wetlands-a-3 In snow-free months, if wetlands cannot be avoided, low ground pressure vehicles will be used wherever possible.

5. Vegetation

Objective

ROP-Veg-a Treatments to alter the vegetative composition of a site, such as prescribed burning, seeding, or planting, will be based on the potential of the site and will: a) retain or promote infiltration, permeability, and soil moisture storage; b) contribute to nutrient cycling and energy flow; c) protect water quality; d) help prevent the introduction and spread of noxious weeds; e) contribute to the diversity of plant communities and plant community composition and structure; f) maintain proper functioning condition; and g) support the conservation of threatened and endangered, Sensitive Status Species, and species of local importance.

Requirements

ROP-Veg-a-1 Vegetation treatments will be designed to achieve desired conditions clearly described in individual burn plans or timber sales. Desired conditions will be based on the ecological capability of a given site and will be expressed as cover types or seral stages within cover types, based on management objectives.

ROP-Veg-a-2 Vegetation treatments will be designed to prevent introduction of noxious weeds. Prescribed burn plans will contain a segment on known occurrence of noxious weeds within planned burning areas and strategies for post-burn monitoring or treatment.

ROP-Veg-a-3 Machinery used in timber sales will be inspected for noxious weed seeds, especially if it is brought in from outside the Copper Basin.

ROP-Veg-a-4 Burn plans for large burns will prescribe conditions that result in a mosaic of burned or unburned areas within the burn unit. Smaller burns may not require a mosaic, dependent on objectives.

ROP-Veg-a-5 Timber sales will rely, to the extent possible, on natural regeneration through proper site preparation.

ROP-Veg-a-6 Permitted livestock grazing will be conducted in a manner that maintains long-term productivity of vegetation. Animals will not be picketed in riparian areas. In areas of low grass production, operators will pack in weed-free hay or concentrated feed.

ROP-Veg-a-7 Currently there is known habitat in the planning area for Sensitive Status plant species. However, no specific population locations are known. If specific populations or individual Sensitive Status species are located, measures will be taken to protect these populations or individuals through site-specific buffers or management prescriptions.

Objective

ROP-Veg-b Minimize vegetation disturbance from permitted activities.

Requirements

ROP-Veg-b-1 Conduct ground operations during frozen conditions when possible (12 inches frost or 6 inches average snow cover).

ROP-Veg-b-2 Bulldozing of tundra mat or vegetation is prohibited unless there is no feasible alternative (lode mining), as approved by the AO. If trenching is required, utilize equipment that minimizes trench width.

ROP-Veg-b-3 Location of winter trails will be designed to minimize breakage or compaction of vegetation.

ROP-Veg-b-4 When ground operations are required in snow-free months, select routes that utilize naturally hardened sites and avoid the need for trail braiding.

ROP-Veg-b-5 Use of tracked or off-highway vehicles in fire suppression or management activities will be conducted in a manner that does not cause erosion, damage to riparian areas, degradation of water quality or fish habitat, or contribution to stream channel sedimentation.

ROP-Veg-b-6 Permanent oil and gas facilities will be designed and located to minimize the development footprint.

ROP-Veg-b-7 Rehabilitate firelines and bulldozer lines by spreading original soil and vegetation on the disturbed ground. In extreme cases where seeding or plugging may be necessary, use native vegetation and seeds. A rehabilitation plan should be developed by the suppression forces working with Field Office wildlife biologists and botanists.

6. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Objective

ROP-Cultural-a Consider protection and conservation of known cultural resources, including historical and pre-historic sites in management practices.

Requirements

ROP-Cultural-a-1 For oil and gas activities, cultural resource protection is covered under the standard lease terms.

ROP-Cultural-a-2 For other non-oil and gas permitted activities, cultural resource protection and conservation will be consistent with a) Sections 106, 110, and 101d of the Historic Preservation Act, b) procedures under BLM's 1997 Programmatic Agreement for Section 106 compliance, and c) the BLM's 1998 Implementing Protocol in Alaska between the BLM and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer.

ROP-Cultural-a-3 If necessary, mitigation measures will be implemented according to a mitigation plan approved by the AO. Such plans are usually prepared by the land use applicant's contract archaeologist according to BLM specifications. Mitigation plans will be reviewed as part of Section 106 consultation for National Register eligible or listed properties. The extent and nature of recommended mitigation will be commensurate with the significance of the cultural resource involved and the anticipated extent of the damage. Reasonable costs for mitigation will be borne by the land use applicant. Mitigation will be cost-effective and realistic.

Objective

ROP-Cultural-b Avoid damage to significant paleontological resources where possible, and mitigate unavoidable damage.

Requirements

ROP-Cultural-b-1 For all actions, evaluate the impacts of proposed actions to known resources and avoid damage to already-identified significant paleontological resources by avoidance.

ROP-Cultural-b-2 If avoidance is not possible, perform scientific examination of the to-be-impacted significant resources followed by appropriate mitigation, which may include the professional collection and analysis of significant specimens by scientists.

7. Visual Resources

Objective

ROP-VRM-a Manage oil and gas, mining, and other permitted activities to meet the Visual Resource Management class objectives described below and shown on Map 16.

- Class I: Natural ecological changes and very limited management activity are allowed. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention. This classification is applied, within this planning area, to Wild and Scenic rivers.
- Class II: The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen, but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.
- Class III: The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.
- Class IV: The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements.

Requirements

ROP-VRM-a-1 To the extent practicable, all permanent facilities will be located away from roadsides, rivers, or trails, thereby using distance to reduce the facility's visual impact.

ROP-VRM-a-2 Access roads and permanent facilities will be designed to meet the visual resource objective using such methods as minimizing vegetation clearing and using landforms to screen roads and facilities.

ROP-VRM-a-3 Permanent facilities will be designed to be screened behind trees or landforms if feasible so they will blend with the natural surroundings.

ROP-VRM-a-4 The modification or disturbance of landforms and vegetative cover will be minimized.

ROP-VRM-a-5 Permanent facilities will be designed so their shapes, sizes, and colors harmonize with the scale and character of the surrounding landscape.

ROP-VRM-a-6 In open, exposed landscapes, development will be located in the opposite direction from the primary scenic views, if feasible.

8. Hazardous Materials and Waste Handling

Objective

ROP-Haz-a Protect the health and safety of permittees, lessees, miners, oil field workers, and the general public by avoiding the disposal of solid waste and garbage near areas of human activity.

Requirement

ROP-Haz-a-1 Areas of operation will be left clean of all debris.

Objective

ROP-Haz-b Minimize impacts on the environment from non-hazardous waste generation.

Requirements

ROP-Haz-b-1 All feasible precautions will be taken to avoid attracting wildlife to food and garbage.

ROP-Haz-b-2 Current requirements prohibit the burial of putrescible waste. All putrescible waste will be incinerated, backhauled, or composted in a manner approved by the AO. All solid waste, including incinerator ash, will be disposed of in an approved waste-disposal facility in accordance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) regulations and procedures.

ROP-Haz-b-3 For oil and gas operations, all pumpable solid, liquid, and sludge waste will be disposed by injection in accordance with EPA, ADEC, and the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC) regulations and procedures. The AO may permit alternate disposal if the lessee demonstrates that subsurface disposal is not feasible or prudent and the alternative method will not result in adverse environmental effects.

ROP-Haz-b-4 For oil and gas operations, produced water will be disposed of into injection wells as approved by the AOGCC under EPA regulations and the UICC program. The AO may permit alternate disposal methods if the lessee demonstrates that subsurface disposal is not feasible or prudent and the alternative method will not result in adverse environmental effects.

ROP-Haz-b-5 No disposal of domestic wastewater is allowed into bodies of fresh, estuarine, and marine water, including wetlands, unless authorized by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) or State permit.

Objective

ROP-Haz-c Minimize the impacts to fish, wildlife, and the environment from hazardous materials, oil spills, and other chemical spills.

Requirements

ROP-Haz-c-1 For oil and gas operations and mining Plans of Operation, a Hazardous Materials Emergency Contingency Plan will be prepared and implemented before transportation, storage, or use of fuel or hazardous substances. The plan will include a set of procedures to ensure prompt response, notification, and cleanup in the event of a hazardous substance spill or threat of a release. The plan will include a list of resources available for response (e.g., heavy-equipment operators, spill-cleanup materials or companies), and names and phone numbers of Federal and State contacts.

ROP-Haz-c-2 A Plan of Operations will include a disclosure of the components in any hydraulic fracturing materials to be used, the volume and depths at which such materials are expected to be used, and the volume capacity of the vessels to be used to store such materials.

ROP-Haz-c-3 For oil and gas operations and Mining Plans of Operation, the operator will maintain Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) information on all hazardous substances used by the operator.

ROP-Haz-c-4 Before initiating any oil and gas or related activity or operation, including field research and surveys and/or seismic operations, lessees/permittees will develop a comprehensive spill prevention and response contingency plan per 40 CFR 112.

ROP-Haz-c-5 For oil and gas operations, mining operations, and other leases and permits, sufficient oil-spill cleanup materials (absorbents, containment devices, etc.) will be stored at all fueling points and vehicle-maintenance areas and will be carried by field crews on all overland moves, seismic work trains, and similar overland moves by heavy equipment.

ROP-Haz-c-6 Fuel and other petroleum products will be stored at a location approved by the AO and within an impermeable lined and diked area capable of containing 110 percent of the stored volume or within approved alternate storage containers.

ROP-Haz-c-7 Fuel storage will not occur closer than 100 feet from any river, lake, stream, or wetland. The AO may allow storage closer than the stated distance (such as for placer mining) if properly designed.

ROP-Haz-c-8 Liner material will be compatible with the stored product and will be capable of remaining impermeable during typical weather extremes expected throughout the storage period.

ROP-Haz-c-9 All fuel containers, including barrels and propane tanks, will be marked with the responsible party's name, product type, and year filled and purchased.

Objective

ROP-Haz-d Minimize the impact on fish, wildlife, and the environment from contaminants associated with the exploratory drilling process.

Requirements

ROP-Haz-d-1 Surface discharge of reserve-pit fluids and produced water is prohibited unless authorized by applicable NPDES and ADEC and approved by the AO.

C. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations

Table 52. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations

Objective	Stipulation	Areas Where Stipulations Apply	Exception, Modification, Waiver
Minimize disturbance to nesting trumpeter swans and their habitat.	**Stip-1:** Closed to drilling (exploration or development), pipeline construction, road construction, or location of permanent facilities May 1 to August 31. Allows off-season exploration activities or pipeline construction.	Area within one-fourth mile of trumpeter swan nesting or staging ponds, marshes, or lakes.	**Exception:** FWS 5-year census data will be used to accurately identify nest sites that are used repeatedly. Upon site-specific review and monitoring, the AO may grant exceptions based on non-occupancy of specific nests. **Modification:** Season may be adjusted based on documented season of occupancy of specific nest sites. **Waiver:** None if nests are present in the lease area.
Maintain high value moose habitat and minimize disturbance in areas of winter concentration.	**Stip-2:** Closed to drilling (exploratory and development), pipeline construction, and road construction activities October 15 to March 31. Open during this period to production activities. Open in off-season to all activities, subject to other stipulated areas.	Moose winter range. See Map 37.	**Exception:** Upon review and monitoring, the AO may grant exceptions based on actual moose use of site-specific area. Exceptions granted for work-over rigs on a case-by-case basis based on duration of activity and actual moose occupancy of area. **Modification:** Season may be adjusted depending on climatic conditions, severity of winter, and documented occupancy of the area. **Waiver:** None if moose winter range is present in the lease area.
Protect active bald eagle nests.	**Stip-3:** Closed to drilling (exploration or development), pipeline construction, road construction, or location of permanent facilities April 1 to August 31. Allows off-season exploration activities or pipeline construction.	One-fourth mile buffer from historically active bald eagle nests. See Map 38.	**Exception:** Where data exists, AO may grant exceptions based on review of eagle nest monitoring data. Nests unoccupied for three consecutive years may be considered for exception. **Modification:** Season may be adjusted based on actual nest occupancy. **Waiver:** None if bald eagle nests are present in area.

Objective	Stipulation	Areas Where Stipulations Apply	Exception, Modification, Waiver
Minimize disturbance to calving caribou and bison.	**Stip-4:** No exploration or development activities May 1 to June 15. Production activities may occur (no work-over rigs).	Nelchina caribou calving and Delta bison calving areas. See Maps 34 and 33.	**Exception:** AO may grant exception if review indicates that calving caribou or bison no longer occupy site-specific area. **Modification:** Season may be extended based on actual occupancy of the area. Monitoring (for Nelchina caribou) provided by annual ADF&G aerial counts. **Waiver:** This stipulation may be waived if caribou or bison migratory patterns change and the areas are no longer used for calving.
Minimize soil erosion.	**Stip-5:** Surface disturbing proposals involving construction on slopes greater than 25% would include an approved erosion control strategy, topsoil segregation/restoration plan, be properly surveyed and designed by a certified engineer, and approved by BLM prior to construction and maintenance.	All slopes greater than 25% within the planning area.	**Exception:** If after an environmental analysis the AO determines that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives, occupancy in the NSO area may be authorized. **Modification:** May be granted if a more detailed analysis (Order I soil survey) finds that surface disturbance could occur without accelerated erosion. **Waivers:** None.
Minimize impact on the human environment.	**Stip-6:** The operator will construct drill pads at least 500 feet and compressor stations at least 1,500 feet from occupied structures.		**Exception:** The AO may grant an exception if the operator obtains the consent of the owner of the structure. **Modification:** None. **Waivers:** None.

Objective	Stipulation	Areas Where Stipulations Apply	Exception, Modification, Waiver
Protect threatened, endangered, or Sensitive Status Species and their habitats.	**Stip-7:** The lease area may now or hereafter contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or Sensitive Status Species. The BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objective to avoid BLM-approved activities that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. The BLM may require modifications to or disapprove proposed activities that are likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed TES species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat.	All BLM-managed lands.	**Exception:** None. **Modification:** None. **Waiver:** None.

D. Standard Lease Terms (BLM Form 3100-11)

Section 1. Rentals

Rentals shall be paid to proper office of lessor in advance of each lease year. Annual rental rates per acre or fraction thereof are:

(a) Noncompetitive lease, $1.50 for the first 5 years; thereafter $2.00;
(b) Competitive lease, $1.50, for the first 5 years; thereafter $2.00;
(c) Other, see attachment,

or as specified in regulations at the time this lease is issued.

If this lease or a portion thereof is committed to an approved cooperative or unit plan which includes a well capable of producing leased resources, and the plan contains a provision for allocation of production, royalties shall be paid on the production allocated to this lease. However, annual rentals shall continue to be due at the rate specified in (a), (b), or (c) for those lands not within a participating area.

Failure to pay annual rental, if due, on or before the anniversary date of this lease (or next official working day if office is closed) shall automatically terminate this lease by operation of law. Rentals may be waived, reduced, or suspended by the Secretary upon a sufficient showing by lessee.

Section 2. Royalties

Royalties shall be paid to proper office of lessor. Royalties shall be computed in accordance with regulations on production removed or sold. Royalty rates are:

(a) Noncompetitive lease, 12 1/2 %;
(b) Competitive lease, 12 1/2 %;
(c) Other, see attachment; or

as specified in regulations at the time this lease is issued.

Lessor reserves the right to specify whether royalty is to be paid in value or in kind, and the right to establish reasonable minimum values on products after giving lessee notice and an opportunity to be heard. When paid in value, royalties shall be due and payable on the last day of the month following the month in which production occurred. When paid in kind, production shall be delivered, unless otherwise agreed to by lessor, in merchantable condition on the premises where produced without cost to lessor. Lessee shall not be required to hold such production in storage beyond the last day of the month following the month in which production occurred, nor shall lessee be held liable for loss or destruction of royalty oil or other products in storage from causes beyond the reasonable control of lessee.

Minimum royalty in lieu of rental of not less than the rental which otherwise would be required for that lease year shall be payable at the end of each lease year beginning on

or after a discovery in paying quantities. This minimum royalty may be waived, suspended, or reduced, and the above royalty rates may be reduced, for all or portions of this lease if the Secretary determines that such action is necessary to encourage the greatest ultimate recovery of the leased resources, or is otherwise justified.

An interest charge shall be assessed on late royalty payments or underpayments in accordance with the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA) (30 U.S.C. 1701). Lessee shall be liable for royalty payments on oil and gas lost or wasted from a lease site when such loss or waste is due to negligence on the part of the operator, or due to the failure to comply with any rule, regulation, order, or citation issued under FOGRMA or the leasing authority.

Section 3. Bonds

A bond shall be filed and maintained for lease operations as required under regulations.

Section 4. Diligence, rate of development, unitization, and drainage

Lessee shall exercise reasonable diligence in developing and producing, and shall prevent unnecessary damage to, loss of, or waste of leased resources. Lessor reserves right to specify rates of development and production in the public interest and to require lessee to subscribe to a cooperative or unit plan, within 30 days of notice, if seemed necessary for proper development and operation of area, field, or pool embracing these leased lands. Lessee shall drill and produce wells necessary to protect leased lands from drainage or pay compensatory royalty for drainage in amount determined by lessor.

Section 5. Documents, evidence, and inspection

Lessee shall file with proper office of lessor, not later than 30 days after effective date thereof, any contract or evidence of other arrangement for sale or disposal of production. At such times and in such form as lessor may prescribe, lessee shall furnish detailed statements showing amounts and quality of all products removed and sold, proceeds therefrom, and amount used for production purposes or unavoidably lost. Lessee may be required to provide plats and schematic diagrams showing development work and improvements and reports with respect to parties in interest, expenditures, and depreciation costs. In the form prescribed by lessor, lessee shall keep a daily drilling record, a log, information on well surveys and tests, and a record of subsurface investigations and furnish copies to lessor when required. Lessee shall keep open at all reasonable times for inspection by any authorized officer of lessor, the leased premises and all wells, improvements, machinery, and fixtures thereon, and all books, accounts, maps, and records relative to operations, surveys, or investigations on or in the leased lands. Lessee shall maintain copies of all contracts, sales agreements, accounting records, and documentation such as billings, invoices, or similar documentation that supports costs claimed as manufacturing, preparation, and/or transportation costs. All such records shall be maintained in lessee's accounting offices

for future audit by lessor. Lessee shall maintain required records for 6 years after they are generated or, if an audit or investigation is underway, until released of the obligation to maintain such records by lessor.

During existence of this lease, information obtained under this section shall be closed to inspection by the public in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

Section 6. Conduct of operations

Lessee shall conduct operations in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to the land, air, and water, to cultural, biological, visual, and other resources, and to other land uses or users. Lessee shall take reasonable measures deemed necessary by lessor to accomplish the intent of this section. To the extent consistent with lease rights granted, such measures may include, but are not limited to, modification to siting or design of facilities, timing of operations, and specification of interim and final reclamation measures. Lessor reserves the right to continue existing uses and to authorize future uses upon or in the leased lands, including the approval of easements or rights-of-way. Such uses shall be conditioned so as to prevent unnecessary or unreasonable interference with rights of lessee.

Prior to disturbing the surface of the leased lands, lessee shall contact lessor to be apprised of procedures to be followed and modifications or reclamation measures that may be necessary. Areas to be disturbed may require inventories or special studies to determine the extent of impacts to other resources. Lessee may be required to complete minor inventories or short term special studies under guidelines provided by lessor. If in the conduct of operations, threatened or endangered species, objects of historic or scientific interest, or substantial unanticipated environmental effects are observed, lessee shall immediately contact lessor. Lessee shall cease any operations that would result in the destruction of such species or objects.

Section 7. Mining operations

To the extent that impacts from mining operations would be substantially different or greater than those associated with normal drilling operations, lessor reserves the right to deny approval of such operations.

Section 8. Extraction of helium

Lessor reserves the option of extracting or having extracted helium from gas production in a manner specified and by means provided by lessor at no expense or loss to lessee or owner of the gas. Lessee shall include in any contract of sale of gas the provisions of this section.

Section 9. Damages to property

Lessee shall pay lessor for damage to lessor's improvements, and shall save and hold lessor harmless from all claims for damage or harm to persons or property as a result of lease operations.

Section 10. Protection of diverse interests and equal opportunity

Lessee shall: pay when due all taxes legally assessed and levied under laws of the State or the United States; accord all employees complete freedom of purchase; pay all wages at least twice each month in lawful money of the United States; maintain a safe working environment in accordance with standard industry practices; and take measures necessary to protect the health and safety of the public.

Lessor reserves the right to ensure that production is sold at reasonable prices; and to prevent monopoly. If lessee operates a pipeline, or owns controlling interest in a pipeline or a company operating a pipeline, which may be operated accessible to oil derived from these leased lands, lessee shall comply with section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Lessee shall comply with Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, as amended, and regulations and relevant orders of the Secretary of Labor issued pursuant thereto. Neither lessee, nor lessee's subcontractors shall maintain segregated facilities.

Section 11. Transfer of lease interests and relinquishment of lease

As required by regulations, lessee shall file with lessor any assignment or other transfer of an interest in this lease. Lessee may relinquish this lease or any legal subdivision by filing in the proper office a written relinquishment, which shall be effective as of the date of filing, subject to the continued obligation of the lessee and surety to pay all accrued rentals and royalties.

Section 12. Delivery of premises

At such time as all or portions of this lease are returned to lessor, lessee shall place affected wells in condition for suspension or abandonment, reclaim the land as specified by lessor and, within a reasonable period of time, remove equipment and improvements not deemed necessary by lessor for preservation of producible wells.

Section 13. Proceedings in case of default

If lessee fails to comply with any provisions of this lease, and the noncompliance continues for 30 days after written notice thereof, this lease shall be subject to cancellation unless or until the leasehold contains a well capable of production of oil or gas in paying quantities, or the lease is committed to an approved cooperative or unit

plan or communitization agreement which contains a well capable of production of unitized substances in paying quantities. This provision shall not be construed to prevent the exercise by lessor of any other legal and equitable remedy, including waiver of the default. Any such remedy or waiver shall not prevent later cancellation for the same default occurring at any other time. Lessee shall be subject to applicable provisions and penalties of FOGRMA (30 U.S.C. 1701).

Section 14. Heirs and successors-in-interest

Each obligation of this lease shall extend to and be binding upon, and every benefit hereof shall inure to the heirs, executors, administrators, successors, beneficiaries, or assignees of the respective parties hereto.

Appendix D: Species Lists

Table 53. Mammal Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries D-3
Table 54. Bird Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries D-4
Table 55. Amphibian Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries D-8
Table 56. Fish Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries D-8

APPENDIX D: SPECIES LISTS

The following tables contain lists of the mammal, bird, amphibian, and fish species that are known to occur on lands within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries. Though these species may be found within these boundaries, they may or may not occur on BLM-managed lands within that boundary. These lists are not all-inclusive.

Table 53. Mammal Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries

Common Name	Scientific Name
Big Game	
Moose	*Alces alces*
Caribou	*Rangifer tarandus*
Dall sheep	*Ovis dalli*
Mountain goat	*Oreamnos americanus*
Bison	*Bison bison*
Sitka black-tailed deer	*Odocoileus hemionus sitkensis*
Brown bear	*Ursus arctos*
Black bear	*Ursus americanus*
Furbearers	
Gray wolf	*Canis lupus*
Coyote	*Canis latrans*
Red fox	*Vulpes vulpes*
Wolverine	*Gulo gulo*
Canada lynx	*Lynx canadensis*
Pine marten	*Martes americana*
River otter	*Lutra canadensis*
Mink	*Mustela vison*
Ermine	*Mustela erminea*
Least weasel	*Mustela nivalis*
Beaver	*Castor canadensis*
Muskrat	*Ondatra zibethicus*
Other Small Mammals	
Hoary marmot	*Marmota caligata*
Snowshoe hare	*Lepus americanus*
Pika	*Ochotona collaris*
Porcupine	*Erethizon dorsatum*
Red squirrel	*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*
Arctic ground squirrel	*Spermophilus parryii*
Northern flying squirrel	*Glaucomys sabrinus*
Northern red-backed vole	*Clethrionomys rutilus*
Meadow vole	*Microtus pennsylvanicus*
Tundra vole	*Microtus oeconomus*
Long-tailed vole	*Microtus longicaudus*
Yellow-cheeked vole	*Microtus xanthognathus*
Masked shrew	*Sorex cinereus*
Dusky shrew	*Sorex obscurus*
Water shrew	*Sorex palustris*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Arctic shrew	*Sorex arcticus*
Pygmy shrew	*Microsorex hoyi*
Little brown bat	*Myotis lucifugus*
Silver-haired bat	*Lasionycteris noctivagans*
Big brown bat	*Eptesicus fuscus*
Brown lemming	*Lemmus sibiricus*
Northern bog lemming	*Synaptomys borealis*

Table 54. Bird Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries

Common Name	Scientific Name
Upland Game Birds	
Willow ptarmigan	*Lagopus lagopus*
Rock ptarmigan	*Lagopus mutus*
White-tailed ptarmigan	*Lagopus leucurus*
Spruce grouse	*Dendragapus canadensis*
Sharp-tailed grouse	*Tympanuchus phasianellus*
Ruffed grouse	*Bonasa umbellus*
Raptors	
Bald eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*
Golden eagle	*Aquila chrysaetos*
Osprey	*Pandion haliaetus*
Northern goshawk	*Accipter gentilis*
Sharp-shinned hawk	*Accipter striatus*
Red-tailed hawk	*Buteo jamaicensis*
Swainson's hawk	*Buteo swainsoni*
Rough-legged hawk	*Buteo lagopus*
Northern harrier	*Circus cyaneus*
Gyrfalcon	*Falco rusticolus*
American peregrine falcon	*Falco peregrinus anatum*
Arctic peregrine falcon	*Falco peregrinus tundrius*
American kestrel	*Falco sparverius*
Merlin	*Falco columbarius*
Great horned owl	*Bubo virginanus*
Snowy owl	*Nyetea scandiaca*
Northern hawk owl	*Surnia ulula*
Great gray owl	*Strix nebulosa*
Short-eared owl	*Asio flammeus*
Boreal owl	*Aegolius cunereus*
Ducks, Geese, Swans	
Trumpeter swan	*Cygnus buccinator*
Tundra swan	*Cygnus columbianus*
Canada goose	*Branta canadensis*
Dusky Canada goose	*Branta canadensis occidentalis*
Tule white-fronted goose	*Anser albifrons gambelli*
Vancouver Canada goose	*Branta canadensis fulva*
Snow goose	*Chen caerulescens*
Black brant	*Branta bernicla*
Mallard duck	*Anas platyrhynchos*
American black duck	*Anas rubripes*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Gadwall duck	*Anas strepera*
Northern pintail	*Anas acuta*
Green-winged teal	*Anas crecca*
Blue-winged teal	*Anas discors*
Cinnamon teal	*Anas cyanoptera*
Northern shoveler	*Anas clypeata*
Eurasian widgeon	*Anas penelope*
American widgeon	*Anas americanus*
Canvasback	*Aythya valisineria*
Redhead duck	*Aythya americana*
Ring-necked duck	*Aythya collaris*
Greater scaup	*Aythya marila*
Lesser scaup	*Aythya affinis*
Common goldeneye	*Bucephala clangula*
Barrow's goldeneye	*Bucephala islandica*
Bufflehead	*Bucephala albeola*
Old squaw	*Clangula hyemalis*
Harlequin duck	*Histrionicus histrionicus*
White-winged scoter	*Melanitta fusca*
Surf scoter	*Melanitta perspicillata*
Black scoter	*Melanitta nigra*
Ruddy duck	*Oxyura jamaicensis*
Hooded merganser	*Lophodytes cucullatus*
Red-breasted merganser	*Mergus merganser*
Common merganser	*Mergus serrator*
Other Waterfowl	
Common loon	*Gavia immer*
Yellow-billed loon	*Gavia adamsii*
Arctic loon	*Gavia arctica*
Red-throated loon	*Gavia stellata*
Red-necked grebe	*Podiceps grisqena*
Horned grebe	*Podiceps auritus*
Double-crested cormorant	*Phalacrocorax auritus*
Great blue heron	*Ardea herodias*
Sora	*Porzana carolina*
American coot	*Fulica americana*
Sandhill crane	*Grus canadensis*
Semipalmated plover	*Charadrius semipalmatus*
Black-bellied plover	*Pluvialis squatarola*
American golden plover	*Pluvialis dominica*
Killdeer	*Charadrius vociferous*
Hudsonian godwit	*Limosa haemastica*
Whimbrel	*Numenius phaeopus*
Upland sandpiper	*Bartramia longicauda*
Greater yellowlegs	*Tringa melanoleuca*
Lesser yellowlegs	*Tringa flavipes*
Solitary sandpiper	*Tringa solitaria*
Spotted sandpiper	*Actitis macularia*
Wandering tattler	*Heteroscelus incanus*
Ruddy turnstone	*Arenaria interpres*
Black turnstone	*Arenaria melanocephala*
Wilson's phalarope	*Phalaropus tricolor*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Red phalarope	*Phalaropus fulicaria*
Red-necked phalarope	*Phalaropus lobatus*
Common snipe	*Gallinago gallinago*
Long-billed dowitcher	*Limnodromus scolopaceus*
Surfbird	*Aphriza virgata*
Sanderling	*Calidris alba*
Semipalmated sandpiper	*Calidris pusilla*
Western sandpiper	*Calidris mauri*
Least sandpiper	*Calidris minutilla*
White-rumped sandpiper	*Calidris fusciollis*
Baird's sandpiper	*Calidris bairdii*
Pectoral sandpiper	*Calidris melanotos*
Dunlin	*Calidris alpine*
Stilt sandpiper	*Calidris himantopus*
Buff-breasted sandpiper	*Tryngites subruficollis*
American black oystercatcher	*Haematopus bachmani*
Glaucous gull	*Larus hyperboreus*
Glaucous-winged gull	*Larus glaucescens*
Herring gull	*Larus argentatus*
Ring-billed gull	*Larus delawarensis*
Mew gull	*Larus canus*
Bonaparte's gull	*Larus Philadelphia*
Black-legged kittiwake	*Rissa tridactyla*
Sabine's gull	*Rissa brevirostris*
Arctic tern	*Sterna paradisaea*
Common murre	*Uria aalge*
Black guillemot	*Cepphus grille*
Other Birds	
Pomerine jaeger	*Stercorarius pomarinus*
Parasitic jaeger	*Stercorarius parasiticus*
Long-tailed jaeger	*Stercorarius longicaudus*
Rock dove	*Columba livia*
Mourning dove	*Zenaida macroura*
Common nighthawk	*Chordeiles minor*
Rufous hummingbird	*Selasphorus rufus*
Belted kingfisher	*Ceryle alcyon*
Northern flicker	*Colaptes auratus*
Yellow-bellied sapsucker	*Sphyrapicus varius*
Hairy woodpecker	*Picoides villosus*
Downy woodpecker	*Picoides pubescens*
Black-backed woodpecker	*Picoides arctos*
Three-toed woodpecker	*Picoides tridactylus*
Eastern kingbird	*Tyrannus tyrannus*
Western kingbird	*Tyrannus verticalis*
Say's phoebe	*Sayornis saya*
Yellow-bellied flycatcher	*Empidonax flaviventris*
Alder flycatcher	*Empidonax alnorum*
Hammond's flycatcher	*Empidonax hammondi*
Western wood pewee	*Contopus sordidulus*
Olive-sided flycatcher	*Contopus borealis*
Horned lark	*Eremophila alpestris*
Violet-green swallow	*Tachycineta thalassinea*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Tree swallow	*Tachycineta bicolor*
Bank swallow	*Riparia riparia*
Barn swallow	*Hirundo rustica*
Purple martin	*Progne subis*
Gray jay	*Perisoreus canadensis*
Steller's jay	*Cyanocitta stelleri*
Northwestern crow	*Corvus caurinus*
Black-billed magpie	*Pica pica*
Common raven	*Corvus corax*
Clark's nutcracker	*Nucifraga columbiana*
Black-capped chickadee	*Parus atricapillus*
Boreal chickadee	*Parus hudsonicus*
Siberian tit	*Parus cinctus*
Red-breasted nuthatch	*Sitta canadensis*
Brown creeper	*Certhia americana*
American dipper	*Cinclus mexicanus*
American robin	*Turdus migratorius*
Varied thrush	*Ixoreus naevius*
Hermit thrush	*Catharus guttatus*
Swainson's thrush	*Catharus ustulatus*
Gray-cheeked thrush	*Catharus minimus*
Mountain bluebird	*Sialia currucoides*
Northern wheatear	*Oenanthe oenanthe*
Townsend's solitaire	*Myadestes townsendi*
Red knot	*Calidris canutus*
Arctic warbler	*Phylloscopus borealis*
Golden kinglet	*Regulus satrapa*
Ruby-crowned kinglet	*Regulus calendula*
White wagtail	*Motacilla alba*
Yellow wagtail	*Motacilla flava*
Water pipit	*Anthus spinoletta*
Bohemian waxwing	*Bombucilla garrulous*
Northern shrike	*Lanius excabitor*
European starling	*Sturnus vulgaris*
Tennessee warbler	*Vermivora peregina*
Orange-crowned warbler	*Vermivora celata*
Yellow warbler	*Dendroica petechia*
Cape May warbler	*Dendroica tigrina*
Yellow-rumped warbler	*Dendroica coronata*
Townsend's warbler	*Dendroica townsendi*
Blackpoll warbler	*Dendroica striata*
Northern waterthrush	*Seiurus noveboracensis*
Common yellowthroat	*Geothlypis trichas*
Wilson's warbler	*Wilsonia pusilla*
American redstart	*Setophaga ruticilla*
Yellow-headed blackbird	*Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus*
Red-winged blackbird	*Agelaius phoeniceus*
Rusty blackbird	*Euphagus carolinus*
Common grackle	*Quiscalus quiscalus*
Brown-headed cowbird	*Molothrus ater*
Western tanager	*Piranga ludoviciana*
Eurasian bullfinch	*Pyrrhula pyrrhula*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Pine grosbeak	*Pinicola enucleator*
Rosy finch	*Leucosticte arctoa*
Hoary redpoll	*Carduelis hornemanni*
Common redpoll	*Carduelis flammea*
Pine siskin	*Carduelis pinus*
Red crossbill	*Loxia curvirostra*
White-winged crossbill	*Loxia leucopteris*
Savannah sparrow	*Passerculus sandwichensis*
Dark-eyed junco	*Junco hyemalis*
American tree sparrow	*Spizella arborea*
Song sparrow	*Melospiza melodia*
Chipping sparrow	*Spizella passerine*
White-crowned sparrow	*Zonotrichia leucophrys*
Golden-crowned sparrow	*Zonotrichia atricapilla*
White-throated sparrow	*Zonotrichia albicollis*
Fox sparrow	*Passerella iliaca*
Lincoln's sparrow	*Melospiza lincolnii*
Lapland longspur	*Calcarius lapponicus*
Smith's longspur	*Calcarius pictus*
Snow bunting	*Plectrophenax nivalis*
Mckay's bunting	*Plectrophenax hyperboreus*

Table 55. Amphibian Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries

Common Name	Scientific Name
Wood frog	*Rana sylvatica*
Western toad	*Bufo boreas*

Table 56. Fish Species Known to Occur within the Glennallen Field Office Boundaries

Common Name	Scientific Name
Arctic char	*Salvelinus alpinus*
Arctic grayling	*Thymallus arcticus*
Burbot	*Lota lota*
Chinook salmon (king salmon)	*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*
Chum salmon (dog salmon)	*Oncorhynchus keta*
Coho salmon (silver salmon)	*Oncorhynchus kisutch*
Cutthroat trout	*Oncorhynchus clarki clarki*
Dolly Varden	*Salvelinus malma*
Lake trout	*Salvelinus namaycush*
Lake whitefish	*Coregonus clupeaformis*
Longnose sucker	*Catostomus catostomus catostomus*
Pacific lamprey	*Lampetra tridentata*
Pink salmon (humpback salmon)	*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*
Pygmy whitefish	*Prosopium coulteri*
Rainbow trout	*Oncorhynchus mykiss*
Round whitefish	*Prosopium cylindraceum*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Sockeye salmon (red or kokanee salmon)	*Oncorhynchus nerka*
Slimy sculpin	*Cottus cognatus*
Steelhead trout	*Oncorhynchus mykiss*

Appendix E: ANILCA Section 810 Analysis of Subsistence Impacts

A. Subsistence Evaluation Factors E-3
B. ANILCA Sec. 810(a) Evaluations and Findings for All Alternatives E-4
B.1 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative A E-4
B.1.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs E-5
B.1.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved E-6
B.1.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes E-6
B.1.4 Findings 6
B.2 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative B E-6
B.2.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs E-7
B.2.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved E-9
B.2.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes E-9
B.2.4 Findings 10
B.3 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative C E-10
B.3.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs E-11
B.3.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved E-12
B.3.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes .. E-13
B.3.4 Findings 13
B.4 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative D E-13
B.4.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs E-14
B.4.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved E-16
B.4.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes .. E-16
B.4.4 Findings 16
C. Evaluation and Findings for the Cumulative Case E-17
C.1.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Such Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs E-17
C.1.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved E-17
C.1.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes .. E-17
C.1.4 Findings 18

D. Notice and Hearings.....E-18
E. Subsistence Determinations Under ANILCA Sec. 810(a)(3)(A), (B), and (C).....E-19

APPENDIX E: ANILCA SECTION 810 ANALYSIS OF SUBSISTENCE IMPACTS

This appendix uses the information presented in the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS to evaluate the potential impacts to subsistence pursuant to sec. 810(a) of the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act (ANILCA).

A. Subsistence Evaluation Factors

Section 810(a) of ANILCA requires that an evaluation of subsistence uses and needs be completed for any Federal determination to "withdraw, reserve, lease, or otherwise permit the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands." As such, an evaluation of potential impacts to subsistence under ANILCA sec. 810 must be completed for the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS. ANILCA requires that this evaluation include findings on three specific issues:

1. The effect of use, occupancy, or disposition on subsistence uses and needs,
2. The availability of other lands for the purpose sought to be achieved, and
3. Other alternatives that would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes (16 U.S.C. sec. 3120).

The evaluation and findings required by ANILCA sec. 810 are set out for each of the four alternatives considered in the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A finding that any of the alternatives of the proposed action may significantly restrict subsistence uses imposes additional requirements, including provisions for notices to the State of Alaska and appropriate regional and local subsistence committees, a hearing in the vicinity of the area involved, and the making of the following determinations, as required by sec. 810(a)(3):

- Such a significant restriction of subsistence uses is necessary, and is consistent with sound management principles for the utilization of the public lands.
- The proposed activity will involve the minimal amount of public lands necessary to accomplish the purposes of use, occupancy, or other disposition.
- Reasonable steps will be taken to minimize adverse effects upon subsistence uses and resources resulting from such actions.

To determine if a significant restriction of subsistence uses and needs may result from any one of the alternatives discussed in the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS, including their cumulative effects, the following three factors in particular are considered:

- A reduction in the availability of subsistence resources caused by a decline in the population or amount of harvestable resources.
- Reductions in the availability of resources used for subsistence purposes caused by alteration of their normal locations and distribution patterns.

- Limitations on access to subsistence resources, including from increased competition for the resources.

A significant restriction to subsistence may occur in at least two instances: 1) when an action substantially reduces populations or their availability to subsistence users, and 2) when an action substantially limits access by subsistence users to resources. Chapter III: Affected Environment of the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS provides information on areas and resources important for subsistence use, and the degree of dependence of affected people on different subsistence populations. Chapter IV, Environmental Consequences, provides much of the data on levels of reductions and limitations under each alternative, which was used to determine whether the action would cause a significant restriction to subsistence. The information contained in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is the primary data used in this analysis.

Section B below outlines evaluations and findings for each of the four alternatives discussed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A subsistence evaluation and findings under ANILCA sec. 810 must also include a cumulative impacts analysis. The most intensive cumulative case, as discussed in Chapter IV: Environmental Consequences, is evaluated in Section C of this analysis on page E-16.

This approach will help the reader to separate the subsistence restrictions that would potentially be caused by activities proposed under the four alternatives from those that would potentially be caused by the compounding of past, present, and future activities that could occur, or have already occurred, in the surrounding area.

B. ANILCA Sec. 810(a) Evaluations and Findings for All Alternatives

The following evaluations are based on information relating to the environmental and subsistence consequences of Alternatives A through D as presented in Chapter IV: Environmental Consequences of the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS and in the ROPs and Stips in Appendix C. Effects are also considered for the alternatives to which they apply. The evaluations and findings focus on potential impacts to the subsistence resources themselves, as well as access to the resources.

B.1 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative A

Alternative A of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is the No Action Alternative. Selection of this alternative would result in continued management of the lands within the planning area as specified in the 1980 Southcentral Management Framework Plan (MFP), as amended. In general under the No Action Alternative, most activities would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis, and few uses would be limited or excluded as long as they were consistent with State and Federal laws.

B.1.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs

Under Alternative A, all existing withdrawals would be maintained including withdrawals from selection and withdrawals from mineral entry. Current management would be considered adequate and sustainable to meet subsistence needs. For this reason, this alternative would have no effect on of the use, occupancy, or disposition of subsistence uses or needs based on management of *Lands and Realty* and *Leasable and Locatable Minerals.*

B.1.1.a Travel and Recreation Management

Travel and recreation management under the status quo would result in the continued unmanaged and unplanned proliferation of OHV use. Additional and poorly planned OHV trails would continue to compromise the effectiveness of habitat refugia for fish and wildlife by allowing easier and increased access to those areas. Furthermore, unlimited access and unrestricted use would cause further habitat degradation that affects fish, wildlife, and non-game resources. Protective measures would be reactive, initiated as conflicts are identified and as issues are brought forth by the public. Under a reactive approach, protective measures would tend to mitigate direct and immediate impacts to a limited extent, but there would probably be an overall decline in resource abundance over the long-term. All users, including subsistence and sport, would continue to have unrestricted access to subsistence areas and resources.

B.1.1.b Natural and Cultural Resources

Under Alternative A there are no areas designated for additional protection of natural or cultural resources. Current management practices are considered sustainable in regards to subsistence resources therefore there should be no noticeable adverse effects to subsistence resources based on a lack of natural and cultural resource determinations under the No Action Alternative.

B.1.1.c Vegetation Management

The goal of vegetation management under all alternatives is to maintain the key ecosystem components and vegetative structure within the natural range. This would be accomplished through fire management and other vegetation manipulation practices, including the extraction of resources where practical. Under the No Action Alternative, the Authorizing Officer (AO) would retain adequate discretion to sufficiently prevent any impacts to subsistence practices or resources. Therefore, vegetation management under the No Action Alternative is not likely to have any adverse effects on subsistence uses and needs.

B.1.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved

The Draft RMP/EIS considers all BLM managed lands located within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries, including selected lands. Conveyed lands, however, cannot be considered for management. Also, other Federal lands managed by the National Park Service and USDA Forest Service cannot be included. No other lands within the Field Office boundaries are available for meeting our multiple-use mandate.

B.1.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes

The only alternative that would eliminate the use of public lands needed for subsistence is to not allow or permit any activities that conflict with subsistence uses. However, such an alternative is not viable given the fact that the BLM manages public lands under FLPMA, which requires that the lands be managed for multiple-use. Changing FLPMA, and thus management of public lands, would require an act of Congress. Alternatives C and D reduce the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes.

B.1.4 Findings

Under Alternative A management would continue under the existing MFP of 1980. The effects evaluation of the No Action Alternative on subsistence presented in *Chapter IV*, *Impacts by Alternative*, *Issue 7: Subsistence/Social and Economic Conditions*, *Alternative A* considers the effects of management of travel, recreation, natural and cultural resources, lands and realty, vegetation, and leasable and locatable minerals. This evaluation concludes that the No Action Alternative would have a negligible effect on subsistence species and on access to subsistence resources, and that ROPs and Stips that would be developed on a case-by-case basis by the BLM for all activities would serve to minimize, to the extent possible, impacts to subsistence uses by the communities of the planning area. Therefore, the land use decisions under this alternative would not significantly restrict subsistence uses. This finding applies to all communities which have a customary and traditional use determination for the planning area.

B.2 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative B

Alternative B lays the groundwork for active management to facilitate resource development. Constraints to protect resource values, including subsistence, would tend to be implemented in specific areas in response to proposed actions as opposed to broad areas in special designations. With the exception of the segments designated as wild of the Gulkana and Delta National Wild and Scenic River corridors, all ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals would be revoked, as would PLO 5150 as amended by PLO 5151.

This would allow mineral and oil and gas exploration on over 97 percent of the planning area, pending State or Native conveyance. This would also allow the transportation and utility corridor to be conveyed to the State of Alaska. Travel and trail restrictions would be minimal. Recreation management would consist of building facilities to meet increasing demand.

B.2.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs

B.2.1.a Travel and Recreation Management

Travel management under Alternative B would result in the continued unmanaged and unplanned proliferation of OHV use. Additional and poorly planned OHV trails would continue to compromise the effectiveness of habitat refugia for fish and wildlife by allowing easier and increased access to those areas. Furthermore, unlimited access and unrestricted use would cause additional habitat degradation that affects fish, wildlife, and non-game resources. Mitigation would be reactive as problem areas are brought to the attention of the land manager.

Under Alternative B, recreation management would continue to be reactive. The ROPs outlined in Appendix C would minimize effects from permitted commercial activities. New road construction would be considered on a case-by-case basis with ROPs applied. Access for subsistence uses would not be affected as restrictions would not apply to federally-qualified users in pursuit of traditional activities.

B.2.1.b Natural and Cultural Resources

Under Alternative B, there would be no areas designated for additional protection of natural or cultural resource values. Current management practices are considered sustainable in regards to subsistence resources. Under Alternative B, ROPs that are designed to protect resources would apply to all permitted activities. These ROPs should give sufficient protection to the resource values that the area designations were proposed to protect. Therefore, there should be no noticeable adverse effects to subsistence resources based on natural and cultural resource determinations of Alternative B.

B.2.1.c Lands and Realty

Alternative B would revoke ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals and PLO 5150, a combination of which withdrew the transportation and utility corridor from the land base that was available for State selection and conveyance. If these withdrawals are lifted, underlying State land selections would thus become valid. Federal subsistence regulations only apply to unencumbered (non-selected) lands. Revocation of these withdrawals could have a significant impact on subsistence activities for communities having a customary and traditional use determination for Game Management Unit 13 in two ways.

First, it would significantly reduce the area that is open for Federal hunting purposes. Approximately 300,000 acres, representing 63 percent of the Federal hunting area in Unit 13, are within the transportation and utility corridor. Furthermore, the transportation and utility corridor is strategically located along the current migration route of the Nelchina Caribou Herd, such that in most years virtually 100 percent of the herd passes through the Federal hunting area. In a typical year, over 80 percent of the moose and caribou that are harvested under Federal regulations in Unit 13 are taken within the corridor.

Second, the transportation and utility corridor provides for a unique access situation to the Federal hunting areas. The corridor follows or overlaps the Richardson Highway for more than 75 road miles. This provides substantial access to the Federal hunting areas by means of highway vehicles. Also, there are three State Controlled Use Areas that overlap the corridor and the Federal hunting areas. OHV use within these Controlled Use Areas is restricted for hunting purposes. This creates an excellent opportunity for subsistence hunters without OHVs to participate in subsistence hunting without the disadvantage of having to compete with hunters with OHVs.

Outside the transportation and utility corridor, there are only 5.5 additional highway miles that provides access to the Federal hunting areas. These additional 5.5 miles are all on the Denali Highway, which is not maintained in the winter and therefore requires the use of OHVs for access during a significant part of the hunting seasons. The remainder of the Federal hunt areas can only be accessed by OHV, airplane, or boat year round.

If the transportation and utility corridor were to be eliminated from the Federal hunting area, it is likely that the hunters who hunt in that area would seek new hunting areas. This would create significant increased competition as hunters, especially in the few remaining easily accessible areas. This could lead to a localized depletion of resources. Furthermore, highly congested areas may be bypassed by migrating animals. Overall, Federal subsistence harvest of moose and caribou would likely go down, although it is difficult to predict by how much.

Revocation of ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals and PLO 5150 would significantly reduce the availability of game resources to Federal subsistence users, and would limit the access to the remaining areas.

B.2.1.d Vegetation Management

The goal of vegetation management under Alternative B is to maintain the key ecosystem components and vegetative structure within the natural range. This would be accomplished through fire management and other vegetation manipulation practices, including the extraction of resources where practical. Under Alternative B, the AO would retain adequate discretion to sufficiently prevent any impacts to

subsistence practices or resources. Vegetation management under Alternative B is not likely to have any adverse effects on subsistence management

B.2.1.e Leasable and Locatable Minerals

Alternative B would open up 97 percent of the land base to mineral extraction, including oil and gas development, pending State or Native conveyance. Specific impacts to fish and wildlife species and habitats are discussed in Chapter IV, and will only be summarized here as they pertain to subsistence use patterns.

ROPs would apply to all permitted activities that are designed to minimize effects to fish and wildlife and their habitats. The ROPs adequately protect fish habitat by prohibiting instream activities except under rare circumstances. Wildlife species, on the other hand, would be impacted due to loss of habitat. The location of mineral exploration and development activities would determine what impact there is to subsistence. If activities were located within key migration routes, animals may bypass Federal hunting areas for the duration of activities. If activities were located in winter range, calving grounds, or refugia, there could be a loss due to overall fitness. Roads and associated other infrastructure may allow increased exploitation of resources by non-subsistence users. Non-game subsistence resources may also be affected based on the placement of activities. Surface disturbing activities would remove that land from a resource production status (i.e., berries), although it is unlikely that this would be on a large enough scale to be significant.

In summary, anything that negatively affects fish and wildlife, or fish and wildlife habitat, will also have a negative effect on subsistence. Mineral exploration and development activities under Alternative B would have more impacts on subsistence wildlife species than any of the other alternatives. These impacts to subsistence resources and access would probably be localized and minimal. The ROPs should be adequate to ensure that significant restrictions to subsistence uses and needs would not occur.

B.2.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved

The Draft RMP/EIS considers all BLM managed lands located within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries, including selected lands. Conveyed lands, however, cannot be considered for management. Other Federal lands managed by the National Park Service and USDA Forest Service cannot be included. No other lands within the Field Office boundaries are available for meeting the BLM's multiple-use mandate.

B.2.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes

The only alternative that would eliminate the use of public lands needed for subsistence is to not allow or permit any activities that conflict with subsistence uses. However,

such an alternative is not viable given the fact that the BLM manages public lands under FLPMA, which requires that the lands be managed for multiple-use. Changing FLPMA, and thus management of public lands, would require another act of Congress.

Alternatives A, C, and D reduce the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes.

B.2.4 Findings

This evaluation considers the effects of management of travel, recreation, natural and cultural resources, lands and realty, vegetation, leasable and locatable minerals, and the effectiveness of the associated ROPs and Stips (Appendix C) as presented by the BLM. The analysis concludes that the effect of Alternative B to subsistence would be greater than that of any of the other alternatives, but effects would remain localized and would not significantly affect subsistence species or resources on a population scale. Adequate ROPs and Stips have been incorporated into Alternative B to ensure that significant reduction to subsistence species and resources is unlikely to occur.

However, actions taken under Alternative B would significantly affect access to subsistence resources and subsistence use patterns by the 26 communities that have a customary and traditional use determination for Unit 13. An issue in this evaluation is the revocation of the ANCSA (d)(1) and PLO 5150 withdrawals, which would reduce the BLM-managed Federal subsistence hunting areas by 63 percent. Furthermore, the remaining 37 percent of the existing BLM-managed Federal hunting areas would be accessible at only a few locations by highway vehicle. This reduced access could cause a shift in user patterns, resulting in increased competition and a decline in harvest. Alternative B is not considered likely to directly reduce key subsistence populations. Alternative B has the clear potential to significantly restrict subsistence uses, triggering the additional requirements of hearings and formal determinations for compliance with sec. 810.

B.3 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes active measures to protect and enhance resource values, which for the most part enhances subsistence opportunities. Production of minerals and services would be more constrained than in the other alternatives. Three Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, one Research Natural Area, and five Special Recreation Management Areas, would be designated with specific measures proposed to protect or enhance resources values. Travel and OHV management would be designated as “limited” or “closed” to protect resource values. Some ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals would be revoked, but not PLO 5150 which constitutes the transportation and utility corridor.

B.3.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs

B.3.1.a Travel and Recreation Management

Under Alternative C, recreation management would focus on maintaining the quality of existing experiences, and providing for a variety of motorized and non-motorized uses. In general, motorized transportation allows users to get farther faster. The result is that fish and wildlife are disturbed more often. This can result in adverse effects in a variety of ways, ranging from direct killing or catching to increased energy expenditure that reduces overall fitness. Recreation management under Alternative C is aggressive in halting the unmanaged proliferation of OHV trails and establishing visitor use limits. Although these measures do not apply to users engaged in traditional subsistence activities, they would benefit the subsistence resources by limiting the recreational pursuit of these resources.

B.3.1.b Natural and Cultural Resources

Under Alternative C, there would be four areas designated for additional protection of natural and cultural resource values. Three of the four areas were created for the protection of wildlife species, so it is anticipated that these additional protective measures would benefit subsistence species and resources. There should be no adverse effects to subsistence resources or access based on resource value determinations of Alternative C.

B.3.1.c Lands and Realty

Under Alternative C, most of the ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals would be retained, most notably the transportation and utility corridor. The net result is that no additional land selections can be validated. Since no additional land selections can be validated, lands that are currently open to Federal subsistence hunting would continue to be so. Therefore, lands and realty options under Alternative C would have no effect on subsistence uses or needs.

B.3.1.d Vegetation Management

The goal of vegetation management under Alternative C is to maintain the key ecosystem components and vegetative structure within the natural range. This would be accomplished through fire management and other vegetation manipulation practices, including the extraction of resources where practical. Under Alternative C, a combination of the ROPs and the discretion of the AO should sufficiently prevent any impacts to subsistence practices or resources. Vegetation management under Alternative C is not likely to have any adverse effects on subsistence management

B.3.1.e Leasable and Locatable Minerals

Alternative C would revoke some of the ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals and modify PLO 5150 to allow for metalliferous metals, which would open up 59 percent of the land base to mineral extraction, including oil and gas. Specific impacts to fish and wildlife species and habitats are discussed previously, and will only be summarized here as they pertain to subsistence use patterns.

ROPs that are designed to minimize effects to fish and wildlife and their habitats would apply to all activities. The ROPs adequately protect fish habitat by prohibiting instream activities except under rare circumstances. Wildlife species, on the other hand, would be impacted due to loss of habitat. The location of mineral exploration and development activities would determine what impact there is to subsistence. If activities were located within key migration routes, animals may bypass Federal hunting areas for the duration of activities. If activities were located in winter range, calving grounds, or refugia, there could be a loss due to overall fitness. Also, roads and associated other infrastructure may allow all resources (fish, wildlife, non-game resources) to be much more exploited by non-subsistence users. Non-game subsistence resources may also be affected based on the placement of activities. Surface disturbing activities would remove that land from a resource production status (i.e., berries), although it is unlikely that this would be on a large enough scale to be significant.

In summary, anything that negatively affects fish and wildlife, or fish and wildlife habitat will also have a negative effect on subsistence. Mineral exploration activities under Alternative C are minimal, but would still have impacts on subsistence wildlife species and habitat. These impacts to subsistence resources and access would probably be localized and minimal. The ROPs should be adequate to ensure that significant restrictions to subsistence uses and needs would not occur.

B.3.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved

The East Alaska Resource Management Plan considers all BLM managed lands located within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries, including selected lands. Conveyed lands, however, cannot be considered for management. Also, other Federal lands managed by the National Park Service and USDA Forest Service cannot be included. No other lands within the Field Office boundaries are available for meeting the BLM's multiple-use mandate.

B.3.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes

The only alternative that would reduce or eliminate the use of public lands needed for subsistence is to not allow or permit any activities that conflict with subsistence uses. However, such an alternative is not viable given the fact that the BLM manages public lands under FLPMA, which requires that the lands be managed for multiple-use. Changing FLPMA, and thus management of public lands, would require another act of Congress.

B.3.4 Findings

This evaluation considers the effects of management of travel, recreation, natural and cultural resources, lands and realty, vegetation, leasable and locatable minerals, and the effectiveness of the associated ROPs and Stipulations (Appendix C) as presented by the BLM. The analysis concludes that Alternative C would have a negligible effect on subsistence species, access to subsistence resources, or subsistence use, and that the effect would be less than that of any of the other Alternatives. The effect would be localized and would not significantly affect subsistence species or resources on a population scale. Adequate ROPs and Stipulations have been incorporated into Alternative C to ensure that significant reduction to subsistence species and resources is unlikely to occur. In sum, the land use actions authorized under Alternative C would not significantly restrict subsistence uses.

B.4 Evaluation and Findings for Alternative D (Proposed RMP)

Alternative D emphasizes a moderate and balanced level of protection, use, and enhancement of resources and services. Constraints to protect resources would be implemented, but would be less restrictive than under Alternative C. This alternative would designate one Research Natural Area and three Special Recreation Management Areas, with measures to protect certain resource values applied to the other geographical areas emphasized under Alternative C. This alternative would revoke many ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals, but would retain some in areas where strong resource protection is needed, including most portions of the transportation and utility corridor. This alternative represents the mix and variety of actions that in the opinion of the BLM, best resolve the issues and management concerns in consideration of all values and programs, and this is considered the BLM's Preferred Alternative.

B.4.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs

B.4.1.a Travel and Recreation Management

Under Alternative D, recreation management would focus on maintaining the quality of existing experiences, and providing for a variety of motorized and non-motorized uses. In general, motorized use allows users to get farther faster. The result is that fish and wildlife are disturbed more often. This can be negative in a variety of ways, ranging from direct killing or catching to increased energy expenditure that reduces overall fitness. Travel management under Alternative D is aggressive in halting the unmanaged proliferation of OHV trails and establishing visitor use limits on unencumbered BLM lands. BLM would focus on education on selected lands to promote ethical riding and raise awareness of the impacts of cross-country travel. Although these measures do not apply to users engaged in traditional subsistence activities, they would benefit the subsistence resources by limiting the recreational pursuit of these resources. In the short-term, there probably would be no impacts from Alternative D on subsistence uses, needs, and access. Over the long-term, however, as trails are inventoried and designated, Alternative D would likely have a beneficial effect on the abundance and distribution of subsistence resources.

B.4.1.b Natural and Cultural Resources

Under Alternative D, no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern are proposed, though one Research Natural Area is proposed. Additional protective measures would be implemented in order to protect resource values of the other areas identified under Alternative C. There should be no adverse effects to subsistence resources or access based on natural and cultural resource determinations of Alternative D.

B.4.1.c Lands and Realty

Under Alternative D, most of the ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals would be retained, most notably the transportation and utility corridor. However, PLO 5150 would be modified to allow for 83,000 acres to be conveyed to the State. These lands include the Gunn Creek segment which is northeast of Paxson, and approximately 59,000 acres north of Paxson and west of the Delta river (see Map 18, Chapter II). These areas represent approximately sixteen percent of the BLM-managed lands on which the Federal subsistence priority applies. However, these parcels have less access and less concentrated Federal subsistence hunting effort than other BLM-managed lands. The areas are off the highway and require access by foot, OHV, or snowmachine. Additionally, approximately 50 percent of the northern area, west of the Delta River, is mountainous, glaciated terrain, where no caribou or moose harvest occurs. Based on annual harvest data since 1994, the average annual federal subsistence harvest from these parcels for caribou is less than five percent of the total Federal subsistence harvest in the region. For moose, the average annual federal subsistence harvest from these parcels is approximately 10 percent. This would still leave a viable unit available for rural priority and federal harvest on

the remainder of the BLM-managed lands where the Federal subsistence priority is implemented.

B.4.1.d Vegetation Management

The goal of vegetation management under Alternative D is to maintain the key ecosystem components and vegetative structure within the natural range. This would be accomplished through fire management and other vegetation manipulation practices, including the extraction of resources where practical. Under Alternative D, a combination of the ROPs and the discretion of the AO should sufficiently prevent any impacts to subsistence practices or resources. Vegetation management under all alternatives is not likely to have any adverse effects on subsistence management

B.4.1.e Leasable and Locatable Minerals

Alternative D would revoke some of the ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals the effect being 80 percent of the land base would be open to mineral extraction, including oil and gas leasing, pending State or Native conveyance. This, however, would not effect most lands currently available for the federal subsistence hunt, as they are withdrawn, either by ANILCA-designated Wild and Scenic Rivers (Delta and Gulkana) or the transportation and utility corridor. PLO 5150, as amended by PLO, 5151, would mostly remain in place, as discussed above. Specific impacts to fish and wildlife species and habitats are discussed previously, and will only be summarized here as they pertain to subsistence use patterns.

ROPs that are designed to minimize effects to fish and wildlife and their habitats would apply to all permitted activities. The ROPs adequately protect fish habitat by prohibiting instream activities except under rare circumstances. Wildlife species, on the other hand, would be impacted due to loss of habitat. The location of activities would determine what impact there is to subsistence. If activities were located within key migration routes, animals may bypass Federal hunting areas for the duration of activities. If activities were located in winter range, calving grounds, or refugia, there could be a loss due to overall fitness. Also, roads and associated other infrastructure may allow all resources (fish, wildlife, non-game resources) to be much more exploited by non-subsistence users. Non-game subsistence resources may also be affected based on the placement of activities. Surface disturbing activities would remove that land from a resource production status (i.e., berries), although it is unlikely that this would be on a large enough scale to be significant.

In summary, anything that negatively affects fish and wildlife, or fish and wildlife habitat, would also have a negative effect on subsistence. Exact impacts are hard to predict because of unknown potential for mineral exploration and development. The likelihood of anything happening on a large scale during the life of this plan is generally considered to be small. Therefore, any impacts to subsistence resources and access would probably be localized and minimal. The ROPs and Stips

(Appendix C) should be adequate to ensure that significant restrictions to subsistence uses and needs would not occur.

B.4.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved

The East Alaska Resource Management Plan considers all BLM managed lands located within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries, including selected lands. Conveyed lands, however, cannot be considered for management. Also, other Federal lands managed by the National Park Service and USDA Forest Service cannot be included. No other lands within the Field Office boundaries are available for meeting the BLM's multiple-use mandate.

B.4.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes

The only alternative that would eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes would be an alternative that prohibited any activity that conflicted with subsistence use or subsistence users. However, the BLM operates under a multiple-use mandate as directed by FLPMA. This mandate prevents us from managing resources based on single resources, such as subsistence. Changing FLPMA, and thus management of public lands, would require another act of Congress.

Alternative C reduces the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes.

B.4.4 Findings

This evaluation considers the effects of management of travel, recreation, natural and cultural resources, lands and realty, vegetation, leasable and locatable minerals, and the effectiveness of the associated stipulations and ROPs and Stips as presented by the BLM. The analysis concludes that Alternative D (the Proposed RMP) would have a negligible effect on subsistence species, access to subsistence resources, or subsistence uses by the communities of that have a customary and traditional use determination for Units 13 and 6. The effect would be localized, of short duration, and would not significantly affect subsistence species or resources on a population scale. Adequate ROPs and Stips have been incorporated into Alternative D to ensure that significant reduction to subsistence species and resources is unlikely to occur. In sum, land uses under Alternative D would not significantly restrict subsistence uses.

C. Evaluation and Findings for the Cumulative Case

The goal of the cumulative analysis is to evaluate the incremental impact of the current action in conjunction with all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in or near the East Alaska planning area. The cumulative analysis considers in general activities that are likely to happen, and activities that were identified as being of great concern during scoping. The Cumulative Impacts are discussed in greater detail in Chapter IV: Environmental Impacts. Two reasonably foreseeable future activities were identified that may negatively impact subsistence uses when analyzed cumulatively. These are an increase in resource development on non-Federal land, and an increase in settlement on non-Federal lands.

C.1.1 Evaluation of the Effect of Such Use, Occupancy, or Disposition on Subsistence Uses and Needs

Assuming increased resource development and settlement on State and private lands (including Native corporation lands) in the planning area, adopting management described under Alternatives A or B could result in significant impacts to subsistence resources. Alternatives A and B make no attempt (except for limited areas) to manage OHV use. Continued unmanaged proliferation of OHV trails in the area would lead to increased competition for subsistence resources, additional disturbance to areas that serve as refugia for caribou and moose, and continued habitat degradation. This combined with a moderate increase in resource development with associated roads and infrastructure, particularly in the Denali Highway area, could cause critical habitat loss or displacement of some animals from traditional migration routes. Increased access to subsistence resources would be off-set by increased competition with recreationists and sport-hunters.

C.1.2 Evaluation of the Availability of Other Lands for the Purposes Sought to be Achieved

The East Alaska Resource Management Plan considers all BLM managed lands located within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries, including selected lands. Conveyed lands, however, cannot be considered for management. Also, other Federal lands managed by the National Park Service and USDA Forest Service cannot be included. No other lands within the Field Office boundaries are available for meeting the BLM's multiple-use mandate.

C.1.3 Evaluation of Other Alternatives that Would Reduce or Eliminate the Use, Occupancy, or Disposition of Public Lands Needed for Subsistence Purposes

The only alternative that would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes would be an alternative that prohibited any activity that conflicted with subsistence use or subsistence users. However, the

BLM operates under a multiple-use mandate as directed by FLPMA. This mandate prevents us from managing resources based on single resources, such as subsistence. Changing FLPMA, and thus management of public lands, would require another act of Congress.

C.1.4 Findings

The cumulative case, as presented in this analysis, would result in a reasonably foreseeable and significant restriction of subsistence use for the communities which have a customary and traditional use determination for Unit 13. This requires a positive finding, and additional compliance, including hearings and formal determinations as required in ANILCA sec. 810. This restriction would be due to an alteration in the distribution of resources, a decrease in abundance, and an increase in competition from non-subsistence users.

Although procedures will be in place to ensure that future development affects access as little as possible, it is still probable the total area available for subsistence purposes will be reduced. Infrastructure associated with resource development located in core caribou and moose habitat areas would result in the displacement, and possible reduction, of the population. Population growth would result in a greater number of residents relying on local resources to meet their needs. In addition, construction of roads for resource extraction and settlement would allow access to the area, thus causing an increase in competition for subsistence resources by sport hunters.

D. Notice and Hearings

ANILCA sec. 810(a) provides that no "withdrawal, reservation, lease, permit, or other use, occupancy or disposition of the public lands which would significantly restrict subsistence uses shall be effected" until the Federal agency gives the required notice and holds a hearing in accordance with ANILCA sec. 810(a)(1) and (2). The BLM provided notice in the Federal Register that it made positive findings pursuant to ANILCA sec. 810 that Alternative B and the Cumulative Case as presented in the East Alaska Draft RMP/EIS met the "may significantly restrict" threshold. As a result, public hearings were held in the potentially affected communities. Notice of these hearings were provided in the Federal Register and by way of the local media.

On April 29, 2005 a Notice of Availability for the East Alaska Draft RMP/EIS was published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency (Federal Register 2005.) This began a 90 day comment period on the Draft. From May 16th through May 26th BLM held public meetings in Chistochina, Glennallen, Valdez, Cordova, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Delta Junction with attendance of 134 stakeholders.

The main purpose for the public hearings was to gather testimony on the impacts to subsistence by alternatives presented in the Draft. Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS proposed the revocation of Public Land Order 5150 which makes up the transportation

and utility corridor that houses the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. This action, as identified by this ANICLA section 810 Analysis, would significantly restrict subsistence uses and therefore required that subsistence hearings be held in the area affected by the proposed action.

Seven subsistence hearings were held and spoken testimony heard from village elders, Ahtna Inc., rural Alaskan residents, and the youth of the community as to the impacts revocation of PLO 5150 would have on their subsistence lifestyle. BLM also hosted a special session of the Southcentral Federal Regional Subsistence Advisory Council to allow the council to hear testimony on the revocation of PLO 5150 and submit a formal comment.

E. Subsistence Determinations Under ANILCA Sec. 810(a)(3)(A), (B), and (C)

ANILCA sec. 810(a) provides that no "withdrawal, reservation, lease, permit, or other use, occupancy or disposition of the public lands which would significantly restrict subsistence uses shall be effected" until the Federal agency gives the required notice and holds a hearing in accordance with ANILCA sec. 810(a)(1) and (2), and makes the three determinations required by ANILCA sec. 810(a)(3)(A), (B), and (C). The three determinations that must be made are: 1) that such a significant restriction of subsistence use is necessary, consistent with sound management principles for the utilization of the public lands; 2) that the proposed activity will involve the minimal amount of public lands necessary to accomplish the purposes of such use, occupancy, or other such disposition; and 3) that reasonable steps will be taken to minimize adverse impacts to subsistence uses and resources resulting from such actions (16 U.S.C. sec. 3120(a)(3)(A), (B), and (C)).

The BLM has found in this subsistence evaluation that Alternative B and the cumulative case considered in this Proposed RMP/Final EIS are likely to significantly restrict subsistence uses. Therefore, the BLM has undertaken the notice and hearing procedures required by ANILCA sec. 810 (a)(1) and (2) in conjunction with release of the East Alaska Draft RMP/EIS in order to solicit public comment from the potentially affected communities and subsistence users.

Public comment gathered as testimony from the hearings supported BLM's findings for Alternative B. The public clearly expressed that the actions proposed in Alternative B would significantly restrict access to subsistence resources available through the federally managed subsistence moose and caribou hunts. They also clearly expressed the concern that, even though State Tier II subsistence permits would be available for Unit 13, they have been traditionally very difficult to get, particularly for younger residents of the area.

Based on public comment and this ANILCA 810 analysis, the BLM has identified Alternative D as the Proposed RMP and it has been analyzed as such in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and in this 810 analysis. Analysis, as described on

pp. E-13 - E-16 and Chapter IV of the FEIS, concludes that Alternative D would have a negligible effect on subsistence species, access to subsistence resources, or subsistence uses by the communities that have a customary and traditional use determination for Units 13 and 6. The effect would be localized, of short duration, and would not significantly affect subsistence species or resources on a population scale. Adequate ROPs and Stips have been incorporated into Alternative D to ensure that significant reduction to subsistence species and resources is unlikely to occur.

Under Alternative D, most of PLO 5150 would be retained, thus maintaining most of the pipeline/utility corridor in federal ownership. However, PLO 5150 would be modified to allow for 83,000 acres to be conveyed to the State. These lands include the Gunn Creek segment which is northeast of Paxson, and approximately 59,000 acres north of Paxson and west of the Delta river (see Map 18 Chapter 2). These areas represent approximately sixteen percent of the BLM-managed lands on which the Federal subsistence priority applies. However, these parcels have less access and less concentrated Federal subsistence hunting effort than other BLM-managed lands. The areas are off the highway and require access by foot, OHV, or snowmachine. Additionally, approximately 50 percent of the northern area, west of the Delta River, is mountainous, glaciated terrain, where no caribou or moose harvest occurs. Based on annual harvest data since 1994, the average annual federal subsistence harvest from these parcels for caribou is less than five percent of the total Federal subsistence harvest in the region. For moose, the average annual federal subsistence harvest from these parcels is approximately 10 percent. This would still leave a viable unit available for rural priority and federal harvest on the remainder of the BLM-managed lands where the Federal subsistence priority is implemented.

BLM does not consider the modification of PLO 5150 to allow these parcels to be conveyed to the State an action that would substantially limit access by subsistence users to resources. This determination is based on the following factors:

- Low annual harvest relative to other portions of the federal area, as explained above.
- Inaccessibility of the parcels described above that would be conveyed to the State. It was clearly expressed in public testimony that rural residents in the area depend on an easily accessible federal subsistence area to rely on when a State Tier II permit is not available. The federal lands that would be retained under the Proposed RMP (Alternative D) will maintain that accessibility and opportunity for caribou and moose harvest. The Proposed RMP retains all lands adjacent to the Richardson highway that are currently available in the federal subsistence unit.
- The Delta River corridor will still be available for federal subsistence hunting, as well as some lands adjacent to the corridor on the west side of the Delta River. Most moose harvest within the Delta drainage occurs on lands within the corridor or closely adjacent to it. These lands would be retained.

In sum, land uses under Alternative D would not significantly restrict subsistence uses.

Because the Proposed RMP (Alternative D) would not significantly restrict subsistence uses, no determination under ANILCA 810(a)(3)(A), (B), and (C) is necessary.

Appendix F: Public Involvement Opportunities

APPENDIX F: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

2003

February 17	Public Meeting, Scoping, Chitna #1
February 19	Public Meeting, Scoping, Gakona #1
February 24	Public Meeting, Scoping, Chistochina #1
February 26	Public Meeting, Scoping, Paxson #1
February 27	Public Meeting, Scoping, Copper Center #1
March 2	Government-to-government Meeting, Ahtna Native Corporation
March 3	Public Meeting, Scoping, Slana #1
March 5	Public Meeting, Scoping, Mendeltna #1
March 9	Government-to-government Meeting, Gulkana Village Council
March 12	Public Meeting, Scoping, Glennallen #1
March 17	Public Meeting, Scoping, Fairbanks #1
March 18	Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS Published in Federal Register
March 19	Public Meeting, Scoping, Kenny Lake #1
March 31	Government-to-government Meeting, Ahtna Native Corporation
April 1	Public Meeting, Scoping, Paxson #2
April 2	Public Meeting, Scoping, Tazlina #1
April 2	Government-to-government Meeting, Native Village of Tazlina
April 3	Public Meeting, Scoping, Copper Center #2
April 8	Public Meeting, Scoping, Anchorage
April 9	Public Meeting, Scoping, Gulkana #1
April 10	Public Meeting, Scoping, Gakona #2
April 16	Public Meeting, Scoping, Kenny Lake #2
April 21	Public Meeting, Scoping, Valdez #1
April 23	Public Meeting, Scoping, Chitna #2
April 24	Public Meeting, Scoping, Glennallen #2
April 28	Public Meeting, Scoping, Cantwell #1
May 1	Public Meeting, Scoping, Gulkana #2
May 5	Public Meeting, Scoping, Slana #2
May 7	Public Meeting, Scoping, Tazlina #2
May 8	Public Meeting, Scoping, Mendeltna #2
May 9	Secession Village Organization Meeting, Gulkana Village
May 12	Public Meeting, Scoping, Cordova
May 13	Government-to-government Meeting, Native Village of Eyak
May 14	Public Meeting, Scoping, Delta Junction
May 23	Government-to-government Meeting, Gakona Village Council

September	Copper River Runner - Article
October 14	Update #1 (Newsletter)
November 5	Meeting with Alaska environmental groups (Copper Country Alliance, Alaska Coalition, and Alaska Center for the Environment)
December	Copper River Runner – Article

2004

April 1	Update #2 (Newsletter)
April 29	Public Meeting, Cordova
April 29	Government-to-government Meeting, Forest Service, Chugach, Cordova Ranger District
April 29	Government-to-government Meeting, Native Village of Eyak
April 30	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Yakutat
May 1	Update #3 (Newsletter)
May 4	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Gulkana
May 5	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Chistochina
May 6	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Paxson
May 10	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Valdez
May 11	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Delta Junction
May 12	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Fairbanks
May 13	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Cantwell
May 20	Government-to-government Meeting, Chickaloon Village Traditional Council
May 20	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Mendeltna
May 24	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Kenny Lake
May 25	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Glennallen
May 26	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Slana
May 27	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Chitna
June 1	Government-to-government Meeting, Matanuska-Susitna Borough
June 1	Public Meeting, OHV Resource Advisory Council
June 1	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Palmer
June 2	Public Meeting, Alternatives, Anchorage
August	Copper River Runner - Article
October 13	Briefing Meeting, Alaska Miners Association
October 14	Government-to-government Meeting, State of Alaska
October 21	Government-to-government Meeting, State of Alaska
October 28	Government-to-government Meeting, Ahtna Native Corporation
November	Update #4 (Newsletter)
November 17	Briefing Meeting, Alaska Outdoor Council, Fairbanks
December 1	Briefing Meeting, Alaska Outdoor Council, Palmer
December 1	Government-to-government Meeting, Matanuska-Susitna Borough

2005

January 18	Briefing Meeting, Alaska Coalition
January 18	Briefing Meeting, Alaska Outdoor Access Alliance
February	Update #5 (Newsletter)
May 16	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Chistochina
May 16	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Glennallen
May 19	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Valdez
May 23	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Cordova
May 24	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Anchorage
May 25	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Fairbanks
May 26	Public Meeting, Subsistence Hearing, Draft, Delta Junction
July 27	Southcentral Regional Subsistence Advisory Council Meeting
October 13	Briefing Meeting, Valley Hikers and Bikers Association

2006

January	Update #6 (Newsletter)

Appendix G: Laws, Regulations, and Policies

APPENDIX G: LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES

The following list of laws, regulations, and policies provides an overview of the direction guiding management of BLM lands in Alaska. It is not meant to be a comprehensive list.

Act of July 26, 1866, also known as the Lode Act (14 Stat. 251)
Act of May 14, 1898 (16 U.S.C. 615a, sec. 11)
Act of May 24, 1928, as amended (49 U.S.C. App. 211-213)
Airborne Hunting Act
Airport and Airway Improvement Act of September 3, 1982
Alaska Forest Resources and Practices Act
Alaska Forest Resources and Practices Regulations - Alaska Water Quality Standards
Alaska Land Status Technical Corrections Act of 1992
Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.)
Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of December 18, 1971, (85 Stat. 688; 43 U.S.C. 1601).
Alaska Railroad Transfer Act of 1982, Title VI of P.L. 97-468 (96 Stat. 2556)
Alaska State Statute 16.05.870(a)
Alaska Statehood Act of July 7, 1958, P.L. 85-508 (72 Stat. 339)
Alien Species Prevention Enforcement Act of 1992 (39 U.S.C. 3015)
American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1996)
Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines
Annual Appropriation Act of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies
Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.)
Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470(a), 470(cc), and 470(ee)
Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.)

Bald Eagle Protection Act of 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668-668(d))

Carlson-Foley Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1241-1243)
Classification and Multiple-Use Act (78 Stat. 986, U.S.C. 1411-18), 43 CFR 1725.3-3(h) as of October 1, 1981
Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857)
Clean Air Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 7401, 7418, 7642)
Clean Water Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1251)
Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act
Coastal Zone Management Act

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (P.L. 104-134)
Disaster Relief Act of May 22, 1974 (88 Stat. 143; 42 U.S.C. 5121)

Eagle Protection Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-884; 76 Stat. 1346)
Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U.S.C. 686)
Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-645)
Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.)
Energy Policy Act of 1992
Executive Order 11288, July 1966
Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, March 5, 1970 (35 FR 4247)
Executive Order 11525, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality
Executive Order 11593 of May 13, 1971, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (36 FR 8921)
Executive Order 11644, Use of Off-road Vehicles on Public Lands, February 8, 1972 (37 FR 2877)
Executive Order 11738, September 10, 1973
Executive Order 11752, December 17, 1973
Executive Order 11752, December 19, 1973
Executive Order 11987, Exotic Organisms, May 24, 1977 (42 FR 26949)
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, May 24, 1977 (42 FR 26951)
Executive Order 11989, Off-road Vehicles, May 24, 1977 (42 FR 26959
Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, May 25, 1977 (42 FR 26961)
Executive Order 12962, Recreational Fisheries, June 7, 1995 (60 FR 30769)
Executive Order 13007, Providing for American Indian and Alaska Native Religious Freedom and Sacred Land Protections, May 24, 1996 (61 FR 26771)
Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species, February 3, 1999 (64 FR 6183)
Executive Order 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, January 10, 2001 (66 FR 3853)
Executive Order 13195, Trails for America in the 21st Century, January 18, 2001 (66 FR 7391)

Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2901-2911)
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 (23 U.S.C. 207-209)
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 (23 U.S.C. 214)
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 (23 U.S.C. 116)
Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 (23 U.S.C. 217)
Federal Coal Leasing Amendments Act of 1976
Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)
Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701)
Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987 (30 U.S.C. 226, et seq.)
Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 (7 U.S.C. 2814)
Federal Plant Pest Act of 1957 (7 U.S.C. 150(aa) 150(jj))
Federal Seed Act of 1939 (7 U.S.C. 1551, 1611)
Federal Waterpower Act of 1920 (16 U.S.C. 818)

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)

General Mining Law of 1872 (30 U.S.C. 22, et seq.)
Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001)

Highway Safety Act of 1966 (23 U.S.C. 401-403)
Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461)

Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460 et seq.)

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (1996)
Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972
Materials Act of 1947 (30 U.S.C. 601-604 et seq.)
Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929 (16 U.S.C. 715) and treaties pertaining thereto
Migratory Bird Treaty Act
Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of 1947 (30 U.S.C. 351-359)
Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 181, et seq.)
Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, (30 U.S.C. 21(a)) (30 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)
Multiple Surface Use Act of July 23, 1955 P.L. 67 (69 Stat. 367)
Multiple Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470)
National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1242-1243)
National Park Services Acts (67 Stat. 495; 16 U.S.C. l(b)).
National Trails System Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. 1241-1249)
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 U.S.C. 3001)
North American Wetlands Conservation Act

O. and C. Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181(e))
Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 147(a))

Protection Act of September 20, 1922 (16 U.S.C. 594)
Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 1901-1908)

Reciprocal Fire Protection Act of May 27, 1955 (42 U.S.C. 1856)
Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act of 1926 (43 U.S.C. 869)
Recreation Fee Demonstration Project (P.L. 104-134, HR3019, sec. 315)
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 (29 U.S.C 791)
Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960 (16 U.S.C. 469), as amended by the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974

Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 201)
Sikes Act (or the Act of September 15, 1960) (16 U.S.C. 670 et seq.)
Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2001)
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1935 (P.L. 74-46)

Soil Information Assistance for Community Planning and Resource Development Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 3271 et seq.)
Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.)
Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (P.L. 94-424, sec. 126(d)).

Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315), as amended by the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181(d))
Timber Access Road Act of 1955 (P.L. 84-171)
Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations

Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (49 FR 31528)
Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Act of January 2, 1971 (P.L. 91-646; 84 Stat. 1894)

Water Quality Act of 1987, as amended from the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1977 (33 U.S.C. 1251)
Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act of 1954, August 4, 1954
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.)

Appendix H: Benefits Based Recreation Planning

Appendix H: Benefits Based Recreation Planning H-3
A. Background H-3
B. Incorporation into this Planning Process H-3
C. Benefit Based Planning Tables and Maps H-4
1. Delta River Special Recreation Management Area H-5
2. Denali Special Recreation Management Area H-10
3. Gulkana Special Recreation Management Area H-16
4. Tiekel Special Recreation Management Area H-22

APPENDIX H: BENEFITS BASED RECREATION PLANNING

The Revised Land Use Planning Handbook, in effect since February of 2005, calls for the inclusion of Benefits Based Recreation Planning principles as part of all land use plans. This Appendix will bring this RMP into compliance with the new Land Use Planning Standards by supplementing the recreation management actions prescribed under the Proposed Plan, Alternative D. No new management is presented beyond what has already been identified and analyzed within the scope of the Draft RMP/EIS document.

A. Background

Traditionally, recreation managers have focused on developing and maintaining facilities, providing programs and services, and implementing management controls. They are there to manage the recreational resources and their users gain certain benefits or outcomes from those experiences disconnected from the planning process that has taken place.

Benefits Based Planning asks managers to invert the equation and first identify what experiences, benefits, and outcomes recreationists look for in a certain area. What makes a particular place or activity more appealing to someone seeking solitude and a feeling of risk-taking than someone taking comfort in the closeness of others and the bonding of the family unit? After these values are identified, managers should plan their program development and implementation to enhance or maintain those sought after outcomes and the characters of recreation settings that foster them.

B. Incorporation into this Planning Process

The East Alaska Draft RMP/EIS identified several Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) within the range of alternatives. These areas are known for their unique recreational qualities. To apply the Benefits Based Model, recreation managers identified Recreation Management Zones within each SRMA. Each RMZ has four defining characteristics:

1. serves a different recreation niche
2. produces a different set of recreation opportunities and facilitates the attainment of different experience and benefit outcomes
3. has distinctive recreation setting character
4. requires a different set of recreation provider actions to meet the strategically-targeted primary market demand. (BLM, 2005b)

For each RMZ, activities, experiences, and benefits are identified. Recreation managers use these baseline lists of activities, experiences, and benefits to manage recreational opportunities.

The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Classes, described in Chapter III on page 201 were considered when delineating distinct RMZ. These classes, by their definition, describe the recreation setting character of an area thus identifying changes in the recreation opportunity or setting that is experienced. As an area moves along the spectrum, from the primitive areas offering isolation and challenge to the urban areas with a high degree of alteration from the natural state and more facility-dependent experiences, the recreation opportunities change as well as the benefits derived from those opportunities.

Implementation-level planning will take place for each SRMA and will include management actions, marketing, monitoring, and administrative support actions for each SRMA as a whole and then refined actions to maintain the desired characteristics of each RMZ. Benefits outlined in the tables below, as well as focus groups, public input, and coordination with the communities and governments affected during the implementation-level planning, will produce a recreation management scheme that can enhance the desired benefits and outcomes while providing the infrastructure for sustainable tourism and recreation.

C. Benefit Based Planning Tables and Maps

Information is not presented for the Delta Range SRMA because recreation managers did not feel that would accurately portray the information without further study of the recreation users of the area.

1. Delta River Special Recreation Management Area

Table 57. Recreation Benefits Based Planning – Delta River SRMA

Primary Market Strategy	Primary Market
Destination	Alaska Residents
Tourism Market Product	
The Delta River SRMA includes the Delta National Wild and Scenic River which consists of the upper stretch of the Delta River, all of the Tangle Lakes, and the Tangle River. This SRMA is located and can be accessed approximately 21.5 miles west of the Richardson Highway on the Denali Highway. The Delta River watershed is located in the Alaska Range in south-central Alaska. The watershed drains an area of about 150,000 acres and contains a network of 160 miles of streams and 21 lakes. The Delta flows through the Alaska Range and joins the Tanana River, which flows into the Yukon River. The Delta River is recognized for its outstanding scenery, natural and cultural values, and exceptionally clean waters. One can expect a true Alaskan wilderness experience floating through class I-IV rapids with sightings of wildlife and exceptional fishing opportunities for grayling. Most visitors float the river by canoe or small inflatable raft. The Tangle Lakes are popular for motorized and non-motorized boating and a multitude of other recreational activities. Tangle Lakes campground and wayside provide RV and tent sites, vault toilets and boat ramps.	

Map 54. Delta River SRMA – Recreation Management Zones

File size: 100 KB
File name: 54_deltarmz.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

a) Recreation Management Zones (RMZ)

Table 58. Delta River RMZ 1 – Tangle Lakes Developed

Niche		
Public and private developed facilities that provide education as well as amenities to users and allows for easy access to lakes and rivers.		
Management Objectives		
To provide quality services and educational information to the public who are visiting and utilizing the local recreational resources including pass through travelers using the Denali Highway. By the year 2015, 75% of users surveyed will reply to BLM that this management objective has been achieved.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• camping • fishing • hiking • berry picking • boating • photography • dining • hunting • OHV use • Picnicking • wildlife viewing • learning • comfort stops • swimming	• enjoying the closeness of family • appreciating personal interactions with visitors • enjoying having a wide variety of environments within the single area • having others nearby who could help you if needed • enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes • enjoying group affiliation with groups and togetherness • enjoying participating in group outdoor events • developing skills and abilities • enjoying meeting new people with similar interests • escaping social pressures • teaching others about the outdoors	• stronger ties with family and friends • increased local economic stability • increased local tourism revenue • greater family bonding • improved skills for outdoor enjoyment with others • freedom from urban living • stress reduction • increased tolerance for multi uses of a resource • increased appreciation of an area's cultural history

Table 59. Delta River RMZ 2 - Tangle Lakes Dispersed

Niche
A semi-primitive experience providing access to the Delta River, Upper and Lower Tangle Lakes, and surrounding BLM managed lands.
Management Objectives
To protect and enhance the qualities of a semi primitive experience resulting in a user satisfaction of 80% of users as determined by a survey conducted in the year 2015.

Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• camping • fishing • hiking • berry picking • boating • photography • hunting • wildlife viewing • cultural and geological viewing • swimming	• feeling good about solitude • enjoying the artistic expression of nature • getting some exercise • sense of exploration • sensory experiences of a landscape • interacting with people • enjoying an escape from crowds of people • savoring a natural experience • a feeling of accomplishment • risk taking • developing your skills and abilities	• improved skills for outdoor enjoyment • enhanced awareness and understanding of nature • deeper sense of personal humility • greater respect for cultural heritage • freedom from urban living • improved physical fitness and mental health • enhanced lifestyle • reduced looting and vandalism of historic and prehistoric sites • reduced negative human impacts such as litter, trampling of vegetation and unplanned trails

Table 60. Delta River RMZ 3 - Delta River Primitive

Niche		
A primitive, non-motorized experience characterized by solitude along the Delta River and surrounding BLM managed lands		
Management Objectives		
To protect and enhance the values, qualities and characteristics of a primitive landscape that provides for a quality experience for visitor resulting in a user satisfaction of 90% as determined by survey.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• non-motorized boating • camping • fishing • hiking • berry picking • photography • hunting • wildlife viewing • cultural and geological viewing • swimming	• risk taking • solitude • testing your endurance • gaining a greater sense of self confidence • savoring the natural landscape • reflecting on ones own character and personal values • bringing back pleasant memories • enjoying the artistic expression of nature • being close to nature • strenuous physical exercise • knowing that things are not going to change too much • conservation of sustainable ecosystems	• improved mental and physical well being • enhanced sense of personal freedom • greater self reliance • improved skills for outdoor enjoyment • enlarged sense of personal accountability for acting responsibility on public lands • closer relationship with the natural world • getting away from society and family • reduced wildlife harassment and disturbance

Table 61. Delta River RMZ 5 - Delta River Semi-primitive Motorized

Niche		
Providing for multiple use recreational activities in a semi-primitive setting associated with the Delta River and adjoining trails.		
Management Objectives		
To maintain the semi-primitive, multiple use experience while preventing further resource degradation that provides a quality experience for visitors resulting in user satisfaction rating of 80% determined by a survey conducted in 2015.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• boating • camping • fishing • hiking • berry picking photography • hunting • wildlife viewing • geological viewing • off-highway vehicle use	• risk taking • learning outdoor skills • enjoying nature • talking about equipment and gear • getting needed physical exercise • escaping responsibility for awhile • getting needed • being able to tell others about the trip • bringing back pleasant memories • family togetherness • greater sense of independence	• local economic support • greater understanding of technology and mechanics • diminished mental anxiety • improved self confidence • greater community valuation of its ethnic diversity • improved opportunity to view wildlife close up • greater tolerance of multiple uses of landscape

2. Denali Special Recreation Management Area

Table 62. Recreation Benefits Based Planning – Denali SRMA

Primary Market Strategy	Primary Market
Undeveloped destination	Alaska residents
Tourism Market Product	
The Denali SRMA is like taking a step into Alaska's past. The vast scenes are dominated by the Alaska Range which shapes this rugged mountain topography. This area was inhabited by prehistoric peoples beginning 10,000 years ago and not much has changed since. The Denali SRMA is accessed by the Denali Highway which is 135 miles long between Paxson and Cantwell. The first 21 miles of the highway from Paxson to Tangle Lakes Campground is paved and the remaining 114 from Tangle Lakes to Cantwell is gravel. This slow paced meandering back country drive offers spectacular breath-taking views of mountains and huge river valleys that were carved out by effects of glaciation and ice sheets. The highway also serves as a link between Wrangell – St. Elias and Denali National Parks. A wide range of recreation opportunities exist that include motorized and non-motorized activities within the 5 established zones. Within each zone, tourists can expect to experience different activities and benefits based upon the recreation opportunities provided therein.	

Map 55. Denali Highway SRMA – Recreation Management Zones

File size: 136 KB
File name: 55_denalirmz.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

a) Denali Recreation Management Zones (RMZs)

Table 63. Denali Highway RMZ 1 – Developed Facilities

Niche		
Developed facilities providing education and amenities to highway visitors.		
Management Objectives		
To provide services, information and education for the public using the highway for recreational opportunities and for pass through travelers.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• camping • picnicking • fishing • comfort stop • hiking • photography • art • birding • staging • gasoline facilities • renting a cabin • restaurant dining	• family togetherness • enjoying artistic expression of nature • personal mental relaxation • stronger ties with family and friends • living a slower paced life • escape physical pressures	• restores mental well being • improves relationship with family • greater freedom from urban living • restored body from fatigue • reduce negative human impacts such as litter vegetative trampling, and unplanned trails

Table 64. Denali Highway RMZ 2 - Paved portion of the highway

Niche		
Scenic views of the caliber of the Denali Highway while providing the comfort and security of a paved road surface.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will continue providing the same level of scenic viewing and educational opportunities while promoting viewshed protection. By 2015, 90% of users surveyed will reply to BLM that this management objective has been achieved.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• driving for pleasure • wildlife viewing • scenic viewing • photography • dispersed camping • interpretation education • picnicking • bicycling	• learning about the environment • family togetherness • enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes • enjoying an escape from crowds of people • contemplating man's relationship with the land • feeling good about solitude • experiencing a different lifestyle	• economic benefits to surrounding businesses • sense of adventure • personal growth • stronger ties with family and friends

Table 65. Denali Highway RMZ 3 - Non-paved portion of the highway

Niche		
Slower paced and more in depth experience of the diversity of scenic landscapes along the Denali Highway.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will continue to maintain the current slow paced, backcountry experience while identifying and providing appropriate access points for off highway recreational opportunities. By 2015, 80% of users surveyed will reply to BLM that this management objective has been achieved.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• driving for pleasure • wildlife viewing • scenic viewing • photography • dispersed camping • interpretation education • picnicking • fishing • hunting • bicycling • berry picking • walking • snowmachineing • dog mushing • skijouring • off-highway vehicle use	• learning about the environment • family togetherness • enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes • enjoying an escape from crowds of people • contemplating man's relationship with the land • feeling good about solitude • experiencing a different lifestyle • talking with others about equipment • risk-taking • gaining greater sense of self confidence and self reliance • having a greater understanding about what will happen while I am here • encouraging visitors to help safeguard our lifestyle, quality of life and natural resources • sharing our cultural heritage with visitors.	• economic benefits to surrounding businesses • sense of adventure • personal growth • stronger ties with family and friends • greater self reliance • greater cultivation of natural resource ethic • improved understanding of gear and equipment • greater freedom from urban living • enlarged sense of dependency on public lands • feeling less stressed • feeling of accomplishment

Table 66. Denali Highway RMZ 4 - Semi-primitive motorized

Niche		
Large expanses of land set aside for dispersed multiple use containing designated trails and rivers for motorized use.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will mange and enhance these lands in a manner that provides a diversity of quality experiences while balancing these activities with the protection of the natural resources. By 2015		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• hiking • backpacking • berry picking • wildlife viewing • photography • hunting • fishing • trapping • snowshoeing • cross country skiing • dog mushing • mountain biking • mountaineering • sightseeing • horseback riding • camping • off-highway vehicle use • snowmachining • motorized and non-motorized boating • commercial recreation opportunities • flightseeing • helicopter supported activities	• thrill of motorized power • escaping everyday responsibilities • enjoying easy access to landscapes • testing your endurance • enjoying being to be able to be more contemplative • feeling good about solitude and quiet • experiencing a greater sense of independence • knowing that things are not going to change too much • risk taking • testing your endurance, nurturing values and growth • living a slower pace of life • self reliance • talking about equipment	• getting to backcountry faster • improved physical and physiological health • developing skills • natural resource stewardship ethics • greater awareness of a special place • greater freedom from urban life • reducing stress • feeling of accomplishment • greater opportunity for people with different skills to recreate in the same place • large sense for personal accountability for acting responsibly on public land • greater opportunity for a wide variety of recreational experiences for the family unit

Table 67. Denali Highway RMZ 5 - Semi-primitive non-motorized

Niche		
Areas set aside for easy access to land and water based quiet, non-motorized recreational opportunities.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will protect and enhance specified areas to ensure their quiet qualities are maintained and to provide a semi- primitive to primitive experience. By 2015, 80% of users surveyed will reply to BLM that this management objective has been achieved.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• hiking • backpacking • non-motorized boating • berry picking • wildlife viewing • photography • hunting • fishing • trapping • snowshoeing • cross country skiing • dog mushing • mountain biking • mountaineering • sightseeing • horseback riding • camping	• enjoying being to be able to be more contemplative • feeling good about solitude and quiet • being near more considerate people • experiencing a greater sense of independence • knowing that things are not going to change too much • risk taking • testing your endurance • nurturing values and growth • living a slower pace of life • self reliance • talking about equipment	• improved physical and physiological health • developing skills • natural resource stewardship ethics • greater awareness of a special place • greater freedom from urban life • reducing stress • feeling of accomplishment • reduced impact to natural resources

3. Gulkana Special Recreation Management Area

Table 68. Recreation Benefits Based Planning – Gulkana SRMA

Primary Market Strategy	Primary Market
Undeveloped	Alaska residents
Tourism Market Product	
The Gulkana SRMA is situated in east central Alaska and east of the Richardson Highway between Paxson and Glennallen. This SRMA includes the nationally designated Gulkana National Wild River that is divided into four recreation management zones. These four zones are uniquely different as they provide a different twist to riparian recreation opportunities. The Upper River and Middle/West Fork zones offer a non-motorized wilderness experience and are popular for river rafting and canoeing because they offer class I-IV rapids and numerous primitive campsites. The Lower West Fork and Sourdough zones are popular for motorized boating experiences and offer semi-primitive, motorized accessible camping opportunities. The Gulkana River is well known for its runs of Chinook (king) and Sockeye (red) salmon which provide excellent fishing opportunities during the summer months. In addition, arctic grayling and rainbow trout are plentiful and much sought after. Wildlife is abundant throughout the length of the river with frequent sightings of bald eagles and moose.	

Map 56. Gulkana River SRMA – Recreation Management Zones

File size: 74 KB
File name: 56_gulkanarmz.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

a) Recreation Management Zones (RMZ)

Table 69. Gulkana RMZ 1 – Upper River

Niche		
A semi-primitive, non-motorized experience where one expects to meet a few other groups of users but solitude is still possible there is little or no evidence of motorized use including ATV trails.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will maintain the current semi-primitive, non-motorized experience within this RMZ following guidelines for dispersed camp management, fire ring management and visitor management (including camp encounters, litter and human waste) as outline in the Gulkana River Management Plan Revision. The standards will be evaluated and management actions taken based on data collected by river crew patrols.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• floating • hunting • fishing • photography • wildlife viewing • swimming • camping • hiking • limited OHV use • birding • trapping • snowmachining • dog mushing	• appreciation of solitude • challenge of navigating whitewater • experiencing and learning about anadromous fish species • seeing and experiencing wildlife • feeling of self reliance • nostalgia • knowing that things are not going to change too much • experiencing the landscape of a wild and scenic river • bonding with family and friends • sharing and talking about equipment • teaching others • escaping everyday life and responsibilities	• greater understanding and appreciation of natural resources • greater self reliance • improved physical and mental health • improved outdoor skills • improved leadership abilities • improved self confidence • deeper sense of personal humility • improved opportunity to view wildlife close up • greater protection of fish, wildlife, and natural habitat • reduce negative human impacts such as litter, vegetation trampling and unplanned trails

Table 70. Gulkana RMZ 2 – Middle and Upper West Forks

Niche		
A primitive, non-motorized experience where one can expect to meet a few other groups of users but solitude is still possible, particularly at camps. There is little or no evidence of motorized use including OHV trails and one may see traces of previous use at some sites.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will maintain the current primitive, non-motorized experience within this RMZ following guidelines for dispersed camp management, fire ring management and visitor management (including camp encounters, litter and human waste) as outline in the Gulkana River Management Plan Revision. The standards will be evaluated and management actions taken based on data collected by river crew patrols.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• floating • hunting • fishing • photography • wildlife viewing • swimming • camping • hiking • birding • trapping • snowmachining • dog mushing	• appreciation of solitude • experiencing and learning about anadromous fish species • seeing and experiencing wildlife • feeling of self reliance, nostalgia • knowing that things are not going to change too much • experiencing the landscape of a wild and scenic river • escaping everyday life and responsibilities • enjoying strenuous physical exercise • getting away from family for awhile • being isolated and independent • enjoying exploring on your own • being in control of things that happen • risk taking • contemplating man's relationship with the land	• greater understanding and appreciation of natural resources • greater self reliance • improved physical and mental health • improved outdoor skills • improved self confidence • deeper sense of personal humility • improved opportunity to view wildlife close up • greater protection of fish, wildlife, and natural habitat • reduce negative human impacts such as litter, vegetation trampling and unplanned trails • improved ability to think things through and solve problems • better understanding of wildlife's contribution to my own quality of life • sense of accomplishment • conservation of entire sustainable ecosystems

Table 71. Gulkana RMZ 3 - Lower West Fork

Niche		
A semi-primitive, motorized experience where one expects to meet a few other groups of users but solitude is still possible, particularly at camps. There is some powerboat use, limited by physical barriers in the river. ATV use is rare but one may see traces of previous use at some sites.		
Management Objectives		
BLM will maintain the current semi-primitive, motorized experience within this RMZ following guidelines for dispersed camp management, fire ring management and visitor management (including camp encounters, litter and human waste) as outline in the Gulkana River Management Plan Revision. The standards will be evaluated and management actions taken based on data collected by river crew patrols.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• Prop boats • jet boats • floating • hunting • fishing • photography • wildlife viewing • swimming • camping • hiking • birding • trapping • snowmachining • dog mushing,	• appreciation of solitude • experiencing and learning about anadromous fish species • seeing and experiencing wildlife • feeling of self reliance • nostalgia • knowing that things are not going to change too much • experiencing the landscape of a wild and scenic river • escaping everyday life and responsibilities • getting away from family for awhile • being isolated and independent • enjoying exploring on your own • being in control of things that happen • risk taking • thrill of motorized power • easy motorized access • personal interaction with visitors • bringing back pleasant memories for those who come back year after year	• greater understanding and appreciation of natural resources • greater self reliance • improved physical and mental health • improved mechanical abilities • improved self confidence • deeper sense of personal humility • improved opportunity to view wildlife close up • greater protection of fish, wildlife, and natural habitat • improved ability to think things through and solve problems • better understanding of wildlife's contribution to my own quality of life • improved local economic stability • increased local job opportunities • greater family bonding • teaching children about outdoor equipment and the environment

Table 72. Gulkana RMZ 4 - Sourdough

Niche		
An undeveloped experience where on expects to meet many other groups of users and solitude is sometimes difficult to find. Motorized uses are common and traces of previous use are visible at any sites		
Management Objectives		
BLM will maintain the current undeveloped experience within this RMZ following guidelines for dispersed camp management, fire ring management and visitor management (including camp sharing, litter and human waste) as outline in the Gulkana River Management Plan Revision. The standards will be evaluated and management actions taken based on data collected by river crew patrols.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• Prop boats • jet boats • floating • hunting • fishing • photography • wildlife viewing • swimming • camping • hiking • birding • trapping • snowmachining • dog mushing	• experiencing and learning about anadromous fish species • seeing and experiencing wildlife • feeling of self reliance • experiencing the landscape of a wild and scenic river • escaping everyday life and responsibilities • getting away from family for awhile • being in control of things that happen • thrill of motorized power • easy motorized access • personal interaction with visitors • bringing back pleasant memories for those who come back year after	• greater personal enrichment through involvement with other people • greater tolerance for multi-use river recreationists • greater opportunity for people with different skills to use the same place • improved undestanding of this communities dependence and impact on public lands • increased local job opportunities • increased property values • reduced social isolation • Dis-benefit: Potential loss of environmental quality within this zone

4. Tiekel Special Recreation Management Area

Table 73. Recreation Benefits Based Planning: Tiekel SRMA

Primary Market Strategy	Primary Market
undeveloped	local community based users
Tourism Market Product	
The Tiekel SRMA is situated in east-central Alaska along the Richardson Highway between Glennallen and Valdez. This SRMA is named after the Tiekel River which meanders along side the Richardson Highway and is known for its arctic grayling and dolly varden char fishery. The natural beauty of this area is highlighted by the Chugach Mountain Range, minimal development and a wide variety of recreation opportunities. This elongated SRMA begins near the Tonsina River on the north end and ends near Thompson Pass (elevation 2771 feet) on the south end with a total length of about 47 miles. The south end of this SRMA is renowned for winter skiing activities because of the heavy snows that accumulate during winter months. This SRMA includes two zones Tonsina sub-unit and Tiekel Dispersed that offer motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities.	

Map 57. Tiekel SRMA – Recreation Management Zones

File size: 166 KB
File name: 57_tiekelrmz.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

a) Tiekel Recreation Management Zones (RMZ)

Table 74. Tiekel RMZ 1 - Tonsina Sub-Unit

Niche		
Primitive area which provides recreational opportunities not associated with motorized activities		
Management Objectives		
Manage this zone to provide an area for non-motorized, quiet experiences and activities that will result in 75% of the respondents realizing this benefit.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• hiking • non-motorized hunting • snowshoeing • skiing • snowboarding • birding • wildlife viewing • horseback riding	• feeling good about solitude and isolation • physical exercise • enjoying nature • escape social pressures • enjoying nature and the surrounding landscape	• relieved stress • improved physical fitness • physiological • sense of adventure • self reliance • increased awareness of natural resources • increased appreciation of wildlands

Table 75. Tiekel RMZ 2 - Tiekel Dispersed

Niche		
Semi -primitive area which provides multiple types of recreational opportunities.		
Management Objectives		
Mange this zone for activities and benefits to both motorized and non-motorized users.		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• skiing • snowboarding • birding • wildlife viewing • horseback riding • snowmachining, • Off-highway vehicle travel • motorized hunting • non-motorized hunting, • heli-skiing • fishing • backpacking	• developing skills and abilities • physical exercise • mental well being • risk-taking • exploration • enjoying nature • physical rest	• relived stress • improved physical fitness • physiological • greater sense of adventure • self reliance • increased awareness of natural resources • increased knowledge of equipment of technology • increased tourism revenue

Table 76. Tiekel RMZ 3 - Tiekel Highway Corridor

Niche		
Roaded natural with semi primitive opportunities available within close proximity to the highway.		
Management Objectives		
Provide visitors with exceptional viewing and educational experiences of scenery and providing access to Zones 1 and 2 (semi-primitive and primitive recreational opportunities).		
Targeted Outcomes		
Activity	**Experience**	**Benefit**
• driving for pleasure • firewood gathering • scenic viewing • fishing • hunting • picnicking • roadside camping	• family togetherness • enjoying nature • enjoying having easy access to natural landscapes	• better mental health • increased nurturance/tolerance of others • appreciation of the multiple uses of the landscape • improved appreciation of nature's splendor • greater family bonding • positive contributions to local economic stability

Appendix I: Wild and Scenic Rivers

Appendix I: Wild and Scenic Rivers I-3
A. Introduction I-3
B. Outstandingly remarkable values and interim protection for eligible rivers I-6
1. Brushkana Creek I-6
2. Clearwater Creek I-8
3. Duktoth River I-9
4. Hungry Hollow I-10
5. Kulthieth River I-11
6. Kosakuts River I-12
7. Liberty Creek I-14
8. Maclaren River I-15
9. Monsoon Creek and Lake I-16
10. Nenana River I-17
11. Susitna River I-18
12. Tonsina River system including the Little Tonsina River, Tonsina Lake, Tonsina River, and Greyling Creek I-19
13. Twelve Mile Creek I-21
14. Victor Creek I-21
15. West Fork Gulkana River, South Branch I-22
C. Reasons for dropping rivers from original list of eligible rivers published in the Draft RMP/EIS. I-24

APPENDIX I: WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

This Appendix contains detailed descriptions of the Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV) for each of the eligible river segment within the planning area along with management actions to protect these ORVs in the interim. Maps 58-60 show the location and the surrounding land status of each eligible river segment.

A. Introduction

Section 1326(b) of ANILCA states, "[n]o further studies of Federal lands in the State of Alaska for the single purpose of considering the establishment of a conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conservation area, or for related or similar purposes shall be conducted unless authorized by this Act or further Act of Congress." A conservation system unit as defined by Section 102(4) of ANILCA includes wild and scenic rivers.

Inventory and review, however, may be conducted as part of a comprehensive planning effort, such as the creation or revision of a resource management plan. The settlement agreement for the 1993 case of American Rivers et al. vs. the Secretary of the Interior states:

> The Director, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will rescind BLM Instruction Memorandum No. 91-127, which provides an exception for Alaska from the general BLM requirement to conduct wild and scenic river studies as part of the resource management plan (RMP) process, and instruct BLM, Alaska to follow the BLM guidelines, presently set out as part 8351 of the BLM Manual, for conducting such studies. It is understood that these guidelines may change with time and it is the mutual intent of the plaintiffs and the federal defendants that BLM, Alaska follow the same policies and procedures that are followed by BLM throughout the rest of the United States (U.S. District Court 1993).

Consistent with these directives, the East Alaska RMP planning team conducted an eligibility review for the planning area. Review was based largely on an earlier review conducted in 1989 as part of a draft RMP effort that was halted due to budget constraints and conveyance concerns. At that time, the team considered over 300 rivers in the area for eligibility based on criteria described in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and BLM's 8351 Manual. After interdisciplinary review, the 1989 team came up with a list of 25 eligible rivers within the planning area. The 1989 team then classified the eligible rivers as wild, scenic, or recreational. The 2004 team reviewed the eligibility and classification of these 25 segments and assessed the segments for suitability, based on criteria listed in BLM's 8351 Manual. The list of eligible rivers and the team's suitability determinations were presented in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Of the 25 rivers listed as eligible in the Draft RMP/EIS, only one was shown to be suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system. Most river segments considered eligible run through uplands that are State or State-selected lands. In assessing suitability, this was a major consideration and in most cases the primary reason for a finding of non-suitability. According to BLM Manual 8351 (Policy and Program Direction for Identification, Evaluation, and Management of Wild and Scenic Rivers):

"In situations where there is limited public lands (shoreline and adjacent lands) administered by the BLM within the identified river study area, it may be difficult to ensure those identified outstandingly remarkable values could be properly maintained and afforded adequate management protection over time. Accordingly…river segments may be determined suitable only if the entity with land use planning responsibility supports the finding and commits to assisting the BLM in protecting the identified river values."

In their written comments throughout the planning process, the State of Alaska is opposed to any additions to the Wild and Scenic River system.

BLM received numerous comments on the Draft RMP/EIS on our eligibility and suitability determinations and on the lists presented in the Draft. Most comments supported protection of the identified eligible segments and opposed BLM's finding of non-suitability. Several commenters asked BLM to defer suitability determinations until State entitlements are met and land status is determined in the planning area. BLM also received comments on proposed additions and deletions to the eligibility list. Based on public comments and on the fact that our primary consideration for suitability was land status (which is in a constant state of change until entitlements are met), the decision was made to defer suitability.

The planning team then re-considered the list of eligible rivers, based on public comment and on internal (BLM) comments received during the planning process. The edited list of eligible rivers is presented in Table 23 of the Final RMP/EIS. This appendix presents a more detailed description of the outstandingly remarkable values for each river, maps, and interim protective measures. In most cases (where adjacent uplands are State-selected), protective measures can only be prescribed on an interim basis. If State-selected uplands are conveyed to the State, these river segments will not be considered for suitability. For rivers that were included on the eligible list in the Draft RMP/EIS that were removed from the list, an explanation is provided.

To be determined eligible, a river segment must be free flowing and posses one or more Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV). The definition of free flowing is "existing or flowing in natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modification of the waterway." (section 16(b) Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; BLM Manuel 8351) ORVs are listed in section 1(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and include scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar

values. BLM Manual 8351 further elaborates on the definitions of these ORVs by outlining standards to guide how these values are to be interpreted and applied on BLM-administered land. These standards, summarized below, were used by the planning team in the identification of eligible river segments.

Scenic The landscape elements of landform, vegetation, water, color, and related factors must result in notable or exemplary visual features and/or attraction with the geographic region. The rating area must be scenic quality "A" as defined in the BLM Visual Resource Inventory Handbook, H-8410-1. Scenery and visual attraction may be highly diverse over the majority of the river segment length and not common to other rivers in the geographic region.

Recreational Recreational opportunities are or have the potential to be unusual enough to attract visitors to the geographic region. Visitors are willing to travel long distances to use the river resources for recreational purposes. The river provides a critically important regional recreation opportunity.

Geologic The river or area within the river corridor contains example(s) of a geologic feature, process, or phenomenon that is rare, unusual, or unique to the geographic region.

Fish The river is nationally or regionally one of the top producers of resident, indigenous, and/or anadromous fish species. The river provides exceptionally high quality habitat for fish species. Of particular significance are populations or habitat for State, Federally listed, or candidate threatened and endangered species or the presence of unique or wild stocks.

Wildlife The river or area within the river corridor contains nationally or regionally important populations of resident or indigenous wildlife species dependent on the river environment. The river or area within the corridor provides exceptionally high quality habitat for wildlife of national or regional significance. Of particular significance are populations or habitat for State, Federally listed, or candidate threatened and endangered species.

Cultural The river or area within the river corridor contains a site(s) where there is evidence of occupation or use by Native Americans. Sites muse be rare, have unusual characteristics, or exceptional human-interest value(s).

Historic The river or area within the river corridor contains a site(s) or feature(s) associated with a significant event, an important person, or a cultural activity of the past that was rare or unusual in the region.

Other similar values While no specific evaluation guidelines have been developed for this category, additional values deemed relevant to the eligibility of the river segment should be considered in a manner consistent with the foregoing guidance.

(BLM 1993)

The planning team also determined tentative classifications for each eligible river or river segment, based on existing characteristics of a river area resulting from human-caused change or levels of development or use. Classification establishes a guideline for management until a suitability determination is done.

Once a river is deemed eligible through the Land Use Planning process and tentatively classified as a wild, scenic, or recreational area, BLM has the responsibility to institute management measures as "necessary to ensure appropriate protection of the value supporting the eligibility and classification determination" BLM Manual 8351 (BLM 1993). Protective management actions are subject to valid existing rights and shall not allow activities or authorized uses to adversely affect the free-flowing characteristic of the river segment, the outstandingly remarkable values, or the tentative classification of the segment. Protective management is initiated by the authorizing officer (District Manager) as soon as eligibility is determined. (BLM 1993).

B. Outstandingly remarkable values and interim protection for eligible rivers

1. Brushkana Creek

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. This clear water creek flows north out of the Talkeetna Mountains, across the Denali Highway and into the Nenana River, a distance of 12 miles. Grayling fishing is a major activity near the Denali Highway and within Brushkana Creek Campground which the river flows next to for a short section. The clear water nature and larger water volume than many other runoff creeks in the area attract visitors to the river. The river can be floated, depending on water levels, by raft or canoe to the confluence with the Nenana.

b) Tentative classification

Scenic. The segment from the headwaters to south of the Denali Highway where the river enters dual-selected lands is free of impoundments, with shorelines still largely primitive and undeveloped, but accessible in places by an OHV trail. **Recreational.** The segment from just south of the Denali Highway to the confluence with the Nenana. With the Denali Highway, Brushkana campground, and an OHV trail parallel to the river, the segment is readily accessible and has some development along the shorelines.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Historic: The Brushkana Creek Cabin is the only standing example of late 1920's Alaska Road Commission shelter cabins along the Cantwell-Denali Trail, which connected the newly constructed railroad with one of the most modern mining communities in Alaska at that time, the town of Denali (Dessauer and Harvey 1980:45). Because of the destruction of the Denali townsite in the 1970's, this cabin remains one of only three structures that represent a unique era in the Alaska Range's mining history.

Recreational: This river offers a diversity of experiences and is road-accessible on the lower portion. It is also accessible north of the Denali via an OHV trail that parallels the river and provides access for fishing or other recreational pursuits. The Brushkana campground provides a roaded-natural recreation setting along the Brushkana. South of the Denali highway, an OHV trail parallels the creek and provides opportunities for a semi-primitive experience. The headwaters of the river are inaccessible and would provide a primitive non-motorized experience.

Scenic: South of the Denali Highway, this river flows through tundra and low-shrub vegetation, with the Talkeetna mountains providing a dramatic backdrop to the south. North of the Denali Highway, spectacular views of the Alaska Range and Clearwater mountains occur.

d) Interim Protective Measures

Most land along Brushkana Creek is selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral entry or leasing until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. This area will be designated as "limited" to OHVs under the East Alaska RMP, with OHVs required to stay on existing trails. No potential exists for forestry activities. Interim recreation management for this area (Denali Highway) is to manage to maintain existing ROS classes, which would maintain the diversity of experiences described under the ORVs.

2. Clearwater Creek

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. Clearwater Creek flows south from the Clearwater Mountains, crosses the Denali Highway, and then flows into the Susitna River. The river is 22 miles long. Grayling fishing is a popular activity near the Denali Highway and Clearwater Creek offers an accessible and highly productive fishing experience. As the name implies, this is a clear water creek with outstanding water quality. To the north, a hike along the creek and into the Clearwater Mountains offers a high quality semi-primitive and primitive experience. Water volume is marginal for floating in the upper segment of the river. During dry years, this segment is probably not floatable. In the segment of the river below the Denali Highway, water volume is sufficient to allow floating.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. The segment from it's origin to one mile north of the Denali Highway is free of impoundments and inaccessible except by trail. The watershed is primitive.
Recreational. The segment from one mile north of the Denali Highway to the confluence with the Susitna river. With the Denali Highway, the Clearwater wayside, and Clearwater south OHV trail, this segment is readily accessible and has some development along the shorelines.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: The river offers spectacular views of the Alaska range Clearwater Mountains to the north which are dominated by the U shaped valleys left behind by glaciers. To the south towards the Susitna, the flat plain extends for miles to distant foothills.

Recreational: The river offers a diversity of experiences and is easily accessed from the Denali Highway. Upstream of the Denali Highway is largely non-motorized, rugged terrain and offers a spectacular and primitive experience. Where the stream crosses the Denali Highway, the highway and the Clearwater wayside offer easy access to a roaded-natural experience and quality grayling fishing. Downstream, a hunting trail parallels the stream and offers occasional access via foot, horseback, or OHV.

d) Interim protective measures

Most land adjacent to Clearwater Creek is selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral entry or leasing until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. This area will be designated as "limited" to OHVs under the East Alaska RMP, with OHVs required to stay on existing trails. No potential exists for forestry activities. Interim recreation management for this area (Denali Highway) is to manage to maintain existing ROS classes, which would maintain the diversity of experiences described under the ORVs.

3. Duktoth River

a) General description

Shown on Map 60, page I-27. From it's origin in the Robinson Mountains north of Cape Yakataga, the Duktoth flows to the west and then south through BLM lands before entering State lands. While the entire river would easily qualify as eligible, this assessment only considers the segment on BLM lands. The river valley in this portion is narrow and flanked by steep mountain walls rising over 3,000 feet. It is inaccessible…there are no roads or known trails that access this upper portion and the closest fixed-wing landing site is at the junction of the Duktoth and Leeper rivers.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. This river segment is free of impoundments and is inaccessible. Its' shorelines are primitive. This is as wild as it gets.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: The river possesses expansive scenic views that create a visual gateway to the inland glaciers and massifs.

Cultural: Of cultural significance, the river served as a route used by native groups in the Interior to trade with native groups on the coast. The Duktoth River was a major prehistoric trade and travel route between the Eyak, Tlingit and Ahtna (De Laguna 1972:100-101). The area may also be part of the Kwackqwan migration route from the interior. Although this river has not been investigated for cultural resources, it is likely to contain significant heritage resources of the Eyak and Tlingit peoples.

Recreational: This river segment would offer a true wilderness challenge. The river above the confluence with the Leeper would be floatable but getting a raft or canoe into this segment would be a challenge.

d) Interim protective measures

This area would be part of the Bering Glacier Research Natural Area and will be managed to protect the unique ecological characteristics associated with the glacial environment. OHV trails would be designated within the RNA. None are known to exist in this river segment, so designation would maintain the status quo. While mature hemlock/spruce stands cover the vally bottom and slopes lower in the drainage, this portion of the river segment is sparsely vegetated, so no timber harvest would occur. Because of the inaccessibility, mineral development in this river segment is highly unlikely. However, a ¼ mile setback will be put in place on mineral leasing.

4. Hungry Hollow

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. This creek flows southward from the lakes in the tundra near the Denali Highway to the Middle Fork of the Gulkana River over a distance of xx miles. Water volume in this clearwater stream would be marginal for floating. Canoeing may be possible in the lower segment of the stream. This stream is accessible from the Denali Highway or from the Swede Lake trail.

b) Tentative classification

Scenic. This stream is free of impoundments, with shorelines still largely primitive and undeveloped. The headwaters are accessed by the Denali Highway and the lower portion of the stream is accessed by an OHV trail. The area offers a semi-primitive motorized setting.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

This stream is a tributary of the Gulkana River and shares some of the same outstandingly remarkable values as that river.

Fisheries: The waters host the northernmost steelhead spawning habitat as well as spawning habitat for sockeye salmon.

Wildlife: Bald eagles nest along the banks in the lower portion and the vegetation provides prime moose habitat. The Nelchina Caribou Herd migrates through the area in the fall or winter, providing subsistence opportunities as well as opportunities to view hundreds of caribou.

Cultural: The watershed is a part of the Tangle Lakes Archeological District, which is managed to protect the high density of cultural sites that exist within the area. See the description on page 260 of the Final RMP/EIS.

d) Interim protective measures

Land along Hungry Hollow is State- and Native-selected and is therefore segregated against mineral exploration or development until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. OHVs are limited to designated trails within the Tangle Lakes Archeological District and along the ½ mile of Hungry Hollow that currently flows through the Gulkana National Wild River corridor. Vegetation consists of low willow and black spruce and no potential for forestry activities exists.

5. Kulthieth River

a) General description

Shown on Map 60, page I-27. This river is a tributary to the Kaliakh River, which flows into the Gulf of Alaska west of Cape Yakataga. The Kulthieth runs out of the Robinson Mountains, where it meanders through a wide valley bottom of wetlands and willow before its confluence with the Kaliakh. The Kulthieth is 20 miles long. The Kulthieth is inaccessible by road or trail, with the closest road at least seven miles distant. Gravel bars may provide landing areas for small aircraft.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. This river is free of impoundments and inaccessible. The watershed and shorelines are primitive.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: Remarkable scenery seen from the river includes majestic mountains and the ice fields beyond. The wide and lush river valley provides stark contrast to a backdrop of mountains and glaciers.

Cultural: This river is part of the headwaters of the Kaliakh River, which figures prominently in the Eyak origin myth. According to the myth, the Eyak came to the area after the great flood, when they were attracted to the river's headwaters by a beautiful mountain above and next to the river. This was also the site of a famous Eyak village, Galiya or Galyax, where they fought an important battle with the Aleut (De Laguna 1972:101).

Fisheries: The Kulthieth River, a clearwater tributary of the Kaliakh River, is the primary spawning and rearing area for coho salmon in the Kaliakh watershed. The coho run supports commercial set net and sport fisheries and a dense population of eagles in the lower Kaliakh River system.

Wildlife: The river provides excellent wildlife habitat. It is a waterfowl nesting and molting area, provides habitat for moose, and the south slopes above the river provide important brown bear spring and fall habitat.

d) Interim protective measures

The Kulthieth flows through State lands, then onto State and Native selected lands until it's confluence with the Kaliakh. Protective measures would only apply on selected lands. Because of the selections, mineral entry or leasing is prohibited until conveyance or relinquishment. OHVs would be limited to existing trails. None are know to exist. The river valley is extensively forested with mature spruce and hemlock. However, access limitations preclude any possibility of forestry activities in this area during the life of this plan.

6. Kosakuts River

a) General description

Shown on Map 60, page I-27. This river is another tributary to the Kaliakh River, which flows into the Gulf of Alaska west of Cape Yakataga. The Kosakuts runs out of the Robinson Mountains, where it meanders through a broad valley bottom of wetlands, willow, and stands of immature spruce and cottonwood before its confluence with the Kaliakh. The Kosakuts is about 10 miles long. The Kosakuts is inaccessible by road or

trail, with the closest road at least seven miles distant. Gravel bars may provide landing areas for small aircraft.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. This river is free of impoundments and inaccessible. The watershed and shorelines are primitive.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: Remarkable scenery seen from the river includes majestic mountains and the ice fields beyond. The wide and lush river valley provides stark contrast to a backdrop of mountains and glaciers.

Fisheries: The Kosakuts River, a clearwater tributary of the Kaliakh River, provides spawning and rearing habitat for coho salmon in the Kaliakh watershed. The coho run supports commercial set net and sport fisheries and a dense population of eagles in the lower Kaliakh River system.

Wildlife: The river and surrounding environment provide excellent wildlife habitat. It is a waterfowl nesting and molting area, provides habitat for moose and brown bear, and the surrounding Robinson mountains provide mountain goat habitat.

d) Interim protective measures

The Kosakuts starts on unencumbered BLM lands, then flows onto State and Native selected lands until it's confluence with the Kaliakh. Because of the selections, mineral entry or leasing is prohibited until conveyance or relinquishment. OHVs would be limited to existing trails. None are known to exist. The river valley is extensively forested with immature spruce and cottonwood. However, access limitations preclude any possibility of forestry activities in this area during the life of this plan.

7. Liberty Creek

a) General description

Shown on Map 59, page I-26. Liberty Creek originates in the open tundra of the Chugach Mountains at 5,000 feet elevation. Visitors to the area will see that its source is a series of lakes fed by high mountain runoff. The creek flows from one lake to the next creating a cascading network of waterfalls that eventually lead to a slotted canyon draining to the Copper River. Although non-navigable, Liberty Creek provides a primitive, non-motorized experience easily accessible from the nearby Edgerton highway.

b) Tentative classification

Scenic. This creek is free of impoundments, with a watershed still largely primitive. The headwaters of the creek are accessible via the 5-mile road off the Edgerton Highway.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: The grand landscapes and ridge tops of the Chugach provide an expansive backdrop. In the upper portion of the watershed, views of the Copper River and Copper Basin are provided, with views of Mt. Drum, Sanford, and Wrangell.

Recreational: The watershed provides a diversity of recreational opportunities. There is a developed campground just off the Edgerton Highway at Liberty Falls, with a hiking trail. There is motorized access to the upper portion of the watershed and some OHV trails in the area. There are hiking opportunities in the open tundra above timberline and hiking access further into the Chugach range and drainages further to the south for a primitive experience.

d) Interim protective measures

Land along Liberty Creek is State- and Native-selected. Therefore a segregation against mineral exploration or development is in place until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. OHVs would be limited to existing trails. The upper portion of the drainage is sparsely vegetated and not a candidate for forestry practices.

8. Maclaren River

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. The Maclaren River, from the headwaters to the confluence with the Susitna River, is a free-flowing, glacial river, running approximately 50 miles. There is enough water for power boating on this river. Access to the headwaters is by OHV trail or airplane to a landing strip at the toe of the Maclaren Glacier. It is also accessible from the Denali Highway. Boating occurs from the highway crossing down river to the Susitna River. It is possible to continue down the Susitna River to the Tyone River, and upriver on the Tyone River to Lake Louise.

b) Tentative classification

Scenic. This river is free of impoundments, though it is bridged where it is crossed by the Denali Highway. Aside from the Denali Highway crossing, the shoreline is still largely primitive and undeveloped.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: There is excellent open scenery at the headwaters from the west fork. The river runs through low tundra vegetation in a broad glacial valley with a backdrop of tall rugged peaks of the Alaska Range. The lower segment is a broad meandering river. Views from the lower segment are of glacial features and the Alphabet Hills.

Wildlife: The Maclaren River valley is a known staging area for the Nelchina Caribou Herd on their fall migration and thus presents opportunities for subsistence hunting or viewing hundreds of caribou. The drainage also provides numerous backwaters, ponds, and lakes that provide excellent waterfowl habitat. It also provides habitat for moose and brown bear.

Cultural: The Maclaren River passes through the Tangle Lakes Archaeological District, a property that is on the National Register of Historic Places for its significant and continuous contributions to knowledge about the prehistory and history of Alaska. This National Register District contains over 400 listed and contributing sites, including two listed prehistoric sites close to the Maclaren River itself (Bowers 1992).

Recreational: The river presents opportunities for a diversity of recreational experiences, from roaded-natural in the vicinity of the Denali Highway to primitive and semi-primitive motorized if floating or powerboating the river.

d) Interim protective measures

Most land along the Maclaren River is selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral exploration or development until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. The area will be designated as limited to OHVs. Because of the vegetation (tundra and black spruce), no forestry activities would be considered.

9. Monsoon Creek and Lake

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. Monsoon Creek flows south from Monsoon Lake to the north branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River, a distance of approximately 13 miles. The river is free flowing and clear. Access is by airplane to Monsoon Lake or other connected lakes. This river ties into the Gulkana River where access out is possible via the west fork and main stem of the Gulkana. This would be a canoe or kayak trip.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. This creek is free of impoundments and inaccessible except by airplane or trail. The shorelines are primitive and undeveloped.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Fisheries: Spawning habitat is present for Chinook and sockeye salmon. The lake and creek also provide habitat for resident species including grayling and lake trout.

Recreation: This creek provides an opportunity for a primitive, non-motorized experience. When combined with the Gulkana trip, it would be a 4 – 5 day float.

d) Interim protective measures

Land along Monsoon Creek is State- and Native-selected. Therefore a segregated against mineral exploration or development is in place until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. OHVs would be limited to existing trails. Currently there are no

OHV trails present in the area. Vegetation consists of black spruce and shrubs and there is no access so forestry activities would not occur.

10. Nenana River

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. The Nenana River has its headwaters at the Nenana Glacier in the Alaska Range. A portion of the river parallels the Denali Highway providing access to floating and powerboating opportunities. The float can take out at points farther along the highway or continue on along the Parks Highway, into McKinley, and north towards Healy. Because most of the lower river portion flows through State or Native land, this eligibility determination and interim protective measures only apply to the river segment from the glacier to Wells Creek, a distance of about 30 miles. This is a glacial river.

b) Tentative classification

Recreational. Most of the upper segment of this river parallels the Denali Highway. There are numerous OHV trails off the Denali Highway in this area, some that overlook the Nenana but none that directly access it.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: The dominant visual features along this segment are the lower peaks of the Talkeetna mountains to the south and the impressive Alaska Range to the north. There is a dramatic display across Monahan Flat of Mt. Nenana, Mt. Deborah, Mt. Hess and associated mountains and glaciers.

Recreational: The road accessible nature and trips of varying lengths, difficulties, and modes of transportation make the Nenana River an exceptional recreational opportunity.

d) Interim protective measures

Most land along the Nenana River is selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral exploration or development until conveyance or

relinquishment occurs. OHVs will be limited to existing trails. Recreation will be managed for a roaded-natural experience in the vicinity of the Denali Highway; semi-primitive motorized and primitive experiences in the upper portions of the watershed.

11. Susitna River

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. The portion of the Susitna River considered includes the headwaters to the confluence of Kosina Creek. This is a glacial, free flowing river. The river is accessible from the Denali Highway. Jet boats go up through the East Fork. Boating occurs from the highway crossing down river to the Maclaren River and upriver on the Maclaren to the Denali Highway. It is also possible to continue down the Susitna River to the Tyone River, and upriver on the Tyone and out through Lake Louise.

b) Tentative classification

Scenic. This river segment is free of impoundments, with shorelines still largely primitive and undeveloped. Exception in this segment is where the river is crossed by the Denali Highway. In the area of the Denali Highway crossing, the river is also paralleled for a short distance by the Valdez Creek road. South of the Denali Highway, the river is paralleled at a distance by the Susitna South OHV trail but this trail does not access the river. Powerboat use occurs on the river and is a traditional and established use.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Recreational: This river and adjacent lands provide a diversity of recreational opportunities. The river is road accessible and the potential exists for several different semi-primitive motorized experiences. In the vicinity of the Denali Highway, there are numerous opportunities to access the river for short day hikes or simply viewing the river from the highway for a roaded-natural experience. Opportunities certainly still exist for quality primitive experiences along the river corridor.

Cultural: The Susitna River corridor contains over fifty-six known archaeological and three historic period sites, spanning from the 1940's through approximately 11,000 years ago (Dixon et al 1982). These sites are likely to provide information for the entire Holocene history of the northwestern Copper River Basin as well as the Talkeetna Mountains. Therefore, many of these sites may be eligible for the National Register of

Historic Places. The Ahtna also know this river as a rich subsistence area that was also the site of a long term territorial feud between themselves and the Nenana people. Ahtna tradition holds that the area near Swampbuggy Lake was the site of their most successful battle, which is often referred to as the Nenana War site (BIA 1993:3).

d) Interim protective measures

Most land along the Susitna River is selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral exploration or development until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. OHVs will be limited to existing trails and much of the segment south of the Denali Highway is not accessed by any trail. Vegetation is a mix of low shrub, tundra, and black spruce so no forestry activities will occur.

12. Tonsina River system including the Little Tonsina River, Tonsina Lake, Tonsina River, and Greyling Creek

a) General description

Shown on Map 59, page I-26. The Tonsina River is a glacier-fed river that flows out of the Chugach mountains, into Tonsina Lake, and then through spruce-covered hills of the Copper basin for approximately 50 miles before it joins with the Copper River several miles above Chitina. The river is accessible at numerous locations along its length from the Richardson Highway and the Edgerton Highway. Because it is glacial, the river is slightly silted by glacial melt. The Little Tonsina and Greyling Creek are tributaries that are both clearwater streams.

b) Tentative classification

The BLM-managed segment above Tonsina Lake to just below Tonsina Lake, including Greyling Creek: **Wild.** This segment is free of impoundments and inaccessible except by trail, with watersheds or shorelines primitive and waters unpolluted. The BLM-managed lands along the Little Tonsina and along the Tonsina mainstem from where it leaves State lands to its confluence with the Copper River: **Recreational.** Portions of this segment are readily accessible by road or trail. The Richardson Highway and the Trans-Alaska pipeline parallel the river for a portion of this segment. Most of this segment is not directly impacted by man-made alterations, but some alterations have occurred to prevent damage to the highway.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Scenic: The wild segment in particular provides outstanding views of the glaciers and high mountains of the Chugach range as well as the Chugach foothills.

Recreational: This river system provides a tremendous diversity of recreational opportunities. Greyling Creek and the Tonsina river above the lake provide a remote and challenging primitive experience. Tonsina Lake and the river below it is accessible by a rough OHV trail. The section of the Tonsina from the Richardson Highway to the intersection with the Edgerton Highway is one of the most accessible and recreationally challenging rivers for floaters in the planning area. Water levels change rapidly with runoff and glacial melt affecting the whitewater experience. It's accessibility from both sides by major transportation systems makes this an exceptional one day river float.

Fisheries: The Tonsina river system provides spawning habitat for coho, sockeye, and Chinook salmon, vitally important subsistence, commercial and sport species.

Cultural: There are numerous historic and prehistoric archeological sites along the Little Tonsina and Tonsina Rivers, including a contact period Ahtna village as well as sites with artifacts similar to those of the Denali Complex, which dates to between 7,000 to 10,000 years ago (AHRS 2005; Keating and Jangala 2004:11). A few of these sites are in the vicinity of where the Tonsina River Valley intersects the ancient, late Pleistocene to early Holocene shoreline of pro-glacial Lake Ahtna, which existed in the area prior to about 9,000 years ago. This river corridor therefore holds the potential for archeological sites that would inform research about a largely unknown period in Copper Basin prehistory.

d) Interim protective measures

Land status along these river segments is a patchwork of BLM-managed lands (both selected and unencumbered), State, and Native. On selected lands, there is a segregation against mineral leasing or mineral entry until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. Unencumbered lands within this area (the pipeline/utility corridor) are withdrawn from mineral leasing or entry. On unencumbered BLM lands, OHVs trails would be designated. On selected lands, OHVs would be limited to existing trails. This is a forestry emphasis area. However, because of access limitations, no forestry activities would occur in the wild segment. Forestry activities in the recreational portion would comply with visual resource objectives described in the RMP and the Required Operating Procedures to minimize visual impacts. This is consistent with management of a recreational segment.

13. Twelve Mile Creek

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. This Clearwater stream originates in the Alphabet Hills and runs for a distance of approximately 12 miles, where it joins the Gulkana River. It is accessed via the Gulkana River or by the Haggard Creek trail, which crosses the Gulkana and continues up Twelvemile Creek into the Alphabet Hills. Because of low water volume, this creek would not be floatable.

b) Tentative classification

Scenic. This creek is free of impoundments, with shorelines still largely primitive. An OHV trail parallels the creek but does not directly impact it.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Fisheries: This creek provides spawning habitat for Chinook and sockeye salmon, as well as steelhead, a BLM sensitive species.

d) Interim protective measures

The mouth of Twelvemile Creek is within the Gulkana National Wild River corridor. Outside of the corridor, the land is State-selected. Because of the selection, there is a segregation against mineral entry or leasing until conveyance or relinquishment occurs. OHVs trails within the corridor will be designated; outside the corridor on selected lands, OHVs will be limited to existing trails. There is only one in the area. Because of the difficult access and black spruce vegetation, no forestry activities will occur.

14. Victor Creek

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. Victor Creek is a tributary of the Gulkana River. It flows southward through the Alphabet Hills and empties into the West Fork of the Gulkana

River. This creek is remote and only accessed via the Gulkana River. There are no roads or summer trails. There is a winter trail in the area. There are no good landing sites for small planes.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. This creek is free of impoundments and inaccessible, with shorelines primitive and undeveloped.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Wildlife: Trumpeter swans nest and stage in lakes and ponds on lands adjacent to the creek. Osprey and bald eagle nests are near the creek. The Alphabet Hills area is noted as prime habitat for bull moose.

Fisheries: Victor Creek provides spawning habitat for Chinook and sockeye salmon, species that provide critical subsistence, commercial, and sport fishing opportunities in the Gulkana and Copper Rivers.

d) Interim protective measures

The area is currently selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral exploration or development until conveyance or relinquishment of the land occurs. OHV use will be limited to existing trails. No summer trails are known to exist in the immediate area. No forestry activities would occur because of the lack of access.

15. West Fork Gulkana River, South Branch

a) General description

Shown on Map 58, page I-25. This portion of the Gulkana River was not included in the ANILCA designation of the Gulkana as a part of the National Wild and Scenic River system. The 1983 Gulkana River Management Plan recommended this portion for inclusion into the system. This clearwater branch of the Gulkana meanders through wetlands and black spruce lowlands before joining with the north branch of the west fork.

b) Tentative classification

Wild. This segment is free of impoundments, with primitive and undeveloped shorelines. There is no road or trail access.

c) Outstandingly remarkable values

Recreational: This free-flowing15-mile stretch represents some of the wildest and remotest reaches of river within the Gulkana system. Expansive views of the Alphabet Hills can be seen from the river that is surrounded by low-lying wetlands. Recreational opportunities provide for an extended, primitive canoe experience accessed from the Tyone River through a series of portages or by floatplane on one of the many interconnected lakes in the area.

Scenic: Expansive views of the Alphabet Hills can be seen from the river, a contrast to the surrounding low-lying wetlands.

Wildlife: Wetlands in the area provide habitat for abundant waterfowl, including trumpeter swans. Osprey and bald eagle nests occur along this segment. The area provides outstanding habitat for moose and brown bear.

Fisheries: This segment provides spawning habitat for anadromous fish species including sockeye and chinook salmon, species that are vitally important to all residents along the Copper River for subsistence, sport fishing, and commercial fishing opportunities.

d) Interim protective measures

The area is currently selected by the State of Alaska and is therefore segregated against mineral exploration or development until conveyance or relinquishment of the land occurs. The State has recognized the segment's outstanding recreational, fisheries, and wildlife values by designating it a State wild and scenic river. The East Alaska Final EIS includes this area in the Gulkana River SRMA designation as well as outlining several protective measures pertaining to wetlands and trumpeter swan breeding habitat preservation. All OHV use is limited to existing trails and no ADNR permitted river crossings exist within the area.

C. Reasons for dropping rivers from original list of eligible rivers published in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Bernard Creek: This creek runs almost entirely through State lands.

Chistochina River: This river runs almost entirely through State or Native lands. Given the State's documented opposition to new additions to the national system, it would be difficult to ensure cooperation in protective management of any outstandingly remarkable values.

Ewan Lake: Same reasoning as the Tangle Lakes trail system. This is a lake, not a flowing body of water.

Fish Lake system: Same as Ewan Lake. In addition, there is significant development on the lake's shorelines, including several houses and an airstrip.

Sourdough and Haggard Creeks: The Draft RMP/EIS and the 1989 planning team listed "extension of Gulkana Wild and Scenic River" as a description of the outstandingly remarkable values for these two streams. However, the current planning team could not find any outstandingly remarkable values for these streams, given the standards described in section A of this Appendix. Just because they are tributaries of the Gulkana does not mean that they share the same outstandingly remarkable values.

Suslota Creek: Only a very small portion of this creek runs through BLM-managed lands. The remaining lands are State or Native.

Tangle Lakes trail system: The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act defines a river as a "flowing body of water or estuary or a section, portion, or tributary thereof…" This series of small lakes is not connected by a creek or river and requires several portages. The planning team did not feel that it fit the definition of river as provided in the Act.

Tyone River: This river's uplands are almost entirely State land. There is a small (5 – 6 mile) portion that is State-selected. Given the State's documented opposition to new additions to the national system, it would be difficult to ensure cooperation in protective management of any outstandingly remarkable values.

Map 58. Eligible River Segments Denali Highway Region

File size: 152 KB
File name: 58_eligden.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

Map 59. Eligible River Segments Tiekel Region

File size: 157 KB
File name: 59_eilgtiek.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

Map 60. Eligible River Segments Bering Glacier Region

File size: 98 KB
File name: 60_eligber.pdf
Map size: 8.5x11

A. Introduction J-3
B. Content Analysis Process J-4
C. Summary of Comments by Topic J-5
1. Travel Management J-7
2. Recreation J-9
3. Natural and Cultural Resources J-9
4. Lands and Realty J-12
5. Vegetation Management J-14
6. Minerals J-15
7. Subsistence/Social and Economic Conditions J-15
8. RMP/EIS Process J-17
9. General/Other J-18
D. Response to Individual Comments J-19
1. Travel Management J-20
General Travel Management J-20
Transportation and Facilities J-21
OHV Management and Trails J-24
Access (17b Easements, R.S. 2477s) J-62
2. Recreation J-75
General Recreation Management J-75
Special Recreation Permits J-82
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum J-83
Areas of Concentrated Recreation Opportunities (SRMA) J-84
3. Natural and Cultural Resources J-95
General Natural and Cultural Resources J-95
Soils J-96
Water Quality J-96
Air Quality J-98
Vegetation (including Sensitive Status Species) J-98
Fish and Wildlife(including Sensitive Status Species) J-99
Wildlife (including Sensitive Status Species) J-101
Fish (including Sensitive Status Species) J-111
Cultural AND Paleontological Resources J-121
Visual Resoruces (VRM) J-124
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) J-127
Wild and Scenic Rivers J-141
Rops and stips J-164
Climate Change J-181
Wilderness J-182
4. Lands and Realty J-189
General Lands and Realty J-189
Lands and Realty Program and Administration J-189
Public Land Order (PLO) 5150 ..... J-190
Slana J-221
Withdrawals J-228

5. Vegetation Management J-232
General Vegetation management J-232
Fire Management J-232
Forestry J-233
6. Leasable and Locatable Minerals J-239
General Minerals J-239
Geology J-242
Minerals occurrence & Potential J-242
Areas Proposed as Open, Limited, or Closed to Minerals J-247
7. Subsistence/Social and Economic Conditions J-254
General Subsistence and Social and Economic Conditions J-254
Subsistence, ANILCA section 810 Analysis J-255
Social and Economic Conditions J-269
Environmental Justice J-272
8. RMP/EIS Process J-273
General Process J-273
NEPA Adequacy J-286
Public Involvement J-292
New Alternatives Presented J-296
Maps J-305
Editorial Changes J-308
9. General/Other J-310
General (crossing multiple categories) J-310
Education J-313
Management of selected Lands J-314
E. Index of Comment Letter Numbers J-319

APPENDIX J: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

A. Introduction

On April 29, 2005, a notice was published in the Federal Register announcing the availability of the East Alaska Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (Federal Register 2005). This notice initiated the beginning of a 90-day public comment period. Comments were accepted at any point during the 90-day period and could be submitted via email, U.S. Mail, in-person, fax, or through spoken testimony. In accordance with the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act (ANILCA), the BLM hosted seven public meetings and subsistence hearings throughout the planning area to gather testimony on the Draft RMP/EIS and to answer questions. Additionally, at the request of the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, the BLM hosted a special meeting in order for the council to accept public testimony on the Draft RMP/EIS and submit formal comments. For a more complete description of the public involvement efforts see *Chapter V* and *Appendix VI*.

Approximately 4,500 comments were received on the Draft RMP/EIS during the 90-day comment period. Of these total comments, approximately 4,120 were submitted as five form letters.

This appendix contains three sections:

1. Content Analysis Process,
2. Summary of Comments by Topic, and
3. Responses to Individual Comments.

It is the third section, Responses to Individual Comments, that comprises the bulk of this appendix. It contains the actual text or transcription of all substantive comments received during the comment period with the BLM responses to each comment. The responses include how the comments were considered and addressed in development of the alternatives, analysis of effects, and overall development of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

B. Content Analysis Process

A standardized content analysis process was conducted by the planning team to analyze the public comments on the Draft RMP/EIS. The word "comment" is used in two ways in this appendix: each letter, email, fax, or testimony that was submitted in response to the comment period is considered a "comment," while at the same time each one of those letters, emails, faxes, or testimonies was parsed to extract individual "comments" or specific themes or issues that could be grouped according to the categories described later in this document.

Each comment was read by at least two members of the planning team to ensure that all substantive comments were identified and coded to the appropriate subject category. Non-substantive and substantive comments are defined in the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook: "Nonsubstantive comments are those that include opinions, assertions, and unsubstantiated claims. Substantive comments are those that reveal new information, missing information, or flawed analysis that would substantially change conclusions" (BLM 2005b: 23-24). The BLM's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Handbook further clarifies that "[c]omments which express personal preferences or opinions on the proposal do not require a response. They are summarized whenever possible and brought to the attention of the manager responsible for preparing the EIS. Although personal preferences and opinions may influence the final selection of the agency's preferred action, they generally will not affect the analysis" (BLM 1988b: V-12). The planning team also adhered to the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations implementing NEPA at 40 CFR 1503.4 (a) to determine which comments would be included with responses in the last section of this appendix beginning on page J-19.

Once identified by the planning team members, each substantive comment was entered into a database to allow sorting based on issue and subject. The seven main issues used to organize the EIS were also used to organize the comments, with additional categories for comments on the RMP/EIS process and general comments not falling under the seven issues. Each issue also contains numerous sub-categories to assist in grouping like comments. These substantive comments and the responses to them comprise the bulk of this appendix. Comments are included verbatim either as they were submitted in letters or email, or as they were recorded at public meetings or hearings

Many of the comments expressed personal opinions or preferences, had little relevance to the adequacy or accuracy of the Draft RMP/EIS, or represented commentary regarding resource management without any direct connection to the document being reviewed. These comments did not provide specific information to assist the planning team in making a change to the preferred alternative, did not suggest other alternatives, or did not take issue with methods used in the Draft RMP/EIS. Where these comments expressed personal preferences or opinions, but did not require a response per BLM direction (BLM 1988b: V-12), they may be summarized below under the section,

Summary of Comments by Topic. Otherwise, non-substantive comments are not addressed further in this document. Example of non-substantive comments not further addressed include:

- "I think the following should be totally banned in this area: 1) hunting; 2) trapping; 3) new roads; 4) all two strokes vehicles of any kind; 5) mining, drilling, grazing or logging; 6) prescribed burning which pollutes the air and causes human deaths through particulates – lung cancer, heart attacks, strokes and asthma,"
- "I oppose Alternative B,"
- "I support all SRMA designations," and
- "I do not agree with the EARMP."

Form letters were analyzed in the same manner as all other comments. Each form letter was analyzed for substantive comments and coded and entered into the database, but the number of signatures on each form letter or the number of each form letter received was noted. For example, if we received a form letter from 4,000 individuals, the letter itself was coded once and any substantive comments noted in this appendix, but only one response was prepared for each substantive comment.

C. Summary of Comments by Topic

This section provides a narrative summary of public responses to issues, organized consistent with organization of Chapters II, III, and IV of the Draft EIS/RMP. Depending on the volume of comments received, summaries of comments by issue may or may not get into the detail in the second level in the outline below (e.g. you may have a general summary of Recreation comments, and, if warranted, a sub-section on Areas of Concentrated Recreation Opportunities).

Table 77. Summary of Substantive Comments Received by Issue

Issue	Number of Substantive Comments Received	Percent of Total Substantive Comments Received
Travel Management		
General Travel Management	3	**16.3%**
Transportation and Facilities	12	
OHV Management and Trails	132	
Access	32	
Recreation		
General Recreation (including tourism)	31	**8.2%**
Special Recreation Use Permits	5	
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum	4	
Areas of Concentrated Recreation Use (SRMAs)	50	

Issue	Number of Substantive Comments Received	Percent of Total Substantive Comments Received
Natural and Cultural Resources		
General Natural and Cultural Resources	6	**33.4%**
Soil	1	
Water Quality	11	
Air Quality	1	
Vegetation	2	
Fish and Wildlife	89	
Cultural Resources	12	
Paleontological Resources	0	
Visual Resources	12	
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC, RNA)	57	
Wild and Scenic Rivers	70	
ROPs and Stipulations	82	
Climate Change	5	
Wilderness	18	
Lands and Realty		
General Lands and Realty	2	**12.1%**
Lands and Realty Program Administration	3	
Utility and Communications Corridors (PLO 5150)	86	
Slana	26	
Withdrawals	16	
Vegetation Management		
General Vegetation Management	4	**2.8%**
Lands and Realty Program Administration	5	
Utility and Communications Corridors (PLO 5150)	22	
Leasable and Locatable Minerals		
General Minerals	13	**5.5%**
Geology	1	
Mineral Occurrence, Potential, and Administration	23	
Areas open/closed to mineral entry/leasing	23	
Subsistence/Social and Economic Conditions		
General Subsistence/Social and Economic Conditions	1	**5.4%**
Subsistence (ANILCA Section 810 Analysis)	46	
Social and Economic Conditions	9	
Environmental Justice	3	

Issue	Number of Substantive Comments Received	Percent of Total Substantive Comments Received
RMP/EIS Process		
General Process	57	**13%**
Concerns with NEPA Adequacy	15	
Public Involvements and MOU Development	19	
New Alternative Proposal	28	
Maps	17	
Editorial Changes	6	
General/Other		
General (crossing multiple categories)	21	**3.3%**
Education	5	
Management of Selected Lands	10	

1. Travel Management

a) Transportation and Facilities

Most comments focused on roads. The mineral industry was supportive of new roads to access areas of high mineral potential. Others voiced opposition because of concerns over impacts to watersheds and fish and wildlife. Comments regarding facilities focused on recreational facilities along the Denali Highway. Most were supportive of new facilities to handle increased use. Some are opposed to the Denali Highway being paved.

b) OHV Management and Trails and General Travel Management

This subject received the most comments (135 responded to). Comments were split between supporting more intensive trail and OHV management and opposing more intensive OHV management or restrictions.

Generally, those supporting more intensive management expressed concern over the increasing use of OHVs on BLM-managed lands and their impacts to vegetation, soils, watersheds, water quality, subsistence resources, wildlife, fisheries, viewsheds, recreational opportunities, and quiet. Numerous commenters felt the alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMP/EIS were not balanced and did not consider enough area for non-motorized opportunities. There was strong support for consideration of a non-motorized area in the Delta Range to maintain existing primitive backcountry skiing and

mountaineering. Many comments expressed that the State's Generally Allowed Uses are not restrictive enough and that designated trails are needed, not just "existing" trails. There were concerns over increasing snowmachine use and that the Draft RMP/EIS does not adequately address this increasing use. Finally, there were concerns about vehicle size, impacts from larger OHVs, and resource damage associated with larger rigs. This group of commentors, in general, support Alternative C.

Those who were not supportive of more intensive management are concerned about access. They wish to be able to access public lands, generally without restriction. They feel Alaska is a big place and they do not acknowledge resource damage from OHVs. They state that OHVs are essential in Alaska for hunting and subsistence use, and that BLM's management needs to be consistent with ANILCA and its' allowance for access to subsistence uses, subject to reasonable regulation. They feel that snowmachines have no resource impacts. They feel strongly that implementation-level planning that considers OHV restrictions needs strong public participation. GFO received a packet of approximately 130 letters from members of the Alaska Access Alliance. These letters were similar and expressed a desire for BLM to adopt alternative A (No Action), but that alternative A should be modified to include the State's Generally Allowed Uses policy for OHVs. These letters also stated that OHV management of State-selected lands needs to be consistent with State policy. These sentiments were also reflected in comments from Alaska Outdoor Council.

In general, there was some support for trail hardening and maintenance but also concern that these activities would bring more use and that trails should be "left alone". Ahtna, Inc. and the EPA strongly support more intensive management of OHVs. The State of Alaska wants to ensure access (particularly to resource development), is supportive of implementation level planning, and will not support OHV limitations based on "impacts to the viewshed, maintaining a diversity of recreational opportunities, or any snowmachine restrictions based on trail densities."

c) Access (17b easements, R.S. 2477s)

Many of the comments received on this subject came from public testimony, particularly from Ahtna shareholders. Concerns expressed include: 1) trespass onto private lands as a result of 17(b) easement use; 2) resource impacts (including soils, water quality, fisheries, cultural, and subsistence resources) on private lands and on the easements themselves; 3) perceived lack of management on BLM's part, particularly in law enforcement. There were also numerous comments about the need for cooperative agreements and for BLM to work with Ahtna on developing a plan for management of 17(b) easements.

2. Recreation

a) General Recreation, Special Recreation Permits, and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

Many comments on general recreation focused on management of the Denali Highway. In general, the sentiment is to keep it the way it is, to maintain a diversity of opportunities there, to maintain or build a few (limited) facilities to handle increasing use, and to not pave the highway. There is some concern over potential mineral development north of the Denali Highway (on State land) and its impacts on recreation. The National Park Service would support a cooperative visitor's center in the Cantwell area. Other general recreation comments included a concern over increasing helicopter-supported commercial recreation activities and potential impacts to subsistence from recreation activities.

b) Areas of Concentrated Recreation Opportunities (SRMAs)

Comments were split in support and opposition of SRMAs and how they should be managed. Most supporting SRMAs would like to see an emphasis on non-motorized recreation and opportunities for primitive recreation maintained. Some feel the Draft RMP/EIS is not balanced and does not consider enough non-motorized areas. There is support for the Denali Highway managed as an SRMA and a strong sentiment to manage it as is. Some commentors supported a Backcountry Byway designation, while Ahtna, Inc. opposed both the Backcountry Byway designation and an SRMA along the Denali because of concerns about recreation impacts on subsistence.

Those in opposition felt that SRMAs would restrict access or mineral development. They also feel that SRMA designations are inappropriate on State or ANCSA selected lands. The State of Alaska is opposed to any non-motorized areas designated through this RMP.

3. Natural and Cultural Resources

a) General Natural and Cultural Resources, Soils, Water Quality, Air Quality, and Vegetation.

Most comments focused on water quality. There is support for increased water quality monitoring and concern for water quality impacts from OHV use, potential mining, and

recreation activities. The mineral industry pointed out that strict water quality standards are applied to miners.

b) Fish and Wildlife (including Sensitive Status Species)

Wildlife: Most comments focused on the need to protect habitat for hunting and for subsistence activities. There were several comments regarding the need for protection of migratory birds. There were comments that expressed concern about the amount of land being made available for potential mineral development and impacts to wildlife habitat from mineral development. Finally, there were several editorial comments about wildlife range maps or non-coverage of certain species.

The State of Alaska encouraged continued local consultation and cooperation with ADF&G. They also will not support OHV restrictions based on wildlife habitat concerns, but encourage consultation with the State on implementation-level planning.

Fisheries: Several commentors felt the analysis of impacts to fisheries was inadequate. They felt coverage of fisheries was inadequate due to the economic, subsistence, environmental, and social significance of the Copper River salmon. They encouraged consideration of a Copper River ACEC. There were comments about OHV impacts to fisheries habitat. The Yakutat borough opposes opening the eastern 1/3 of Bering Glacier to mineral entry or leasing, based on concerns about potential mining impacts to fisheries. The State's comments emphasized that ADF&G manages populations and that there is very little evidence of habitat degradation in the planning area.

c) Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Most comments focused on the need to continue inventory of cultural sites and provide protection. There is concern, particularly from Ahtna shareholders, regarding impacts to cultural resources from OHV use, 17(b) easements, and recreation. Comments on paleontological resources focused on our lack of inventory.

d) Visual Resources (VRM)

Most commentors suggested that the Draft RMP/EIS should consider more Class I and II areas and less Class III and IV areas.

e) Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)

Most commentors supported alternative C and its designation of ACECs and the Bering Glacier RNA. Support focused on protection of resource values, including caribou and bison habitat, trumpeter swan nesting habitat, and the unique ecological communities associated with the Bering. Some commentors felt that protective measures identified in the ACECs were not strong enough, even in alternative C. Support for the Nelchina caribou calving ACEC and West Fork ACEC included the Southcentral Regional council and the EPA. The State of Alaska supported these areas in concept but some implementation-level considerations were problematic.

Opposition to ACECs came from Alaska Miners Association and the Alaska Outdoor Council because of perceived restrictions to access or to mineral development. They also felt that such designation on State or ANCSA selected lands is inappropriate.

Support is almost unanimous for the Bering RNA, though most commentors preferred alternative C. EPA, the National Park Service, and Yakutat borough are all opposed to the lifting of PLO 5179 in the eastern 1/3 of the Bering under the preferred alternative.

f) Wild and Scenic Rivers

This topic generated a lot of comments (70 substantive). Most comments were supportive of Wild and Scenic River designation and management. Some comments questioned the adequacy of our eligibility and suitability determinations, as presented in the Draft RMP/EIS. Others suggested additional rivers that did not appear on the list of eligible rivers presented in the Draft RMP/EIS. Other comments stated that we failed to consider protective measures for eligible rivers and that we failed to consider a range of alternatives for suitability. Finally, there were several comments that suggested deferring suitability determinations until State and ANCSA entitlements are met and land status is stable.

Opposition to Wild and Scenic River designation came from Alaska Miners Association and the State of Alaska. AMA also opposed protective measures in existing Wild and Scenic River corridors (the Delta and Gulkana).

g) ROPs and Stips

This topic also generated a lot of substantive comments (82). Most comments, though, were submitted by two groups (Alaska Coalition and Cascadia Wildlands). In general, these comments suggested the ROPs and stipulations should be more prescriptive and leave less opportunity for exceptions, waivers, or modifications. Several comments questioned the adequacy of specific buffer distances. They asked for justification for

those distances. There were also questions about enforcement of the ROPs and stipulations. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) felt that ROPs and stipulations should be more prescriptive and that justification for buffer distances should be provided in each ROP or stipulation, where applicable.

There were no comments from industry.

h) Climate Change

All commentors felt that the Draft RMP/EIS did an inadequate job of considering climate change and its potential effects in the planning area.

i) Wilderness

Eighteen substantive comments were received, all questioning the lack of wilderness inventory and consideration in the Draft RMP/EIS. They also question the legality of the Secretary's directive regarding wilderness inventory and consideration in land use planning in Alaska. There was particular interest in the Bering Glacier area.

4. Lands and Realty

a) General Lands and Realty and Lands and Realty Programs and Administration

Very few comments received in these categories. The State requests consistency with ANILCA in permitting temporary shelters on public lands.

b) Transportation and Utility Corridors (PLO 5150)

This topic generated many comments (86 substantive), mostly generated through the seven public hearings that were held in Fairbanks, Anchorage, Delta Junction, Chistochina, Glennallen, Valdez, and Cordova. Spoken testimony was also received at a special Southcentral Advisory Council meeting held at Kluti Kaah hall (Copper Center). These meetings were held consistent with ANILCA, section 810, in response to the Draft RMP/EIS section 810 analysis finding that revocation of PLO 5150 and subsequent transfer to the State of Alaska would have a significant impact on subsistence (this is proposed in Alternative B, not the preferred alternative). They are

considered under Lands and Realty, though most of the comments received were related to impacts to subsistence.

The substantive comments recorded in this Appendix do not reflect the emotion and total volume of comments generated at the public hearings, particularly those in Glennallen, Chistochina, and Kluti Kaah. Many comments received were not considered substantive because they were stated as general statements of opposition without supporting justification or they were statements about issues that are out of the scope of the decisions made in this RMP. However, because of the volume received and the nature of the testimony, some of those comments are summarized here:

- Trespass and competition on Native lands have resulted in fewer opportunities for subsistence activities.
- Increased use of trails (including 17(b) trails), and particularly large rigs using trails, is resulting in impacts that directly or indirectly effect subsistence resources.
- The State's Tier II subsistence permit system is not user-friendly and permits are hard to get, particularly for younger people.
- Subsistence is about sharing and other activities besides hunting.
- Ahtna people do not waste subsistence resources. They use it all.
- OHVs make hunting harder for those without one.
- Caribou are waiting longer to cross through pipeline/utility corridor area because of Tier II hunting pressure. The Federal hunt allows longer season and needs to be maintained.
- Elders can hunt in the pipeline/utility corridor because of easy access and ability to take any bull moose.

Almost all substantive comments received opposed the revocation of PLO 5150 and subsequent transfer to the State of Alaska. Reasons for opposition focused on federal management of the area as a subsistence hunting unit, but there was also concern expressed about recreation management and federal oversight of the pipeline if the pipeline/utility corridor was transferred to the State. Resolutions opposing the revocation were received by Ahtna, Inc., local tribal governments, and the Southcentral and Southeastern Advisory Councils. Environmental Protection Agency and the National Park Service also opposed the action.

Those in favor of the revocation of PLO 5150 were Alaska Miner's Association, Alaska Outdoor Council, and the State of Alaska.

c) Slana

Most commentors voiced opposition to disposal of lands in the Slana area on a large scale, competitive bid basis. Reasons for opposition included: 1) The need for BLM to focus its management efforts on cleaning up the unauthorized use and associated

resource impacts from the 80's settlement in the area; 2) lack of infrastructure in the area to support more people; 3) lack of resources in the area, leading to competition for those already there; and 4) resource impacts that have occurred and are still occurring as a result of settlement in the area. Opposition was voiced by Mentasta village, Chistochina, and Ahtna, Inc. as well as Slana residents. There was some support for using selective disposal for cleaning up unauthorized use.

d) Withdrawals

Those opposed to the revocation of ANCSA d(1) withdrawals cite the need to retain protective measures, particularly against mineral development. There were some comments that expressed confusion over the purpose of the ANCSA d(1) withdrawals and the effects that revoking them would have. There was also some question of the relationship between decisions made in this RMP and the State-wide ANCSA d(1) withdrawal review.

The State of Alaska and Alaska Miners Association both strongly oppose retention of ANCSA d(1) withdrawals.

5. Vegetation Management

a) General Vegetation Management and Forestry Practices

In general, there is local support for habitat improvement, particularly for moose habitat, through prescribed burning. Most commentors supported small-scale commercial sales to support local demand, and comments supported providing areas for personal firewood gathering. There were concerns expressed about impacts from commercial timber sales and questions about clarity of the proposed scale of commercial sales being proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS.

b) Fire Management

Few substantive comments.

6. Minerals

a) General Minerals, Geology, and Minerals Occurrence, Potential, and Administration

Alaska Miners Association asked for more detail in mineral potential and in discussion of major exploration projects in the area. Many other comments opposed the opening of 80% of the area in the preferred alternative through removal of ANCSA d(1) withdrawals in the preferred alternative. There are comments about concerns over mineral development impacts on water quality, soils, wildlife habitat, fisheries, and recreation, particularly in the Tangle Lakes area.

Some commentors felt that the analysis presented in the Draft RMP/EIS did an inadequate job of considering impacts from mineral development. Others questioned how determinations were made on which areas to make open to mineral development. There were a couple of comments about the perceived lack of coverage in the Draft RMP/EIS of coalbed methane development and coal.

d) Areas proposed as open or closed to mineral development

Most commentors were opposed to the opening of 80% of the area to mineral development in the preferred alternative. Some commentors felt that the range of alternatives is inadequate in consideration of this issue (there should be more area closed in Alternative C). Some commentors questioned the adequacy of the impacts analysis relative to mineral development.

7. Subsistence/Social and Economic Conditions

a) Subsistence, ANILCA 810 Analysis

This analysis generated numerous substantive comments (46). Several commentors (including the State of Alaska) felt that the background information, presented in Chapter III, on subsistence activities, resources, and use patterns was inadequate. Some commentors also felt the Chapter IV analysis and 810 Analysis were inadequate and did not do a thorough enough job in portraying impacts to subsistence from mineral development, other resource development activities, and OHV use. There were several editorial comments, including from the State of Alaska. The State suggested re-wording

to clarify federal/State roles in subsistence management and questioned the future federal role in subsistence management.

Alaska Outdoor Council pointed out that the local ADF&G biologists have cited no specific or significant impacts to subsistence resources as a result of OHV use in the area.

Numerous comments were gathered through spoken testimony on the issue of subsistence and the role that it plays in the lives of Alaska Natives and rural Alaska residents. Although many of these comments were not substantive, their content depicts the importance of the Federal Subsistence Program in the daily lives of those it serves. Excerpts representative of these testimonies are included below.

- "A lot of people in the area, in the Copper River Basin, for years, have not gotten a hunting permit under the [State of Alaska] Tier II system, but a lot of urban people do. So we know that that's kind of working against the local subsistence hunting." (BLM 2005d)
- "[I] know like a lot of other people, like a lot of other youths in my life, it's something that they learned how to survive on. And the elders, they teach us youth to survive on hunting and berry picking . . . [W]e survive on hunting and this [revocation of PLO 5150] will just like kind of destroy our tradition[.]" (BLM 2005d)
- "[T]heir [State of Alaska's] season closed on September 20th, and every years it seems like the last three years, I know, they [caribou] migrate through there after that season. So people from the local areas using this rural preference get permit to hunt caribou there." (BLM 2005d)
- "I know that predominately a lot of locals in that time do take animals and, you know, in our culture is that most of the young people share those animals with the elders. They bring them in and share the, . So it will have a huge impact in these villages if that 5150 is revoked." (BLM 2005d)

b) Social and Economic Conditions and Environmental Justice

Few comments were received here (12 substantive). Most economic comments focused on the lack of economic information presented in the Draft RMP/EIS on Copper River salmon, particularly commercial fisheries. Alaska Miners Association asked for more discussion and analysis of the economic benefits of mineral development.

8. RMP/EIS Process

a) General Process

These comments covered a wide variety of topics. Several commentors felt strongly that BLM needs more money in order to carry out its management intent, particularly in monitoring and inventory and in enforcement. Several commentors stated that if PLO 5150 is revoked (as is proposed in Alternative B) that new analysis would be needed to consider impacts to recreation in particular. There were questions about implementation level planning—how it would be prioritized and how much public involvement would occur. The Alaska Outdoor Council and members of the Alaska Access Alliance stated that this planning effort should be deferred until State and ANCSA entitlements are met. They also felt that State-selected lands should not be included in this planning effort. A couple commentors (including EPA) expressed concern about the public's ability to comment on the plan with GFO's website down.

b) Concerns with NEPA adequacy

The following comments were included:

- There was inadequate consideration of critical elements.
- The cumulative impacts analysis is inadequate. Specific omissions were noted.
- A full range of alternatives was not considered. The feeling is that Alternative C does not represent a true "conservation" alternative.
- No alternatives were considered on several issues, including Wild and Scenic Rivers, consideration of a Copper River ACEC, wilderness, and others.
- A watershed approach should be utilized, particularly for cumulative effects.

c) Public Involvement including MOU development

Nineteen substantive comments were received on this topic. There were numerous comments from Ahtna and Ahtna shareholders about the desire to work with BLM on cooperative agreements covering many facets of implementation of the plan. A couple commentors felt that the review period on the Draft RMP/EIS was too short. Some felt that there could have been better notification prior to public meetings. Several Ahtna shareholders emphasized the need to tribal entities to be referred to on a government-to-government basis. EPA recommends a description of public outreach efforts and a description of how public comments were used in the planning process.

d) New Alternative Proposals

Alaska Outdoor Council and Alaska Access Alliance commented that Alternative A should be amended to include the State's Generally Allowed Uses relative to OHV management. There were several comments asking for consideration of a Copper River ACEC. And several commentors asked for the addition of the McCallum Creek drainage for consideration as a non-motorized use area.

e) Maps

Ahtna Inc. and several Ahtna shareholders requested removal of R.S. 2477 routes as depicted on the trail map in the Draft RMP/EIS. Other commentors asked for more detail on maps and for specific items to be included on maps.

9. General/Other

a) General (crossing multiple categories)

These comments covered various topics. Most commented on the Draft RMP/EIS coverage (or perceived lack of coverage) of navigable waters and Native allotments.

b) Education

All comments were supportive of more education, particularly related to 17(b) easements.

c) Management of Selected Lands

Most commentors felt that BLM should take a more proactive role in management of selected lands, while Alaska Miners Association and Alaska Outdoor Council feel that proactive management of selected lands by BLM is inappropriate.

D. Response to Individual Comments

This section contains responses to specific comments, organized by the major seven issues used throughout the document. Some general categories were also included beyond the seven issues, to facilitate topics brought up the content analysis. Comment letters were assigned numbers when they were received and these numbers are used in this section of the document so that reviewers can easily find their comment and how we responded to it. Following the specific responses to comments is an index of comment letter numbers and the name associated with it as a cross reference for reviewers to find their individual comments. The index also shows which page numbers contain comments and responses to comments for each comment letter number that was assigned. Organizations and government entities are listed by the organization or the government agency rather than by the signature to the submission.

1. TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL TRAVEL MANAGEMENT		
0164-20	Separate out references to "selected" lands into Native-selected and State-selected as we have different views on the management of OHVs on these lands.	Although the State of Alaska and native groups have differing views on the management of OHVs, BLM's management of OHVs on selected lands is the same regardless of the selecting entity. Both the State and native groups have the opportunity to work with the BLM to more actively manage OHV use on lands they have selected. Because the management actions described are the same regardless of the selecting entity, it is logical to reference all "selected" lands as one category when referring to OHV management. Travel Management Areas that are predominantly Native-selected land (Chistochina-Cantwell Area described in the Draft RMP/EIS in pages 40 and 47) have different implementation-level decisions than those predominantly State-selected.
0310-1	Alternative "A" is the best alternative since it does not impose additional restrictions on access. I support this alternative revised so that it matches the State of Alaska's "Generally Allowed Uses on State Land" policy.	Alternatives C and D analyze the effects of adopting criteria consistent with "Generally Allowed Uses on State Land" (11 AAC 96.020 and 11 AAC 96.025) for interim management of OHVs on State- and Native-selected lands. Alternative A (the No Action Alternative) is presented in the document to consider the effects of managing under a predominantly "open" OHV designation. We will not revise Alternative A in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS but could consider a combination of Alternatives A and D in the final decision.
0385-2	Another thing, you know, I was concerned about is the need to monitor vehicles and traffic, you know, in the streams, in our streams, especially I'm thinking of Chitina areas and the habitat in our whole area, you know.	The Draft RMP/EIS, page 33 describes Inventory and Monitoring Common to All Action Alternatives and states that "inventory and assessment will continue...to identify all existing trails and assess trail density and resource impacts."

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	TRANSPORTATION AND FACILITIES	
0010-8	I'm concerned about any construction of road in new areas or access without first talking about trespass issue and the affect on wildlife and fish.	Alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS consider a different range of areas that would be excluded from consideration for issuance of rights-of-way, based on specific resource concerns. These are presented in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 107-109. Potential effects of road construction on soils, water quality, and vegetation are discussed in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 399, 402, 410, 414, 425, and 427. Required Operating Procedures developed to mitigate impacts in areas where roads would be permitted are described in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 610-621. Consideration of potential trespass needs to be considered in consultation during implementation level planning.
0044-1	On many maps, the area where "my" land (USS 4339) is located, east of the Susitna River bridge and above Susitna Lodge, seems to have many designations. Am I correct to assume that it has no planned transportation restrictions and is planned to be open to a variety of mining options? If so, can a land "owner" like myself request a buffer zone around the private property to avoid conflicts with other land use? The reason I enjoy being on USS 4339 is its quietness and remoteness from major development.	The area around your private land is State-selected. For OHV management, Alternative C would limit OHVs to designated trails, while Alternative D would encourage OHV users to utilize existing trails while lands are selected, and would designate trails if lands are retained in Federal ownership. Under Alternatives A and B no OHV restrictions would apply. Alternative C would maintain withdrawals to prevent mineral development, while Alternatives B and D would allow mineral development if lands are retained in federal ownership, subject to Required Operating Procedures described in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 610-626. No buffer zones around private lands are considered.
0044-18	The Denali highway corridor does have many existing pull-outs already degraded. It makes sense to develop those with trash dumpsters (bear proof of course) or, at least, signs regarding proper disposal and storage of food and trash, and other traveler services.	The Draft RMP/EIS, pages 57,59, and 62, considers a range of alternatives for facility development along the Denali Highway.
0044-20	The Denali Highway will retain its quality experience by remaining gravel. It might last longer if the size of vehicles - tractor trailers and tour buses - could be restricted or pay for road use.	The Denali Highway is a State Highway maintained by Alaska Department of Transportation. The decision of whether or not to pave the Denali Highway is ultimately a State decision.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0057-3	They talk about the right-of-way applications and it's part of the process, however, there's a certain amount of responsibility of BLM to see that these off-road -- or these roads going to these public lands are accessible safely. Besides my homestead area that I'm primarily concerned with, there's another recreational, Little Tok Drainage area, and they need a road that goes in where people could park and take off on trails, either by foot or by ATV at a certain point, but they need a proper access on some of these trails to get to see these resources. And it's not exploiting the resources when they have these roads, but it's actually going to add to protecting the resources, such as law enforcement, such as fire protection and public services.	Applications for rights-of-way would continue to be processed by the Glennallen Field Office, under any alternative. Alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 107-109 consider a different range of areas that would be excluded from consideration for issuance of rights-of-way, based on specific resource concerns. The Slana area as an exclusion area for right-of-way issuance is not considered under any alternative.
0164-18	Road Construction - Ahtna Inc. requires consultation regarding the development of roads that would have an impact on our lands and resources.	Please see response to comment 0010-8.
0169-1	The populations of South Central Alaska is increasing. This increase will need recreational development to meet its needs. This development should consist of new trails and improvements to existing trails. Without new development, we only have saturation of existing facilities.	In the Draft RMP/EIS under Implementation-level Considerations, pages 42-48, Alternatives A and B allow new trails to develop with increased use. Alternative D considers new trail construction in specific travel management areas, consistent with objectives.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0173-5	The BLM should work in partnership with the Mineral Exploration Industry to identify new roads that would provide the BLM with better fire fighting, access, recreation and hunters with better back country access and mineral explorers with access to identified mineral occurrences. Mineral Exploration companies are willing to spend money to create roads that can be used by all residents of the State. However, we would like to work closer with the local governing authorities to assure the placement of the roads will benefit all users.	Alternative B anticipates an increase in road construction and considers effects (including positive effects) of such an increase. Alternative D also anticipates slight increase in road construction. Partnerships, coordination, and consultation related to road-building, mitigating impacts, and providing benefits, would be considered during implementation-level planning.
0175-3	For all management areas with alternatives including "Construction of new roads" and "Rights of Way," and for Issue 1, Travel Management, we request recognition of valid existing rights either in the table or as a footnote. In addition, for conservation system units (CSUs) under ANILCA (Gulkana SRMA and Delta SRMA), the alternatives for the above mentioned categories should recognize the provisions under Title XI of ANILCA. Specifically, Title XI includes the option of considering future transportation and utility systems across CSUs.	The Draft RMP/EIS has been changed to recognize valid existing rights. These include the following sections and pages within the Proposed RMP/Final EIS: alternative descriptions for the Gulkana WSR Corridor and Delta WSR Corridor Travel Management Areas on pages 43, 45, 47, 51, and 53; Table 3 on page 58; and discussion of right-of-way exclusion areas on 122.
0175-23	Page 49, Travel management summary. We request the preferred alternative include the development of more facilities for recreational use, including increased trail development and improvements and waste management facilities, in order to help keep public lands clean. A proposal to develop these facilities is only included under Alternative B.	As mentioned in your comment, increased facilities to handle impacts are considered in Alternative B. However, Alternative D also considers increasing recreational facilities along the Denali Highway over existing levels to facilitate increasing visitor use. Alternative D also considers new trail construction in specific travel management areas, consistent with objectives. This information is presented in the Draft RMP/EIS under Implementation-level Considerations on pages 42-48.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-35	Road building would cause significant negative impacts to watersheds. Subgrade roads in particular cause substantial damage. Please do not permit them.	Alternative C considers 3,270,000 acres where no new road construction would be permitted. Alternative D also considers some areas closed to new road construction, based on specific resource protection. Potential effects of road construction on soils, water quality, and vegetation are discussed in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 399, 402, 410, 414, 425, and 427. Required Operating Procedures developed to mitigate impacts in areas where roads would be permitted are described in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 610-621.
0329-188	Please use quantitative statistics in the Travel Management section. How many miles of what kinds of roads are there? What is a "moderate" amount of road construction? (p.377) What is a "slight" increase in road construction? (p.421) The Draft EIS says cumulative impacts from continued OHV trail proliferation would be "minor to insignificant," (p.539) while the Management Situation Analysis says it is an "extreme concern." What do these words mean?	Miles of existing roads have been added, see the Proposed RMP/Final EIS Table 14 page 184. The terms "moderate" and "slight" were used because these are predicted amounts based on lands available for potential development. We have quantified these terms in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on pages 414 and 415 as well quantified why the expected effect would be "minor to insignificant" in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
OHV MANAGEMENT AND TRAILS		
0006-2	I strongly believe that non-snow ORV use should occur not on all existing trails, but on designated trails only. Many existing trails are unplanned, social trails and are in inappropriate locations with regard to soils, vegetation, hydrology, fisheries, wildlife, scenic vistas, wilderness, social conflicts, etc. BLM should review its inventory of existing trails and designate for continuing use only those that are appropriately located; that may be a relatively small number of the presently "existing" trails. This makes sense from both a resource and an enforcement perspective. How will BLM prevent the proliferation of "existing" trails, and how will it prove that a rider on a trail created after the plan is implemented knew that, although the trail existed on the ground, it was in fact an illegal post-plan trail?	OHV management decisions described under Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative) would set the stage for taking the actions you describe, particularly on lands managed long-term by the BLM. It does this by designating the majority of lands as "limited" to OHVs, which gives us numerous options for management, based on on-going site-specific trail inventory and assessment and public input during implementation-level planning within the next five years.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0006-3	Even Alternative C provides an inadequate number of areas where only non-motorized recreational use is allowed. Balance and fairness require that additional non-motorized areas be designated (under Alternative C, the most protective alternative, only 4% of the area is closed to summer motorized use, and 3% to winter motorized use; this is hardly balanced, and of course the preferred alternative is even less fair); people are not locked out of such areas--machines, not people, would be prohibited.	BLM feels that a balance in recreational experiences and a mix of motorized and non-motorized opportunities can be achieved in many areas without regulation, by maintaining existing primitive recreation opportunities. Current Recreation Opportunity Spectrum inventory shows that 63% of BLM-managed lands offer a primitive recreation experience as shown in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 174.
0006-4	Although the ecological impacts of snowmachine use are less obvious than those of summer use, they are not non-existent. Clean air and water are affected, wildlife can be stressed, travel where there is inadequate frost and snow cover can harm vegetation and soils, and scenic snowscapes can be degraded by large mazes of vehicle tracks for as far as the eye can see.	BLM acknowledges possible snowmachine impacts in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 171. BLM allows for possible snowmachine regulation in implementation considerations for specific areas in Alternatives C and D, based on specific resource concerns in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 33-50.
0006-5	Providing quiet areas in all seasons, and providing high quality opportunities for non-motorized recreation (where both uses are allowed, motorized use, which is incompatible with quiet use, becomes dominant and displaces the vast majority of quiet users, or at best provides only a low quality opportunity), enhances both mental and physical health.	Thanks for the comment. The Draft RMP/EIS considers alternatives that designated up to 281,000 acres as non-motorized (see Draft RMP/EIS, Alternative C, page 49). In addition, described management objectives for recreation under Alternatives C and D (Draft RMP/EIS, pages 58-64) maintain primitive recreation opportunities over as much as 63% of the BLM-managed lands in the planning area. This represents a large area where, at the least, motorized encounters are rare or limited to established trails, even in the winter.
0006-7	Jet skis should be prohibited in most locations. They are nothing but thrillcraft, almost entirely used for non-functional purposes, excessively noisy, unusually irritating because of the frequent change of pitch, and harmful to fish and wildlife when they invade riparian areas.	While this may be a consideration in some implementation-level plans, the decision, on any navigable waterways, ultimately lies with the State of Alaska.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0006-8	Where airboats (which are incredibly loud) can be used should be strictly limited. For most purposes, other motorized, less noisy and intrusive craft (let alone non-motorized boats) are entirely adequate alternatives to airboats. Some argue that airboats are necessary in some places during the hunting season; if this is in fact the case in some locations; such use should be limited to the hunting season.	Use of airboats has been and will continue to be considered in implementation level planning (Delta and Gulkana rivers, for example). However, the ultimate decision on whether or not to allow airboat use on navigable waterways belongs to the State of Alaska.
0006-10	The State of Alaska does an abysmal job of managing motorized recreation on general lands; the results are land and resource degradation and user conflicts. BLM, by deciding to be a responsible manager of motorized recreation, could be a model for the State and could create an alternative, responsible scheme for the management of this use in the region. If quiet, relatively unspoiled lands are not going to be found on state lands, at least the BLM can provide them.	BLM's goal, as stated in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 55, is to manage to maintain a diversity of recreation opportunities. Certainly a key to managing for a primitive recreation experience is the management of motorized use. By taking the management direction indicated in Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative), BLM sets the stage to proactively manage to maintain a range of recreation experiences, particularly on lands managed long-term by the BLM. In some cases this can be done in a non-regulatory fashion by controlling un-managed proliferation of motorized trails. In other cases, particularly where use trends are increasing, some regulation may be required.
0006-13	In addition to other provisions, C makes the Tangle Lakes, one of the gems of the planning area, one of the few waters in the region that would be free from the noise and pollution of motorized watercraft.	Under Alternative C, BLM would recommend to the State that no motorized watercraft be permitted on Tangle Lakes. This wording has been changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on pages 68, 71, and 495. This is a management action that would be consistent with objectives for the area described under Alternatives C and D and would be considered in implementation-level planning, subject to coordination with the State and Native Corporations and public involvement.
0006-17	You say that you desire to maintain a diversity of recreational opportunities. I think actually that you need to restore some non-motorized recreation opportunities, there are very few of them any longer, of high quality, on BLM's lands.	We disagree. Our Recreation Opportunity Spectrum inventory indicates 4,787,000 acres that currently provide a primitive recreation experience, where exposure to motorized use is rare to non-existent. While this may decrease somewhat during the winter season, snowmachine use in much of the Copper Basin is limited to winter trails due to heavy vegetation.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0006-19	I think you need to do some management in the wintertime also, and not just on heli-skiing, but also snowmachine use and, again, there should be some areas that are closed to both snowmachine use and heli-skiing use for both recreationists and to protect wildlife who are stressed in the winter and are seeking some refuges where they're not going to be, you know, driven into more restricted areas or habitat.	By designating most BLM-managed lands under a "limited" OHV class, the Preferred Alternative sets the stage to do some snowmachine management in implementation-level planning. In addition, Alternative C would close 281,000 acres to snowmachine use, except for access for subsistence hunting.
0016-2	I think like some of these roads they shouldn't be out there in May because they just tear it up is what they do and it's just soft, and I think they should close it for about three weeks in the spring.	Specific seasonal closures will be considered in implementation-level planning, as indicated in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 33-50.
0017-2	Another thing I'd like to talk about, which hasn't been mentioned too much tonight, is how you propose to manage both ATVs and off-road vehicles, big CAT rigs and six-wheelers. Right now, if we were to go with Alternative A, nothing would change and you wouldn't be able to limit some of that use that's causing a lot of trail damage up in the Talkeetna's. At the meeting in Chistochina earlier, I went to listen to concerns, and folks are really concerned with both ATV and off-road vehicle damage, so I would suggest that you go with the alternative that gives you some tools to manage that, and that would be C. In there you've proposed these special recreational management areas, five of them, and that's great. I mean I really think that should be in the preferred, in the final, I think you should go with that. That will give you tools, people can be involved. It will affect both Native and State selected lands, and I think that's the position that would make you a good land steward for the interim, for those selected lands.	Thank you for the comment. We agree that both Alternatives C and D give BLM the most management options for management of OHVs in future implementation.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0020-17	The limited and closed areas proposed for the off-road vehicles, we just don't want those big rigs up there. We watch big rigs, mud-boggers, you know, whatever they call them, go across our trails and destroy our fish, but they're also destroying our--how we feel about ourselves. We can't protect our lands, do you know what that does? If it was your land that you couldn't protect for your children and grandchildren, and you feel this sense of hopelessness. So I'd like to have those reworded to where we're starting to protect our resource values.	Please see response to comment 0164-17 regarding weight limitations.
0020-22	We need reparation on our trails. Some of those trails are a mile wide. I read your report, you gave it up to 100 feet, I'm talking a mile wide that they've destroyed our lands, destroyed the watersheds, destroyed the ground, the vegetation. You have lofty goals but you know what that land's being destroyed, so you need multi-billion dollar budgets to repair them now.	The Draft RMP/EIS on page 168 acknowledges that trail braiding is occurring and the impacts to soils, vegetation, and water quality. The documented resource impacts that are occurring drive the need for BLM to propose changing OHV management from the status quo to a more proactive role in trail and OHV management. These proposed changes are discussed and analyzed under Alternatives C and D in the Draft RMP/EIS. We agree that an increased operating budget will be necessary to implement even a portion of the needed trail maintenance.
0020-23	Many of the existing trails are currently illegal and not enforced. So some of the regulations you're wanting to keep status quo, you cannot keep an illegal trail status quo, that's not acceptable.	The only "illegal" trails that currently exist on BLM-managed lands are unauthorized trails within the Tangle Lakes Archeological District. Otherwise, all BLM managed lands within the planning area (except the Gulkana and Delta river corridors) are currently open and cross-country travel is permitted. Adopting the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) of the Draft RMP/EIS would change this situation by designating most areas as limited to OHVs.
0022-2	[W]hen you talk about restricted use for off-road vehicles, why don't we include aircraft when we talk about this?	The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulates aircraft. However, BLM is involved in aircraft landing areas, particularly in permitted or commercial uses, such as heli-skiing. There are specific proposals for regulation of helicopter-supported activities within the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 59, 63, 83, and 85.
0026-3	One alternative I would like to see is only limited to ATV use only on the trails because a lot of our trails have been damaged by a lot of these vehicles and track rigs.	Under Alternatives C and D, most areas would be managed under a "limited" designation, where trails would be designated or OHVs would be encouraged to use existing trails. Specific trail designations or other limitations would occur during implementation-level planning.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0027-1	So the big thing is the management of trails and working with the communities and the villages, with those, to come up with a plan that will work for everyone and not just target certain populations.	This is clearly BLM's intent under Alternatives C and D. See Draft RMP/EIS, pages 40 and 47, for the Chistochina-Cantwell Area, where it is stated, "Where immediate concern exists regarding protection of traditional and cultural areas or sites, the BLM would work with the Native or village corporations to inventory, designate, and post trails to avoid negatively impacting such sites."
0034-1	I think that BLM should take a more proactive approach in management like limiting the ORV size to 1,500 pounds. I say this because you see the Klutina Road, that was a trail, now it's a road. The same thing is happening in Chistochina. The Chistochina trail is now becoming like the Klutina, a road. And I feel very strongly about this.	For ANCSA 17(b) easements, the reserved uses of the easement are listed in the interim conveyance or patent documents. If the easement is a 25-foot easement, there is an upper limit of 3,000 lbs. Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) for OHVs. 50 trail and 60 foot road easements allow GVWs higher than 3,000 lbs. For trails other than 17(b) easements, Alternatives C and D consider weight limits for specific travel management areas under Implementation-level Considerations in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 35-48.
0035-1	The pleasure of working hard to travel through this spectacular country using one's own power is a large part of the reward of skiing and climbing, and can be greatly compromised by the activities of snowmachines in the vicinity. Unfortunately, the presence of this type of country and access to it is fairly limited. While I am not a fan of regulations and restrictions, I feel that designating and enforcing a "no motorized transportation" zone is the best solution to the growing conflict between motorized and non-motorized users. Please designate all drainages flowing into Augustana Creek as "non-motorized." In addition, I would like to see the following popular skiing/climbing areas designated "non-motorized" to help balance the extremely high levels of snowmachine use that occur to the south: Castner Glacier; Fels Glacier; Canwell Glacier; McCallum Creek and Glacier and West Gulkana Glacier	Alternative C would close the Augustana and Canwell sub-units to motorized use year-round. This area includes portions of the Fels, Canwell, Castner, and Augustana glaciers. Alternative D would close a portion of these units to snowmachine use. Under Alternatives A and B, they would be managed as is.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0035-4	That area [Augustana Creek on the west side of the Richardson Highway in the Alaska Range] has been a favorite skiing and climbing destination for me and many Fairbanksians for quite a while now. And as of yet it's still been more or less unfound by the hordes of snowmachiners that use the country just a little ways to the south of there. If it starts to be used for snowmachiners I'm afraid that it wouldn't be nearly as attractive for those of us who get there under our own steam.	Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS propose this area as closed to snowmachines, except when used for access for subsistence hunting.
0038-2	Within that area, if we're talking trails, I have not seen any figures or facts on actually wherever there is trails, how much area those trails actually take up. I think in these vast areas of land, that basically these trails are just little slivers. They're not even--if you take the whole vast area they're not even really noticeable. If we actually did honestly of saying how much area is directly impacted by trails then there might be another category of how much area could be potentially impacted and so forth.	As stated in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 160, 720 of approximately 1,200 miles of trail on BLM-managed lands have been mapped and assessed for resource impacts. A map of these trails is presented in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 163. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS on page 194 has been edited to include some representative trail densities, based on trail assessment work conducted in 2003 and 2005. These figures show that trail densities in the planning area are comparable with those in parts of the Lower 48.
0040-1	I believe the BLM needs to maintain these trails [in the Copper Basin] by adding planks to help minimize erosion.	BLM already uses a variety of trail-hardening techniques on BLM-managed lands in the planning area. Specific considerations for trail maintenance will be considered in implementation-level planning, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 33.
0042-3	It seems that of the alternatives you have available, there is consistent preference for motorized use and for development. It would be nice if there was a more balanced proposal that would give satisfaction to both motorized users and developers, and to quiet users and people who want an area to get away from development. I would also like to point out that this is in keeping with what local community members in the area prefer! I strongly support alternative C.	In the Draft RMP/EIS on page 174, Alternative C, BLM considers 281,000 acres of area that would be managed as non-motorized. BLM feels that there are numerous opportunities for primitive experiences on BLM-managed lands within the planning area, given that 69% of BLM-managed lands are currently classified as primitive within the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0043-1	I've hiked extensively in the Rainbow Mountain/Canwell/Gulkana Glacier area and feel it offers such an excellent array of recreational opportunities as to seem obvious its preservation is the wisest course. BLM's suggestion of increased snowmobile usage and decreased non-motorized vehicle areas is contrary to the best use of the area. Sufficient snowmobile use already exists elsewhere in the area (as well as throughout Alaska) and it behooves BLM and other agencies, both state and federal, to save some areas for those who can enjoy Alaska on foot.	BLM's preferred alternative proposes that portions of the Augustana, Canwell, Fels, and Castner Glaciers be managed as a seasonally non-motorized area (no snowmachines except if used for subsistence hunting). The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been edited, based on the strength of public comment, to include the McCallum Creek drainage in this area on page 73 and Map 9 on page 81. The Proposed RMP drops the Augustana drainage, based on proposed modification of PLO 5150 under this alternative to allow conveyance to the State.
0044-16	No new trails or staging areas should be developed along Windy Creek because of its critical habitat status. To add a trail along the creek would invite erosion and degrade the experience now possible in the area. The existing well-used gravel road is sufficient.	New trails or staging areas are not considered in any alternative for this area. Alternatives C and D would limit OHV use to designated trails in the area, which would minimize the potential for un-managed trail proliferation in the area.
0044-27	Alternative D generally does not provide adequate protection for the highly-valued wildlife and habitat and visual resources. Unrestricted OHV use (as per ADFG, 1990, stated in draft) will mean more unnecessary trails and more fragmented habitat.	Alternative D prescribes a "limited" designation for OHVs on almost all BLM-managed lands. For unencumbered BLM lands, this would result in designated trails, with designated trails located to provide access while minimizing resource impacts. For State or Native-selected lands, this would mean OHV users would be encouraged to utilize existing trails. BLM does not consider this "unrestricted OHV use" and feels it represents a significant change from existing OHV management, which is mostly unrestricted.
0046-1	There should be provisions for creating new trails. An application process similar to that used for new roads.	BLM clearly intends to consider construction of new trails, as described under Implementation-level considerations in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 33-50. These implementation level planning efforts will include public involvement.
0046-2	The amount of land classified as "open" to OHVs is too extreme, from mostly open to none open. The plan should offer some areas as open.	Alternatives A and B consider most areas managed as “open” to OHVs.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0046-3	Management of State selected lands. Alt D specifies OHVs as limited to existing trails. The State's Generally Allowed Uses allows the creation / construction of trails up to six feet wide using only hand tools. The plan proposal appears to be in conflict w/State rules.	The Draft RMP/EIS, under Alternatives C and D, would adopt OHV policy consistent with the State's statute, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 36 and 41. The State's Generally Allowed Uses (11 AAC 96.020) also includes "Conditions for Generally Allowed Uses" (11 AAC 96.025) which states that "vehicles must use existing roads and trails whenever possible." So, the BLM's proposed policy is not in conflict with the State's statute.
0046-4	The summary table should clearly state that the reference to OHVs exclude snowmobiles because this is different from the regular definition of OHV.	Thanks for the comment. The Table 3 in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on page 58 has been changed in order to clarify that point.
0047-3	With the formation of new and hardened trails instead of closures and eliminations, the problems you see happening now would resolve themselves.	We agree that trail maintenance and routing trails on suitable soils and vegetation is a part of the OHV management equation. Specific trails maintenance and routing will be considered in implementation-level planning as described in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 33.
0050-2	[I] continue to support Alternative A, as this gives us the most amount of access, continues to work at what is far less restrictive than the other alternatives. One of the reasons that we continue to look at Alternative A as our biggest preference, is that, this is Alaska, this isn't the Lower 48 where they have as many problems as they are having with access there. Up here, there's still an awful lot of lands to be developed, there's a lot of trails that need to be developed, you know, we're talking about a state that has relatively a small road surface area in comparison to other states that aren't anywhere near its size.	Thanks for the comment. In the Draft RMP/EIS on page 32, BLM's first stated goal for Travel Management is to "manage trails to provide access to public lands, recreation, and subsistence opportunities." BLM is committed to maintaining access but also to start managing trails to minimize resource impacts that are occurring and documented in the Draft RMP/EIS. While it is true that Alaska is a large State with very low road densities, trail density in this area might surprise you. Information has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on page 194, based on 2005 trail inventory, that shows trail densities in the area.
0051-1	So on behalf of the non-organizational structure, and enjoying recreation and wildlife and sightseeing and that sort of thing, strongly agree that Alternative A should be kept as the main management approach to allowing free unencumbered transportation.	Thanks for the comment. The Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of travel management options, including varying amounts of areas open, limited, or closed to Off Highway Vehicles.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0052-1	I would like to see a more detailed map of designated or limited trail before this is decided on. And I think that the BLM land should be in line with State use as defined and there should be a consistency between State and Federal government concerning recreational use.	The Draft RMP/EIS on page 33 describes each area designated in this RMP as limited or closed to OHVs would have an implementation level plan completed. A complete description of what this would entail (including public involvement) is included. The BLM has coordinated closely with the State of Alaska in this planning process, particularly on State-selected lands, to assure a high degree of management consistency wherever possible (see Draft RMP/EIS, page 564).
0058-1	We're primarily concerned with the off-road vehicle access because long-term Alaska residents are by length of residents older, by necessity, need off-road vehicles to access any distance from maintained roadways. So we are interested in maintaining access to the Mat-Su areas of Alaska not on the maintained road.	Please see response to comment 0093-2. BLM will continue to provide access to hunting, subsistence, and recreational opportunities.
0059-1	ACE supports areas of quiet recreation in the Canwell and Augustana subunits and would ask that BLM take a look at adding the Tonsina and Tiekel areas to OHV and ATV limitations.	Motorized restrictions are proposed and analyzed for these areas as part of alternatives C and D.
0060-12	For the most part, alternative D in the draft plan follows the state's precedent by requiring that OHVs stay on existing trails "whenever possible." While some OHV users, particularly in the Anchorage area, seem to feel that this is an unwarranted limitation, from our perspective it seems vague at best, and undoubtedly difficult to enforce. It leaves 99.4% of lands open to OHVs while only 0.6% are closed. We strongly prefer alternative C, and feel that it represents a more equitable strategy, since it still leaves 96% of the planning area to OHVs and restricts those vehicles to designated trails in only half that area.	Your comment is noted. Please see response to comments 0331-18 and 0312-73 regarding enforcement.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0060-13	In addition to following the stipulations described in Alternative C, we recommend the following: In areas designated as limited to existing trails, trails should be surveyed and marked as soon as possible; The public should be educated regarding the OHV regulations through clear signs and other outreach efforts; Whenever possible, these regulations should be actively enforced; The additional closures under Alternative C within the Tonsina unit of the Tiekel Area should be implemented. Thus, the south unit would be closed year-round to motorized vehicles and the north unit would be closed seasonally from April 15 to October 15.	It is BLM's intent to conduct implementation-level planning on travel management units within the next five years, focusing first on long-term BLM managed lands. On other lands (State-selected), trail assessment work is continuing (400 miles were assessed in the summer/fall of 2005) and BLM intends to use education to inform the public about the benefits of using existing trails as well as the penalties associated with traveling off-trail and causing resource damage. Incorporation of the Tonsina sub-units are considered in Alternative C.
0064-1	With these large tracts of lands that you need to consider at least having some areas that are closed to motorized vehicles, is that, it seems the way society is going and motorized--one motorized vehicle can kind of ruin the day for a whole bunch of people by either ruining the trail and making it into a bog, which I've seen tens if not hundreds of miles of in a lot of places in the state, and non-motorized traffic can use an area for hundreds of years without destroying it.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers proposals that would close areas to motorized use (up to 281,000 acres in Alternative C), as well as management that would consider closure of specific trails to motorized use (see Draft RMP/EIS, Implementation-level Considerations, pages 33-50).
0067-2	I would say not to change things too much because the people that are making a living mining in some of these trails, not only that, the trails--some of the trails that are made, the animals use them too, especially in the winter, the snowmachine trails, you'll see moose tracks. It's a lot easier for them to survive and walk, it saves their energy when the snow has been packed for them, and you will see that.	The Draft RMP/EIS analyzes Alternatives (A and B) that would make very few changes to the current travel management.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0068-1	I would like to see the Denali Highway stay the same as it is. I don't think the snowmachiners are bothering the vegetation whatsoever. If they did there wouldn't be none on Summit at all. And I don't see where there should be any change on, at least, the snowmachiners in the wintertime because I don't think they're bothering anything.	Thanks for your opinion. Alternatives A and B would impose no additional restrictions on snowmachine use.
0070-1	I would like to see open snowmachine access. I don't really see a reason to limit snowmachining. It seems to me that most people stay to the open areas, they stay out of the willow, alder thickets, whatever, they're not going to thrash around in there so I don't see a whole lot of vegetation damage occurring. I think most people are going to limit their snowmachining to when there's enough snow to protect their machine but also to protect the vegetation.	Within the range of alternatives presented in the Draft RMP/EIS, very little area is considered for snowmachine restrictions (4% in Alternative C, 1% in Alternative D, 0% in Alternatives A and B). Where restrictions are proposed, they occur in areas currently experiencing very little snowmachine use, in order to maintain an existing non-motorized experience.
0070-4	If you're going to do restrictions on ATVs, you might do it in a manner that blocks--blocks up areas or areas where you would designate upland areas for ATV use and not necessarily restrict them to a single trail. And where maybe higher value wetlands, emergent wetlands or whatever, that in those areas you may consider restrictions, but, you know, trying your hardest to provide access to perhaps areas that people are trying to get to behind them, next to them or around them.	Travel management areas have been identified and mapped within the Draft RMP/EIS, with a general designation of open, limited, or closed to OHV use assigned. Within limited areas, implementation level planning will determine specific designated trails or restrictions that occur. At this level of planning, there will be consideration for allowance of off-trail use for game retrieval, etc.
0070-5	In high recreation areas along the Denali Highway there's probably a lot of areas that are mucked out, you may consider geotech work on some of those trails, or trying to reroute them to some of the upland areas to get people back to the areas they want to go to hunt fish, whatever.	Glennallen Field Office has already utilized these techniques for trail maintenance and hardening, particularly in the Tangle Lakes Archeological District. As described in the Draft RMP/EIS, Implementation-level Planning, page 33 we intend to continue this kind of trail maintenance and re-location, based on site-specific information and on-going trail assessment.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0077-3	I feel it's important to include a balanced approach to the use of ATVs in your management plan for the area. Quiet recreationists such as skiers, hikers, canoeists and climbers must be treated fairly in this plan. Please consider the following: Although there should have been more non-motorized areas designated in the Delta Range, the two Delta Range non-motorized areas that made it into the final round should remain in the plan.	See response to comment 0042-3. And…the Delta Range non-motorized areas are still considered within the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0078-1	[I]t is very important to have areas that are off limits to motorized vehicles. Please consider that 95% of Alaska is open to snowmachines. Please remember that there are many of us that value wild areas. Don't forget about our hopes and our wishes. I'm hoping the Castner, Fels & Augustana glaciers will be designated off limits to motorized use.	Please see response comment 0077-3.
0080-3	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends provisions with greater water quality, erosion, habitat, and fish and wildlife resource protection through ORV management. Local testimony emphasized concern about inadequate regulation of ORV/ATVs, with the result that stream crossings contaminate and degrade water quality, over use of trails leads to development into roads, roads/trails take people into stream headwaters where human waste and trash are inadequately disposed of, and unregulated access leads to encroachment on fish and game refuge habitat and adverse impacts on wildlife behavior patterns.	The Draft RMP/EIS also recognizes resource impacts associated with unregulated OHV use (see Draft RMP/EIS, Chapter 3, pages 182, 188, and 195). Documented resource impacts and the need to continue to provide for a diversity of recreational experiences drive the OHV proposals described in Alternatives C and D, where most BLM-managed lands are designated as limited to OHVs, with site-specific limitations to be determined in implementation level planning.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0092-1	I feel the need to point out that gross vehicle weight is NOT a good way to determine how much trail damage a vehicle is capable of inflicting. Pounds per square inch of contact surface would be a much better means of determining this. I own a Hagglund SUSV (small unit support vehicle) which is street legal but is considered to be an off-road vehicle. It has four tracks, each with a contact surface of 24" by 80". It weighs about 9000 pounds and with more than 7,500 square inches of track contact surface exerts about 1.2 pounds per square inch. Compare this to a highway vehicle weighing 9000 pounds with about 320 square inches of tire contact surface; that's about 25 pounds per square inch. Four wheelers have similar high weights and to complicate the issue, wheeled vehicles tend to almost constantly churn the trail surface in order to maintain forward momentum. Add the fact that track vehicles are capable of hauling multiple people and very heavy loads and it is obvious that damage from wheeled vehicles is an order of magnitude more significant.	We agree that it is impossible to generalize about impacts of "standard" 4-wheelers vs. tracked vehicles. Studies conducted along the Denali Highway in the early 80's showed that impacts to vegetation and soils from OHV use (including tracked rigs) varied widely based on soil and vegetation types. Concerns with tracked rigs often revolve around the width of trail they create, particularly through black spruce vegetation, and the subsequent development of road-like trails as a result.
0093-2	[Y]our plan will be limiting access and availability of natural outdoor activities. Who is going to enforce the laws on these new provisions? The state? Federal? And where is the money coming from? User fee?	We disagree. BLM's clearly stated goal for travel management is to "manage trails to provide access to public lands, recreation, and subsistence opportunities." (Draft RMP/EIS page 32). Proposals under the preferred alternative would ultimately prohibit the wide-open, cross-country travel that now occurs, by limiting OHVs to existing or designated trails. However, major existing access routes will not be closed. BLM will provide enforcement on BLM lands.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0097-6	[I]t is AQRC's [Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition] opinion that adopting the State's "Generally Allowed Uses" as BLM's standard for interpreting Limited on the selected lands , which constitute 5 of the 7 million acres covered by this Plan drastically undercuts the purpose of the Limited designation. The state's policy limits OHVs to existing trails "whenever possible". (We find the language used in the Plan's text and tables to be misleading and inaccurate when characterizing the state standard simply as limiting OHVs "to existing trails'".) The wholesale proliferation of trails on general state lands, and the widespread resource damage, shows this policy does not work-it does not restrict riders to existing trails. We believe the qualifying phrase acts as a license which gives permission to any rider to make a new trail whenever he/she wishes. Further, the inherent ambiguity of the language makes enforcement impossible.	Please see our response to comments 0006-2 and 0159-1.
0156-1	Ref page 34: This area [Copper Basin] has been used for years by both the state and federal subsistence hunters, any restrictions on ORV use would have a significant effect on the hunting.	The Draft RMP/EIS on page 34 recognizes the importance of trails for accessing subsistence resources, and states "all proposals for OHV management considered below would be consistent with section 811 of ANILCA…"

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0156-2	Ref. page 36: Any restriction on ORV use is not necessary; there is little use in this area until hunting starts. Designating trails for snow machines use in the West Fork area is also not needed. There is no biological proof that snow machines use in the West Fork are impacting moose. Putting restrictions on snow machines use would impact the area trappers, who are helping area moose by trapping wolves. Also any designation of those trails as public use trails would greatly impact local area trappers. As it could draw recreational snow machines to the area.	These are implementation-level considerations. The BLM is committed to working with the State (including DNR and ADF&G), Ahtna Native corporation, and the general public when this level of planning occurs.
0156-3	Ref. page 38: The Denali Highway area has always been used by ORV for hunting, fishing and recreational travel, there is no evidence that demands any immediate need to promulgate new regulations to significantly restrict the use of ORV and limiting ORV only to trails is also to restrictive. The use of ORV in most instances distributes the hunting pressure through out the area. Most of the area is high country and any damage by use would not be high.	While your assessment for the Denali Highway area may be correct for hunting and fishing use, BLM also is mandated to manage for recreational use. Our goals, objectives, and management intent for recreation are outlined in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 55-66. This includes the need to managed for a diversity of recreational experiences, which, in some areas, may require OHV regulation, such as described under Travel Management for the preferred alternative (D). We disagree that under current management and unlimited OHV use, "any damage by use would not be high" for the Denali Highway area. Our current trail assessments show extensive muck holes and braids of 100 feet or more on several trails in the area, including Butte Lake and Seattle Creek.
0156-4	Ref. page 39: Travel management plans C and D are too restrictive[.] … This is state, federal, private and native lands, any closing of federal land to ORV will place moose hunters and users on the state, private and native lands which could impact our game animals. Any regulations on ORV should be for specified length and reviewed at regular intervals.	We disagree. While trail management proposed in Alternatives C and D may cause some displacement of those looking for an "unregulated" experience, it may attract other users looking for maintained trails or non-motorized opportunities. Our use data shows no downward trend in motorized use within the Tangle Lakes Archeological District (where OHV travel is currently limited to designated trails). The area is still being utilized by hunters accessing both state and federal lands.
0156-5	[A]ny regulations should not be put in place with out local Fish & Game, the local advisory committee's, both State Board of Fish & Game, local users and the native Corporations are included in the planning effort.	BLM has included and received comment from all these entities during this planning process. Input from these entities will be invited and encouraged during implementation-level planning.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0156-6	Ref. page 375: Travel management, both C and D are too restrictive and offer no open ORV areas, this limits subsistence hunting. Primarily motorized sport and subsistence hunters use the area of Unit 13. This area is mostly non-road accessible and travel by ORV is one of the ways to spread hunters and users apart. The lands have with stood decades of motorized use without significant resource damage or lost of wild life.[sic]	Under Alternatives C and D, all areas would be managed under a "limited" OHV designation. This means, in most cases, that OHV travel would be limited to existing or designated trails, not that trails would be closed. BLM's intent is to limit unmanaged cross-country travel. It is not BLM's intent to stop considering the need for new trails…this is clear in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 33-50, where new construction of trails is discussed for several travel management areas under Implementation level considerations. We disagree with your assessment of significant resource damage, particularly to soils, vegetation, and water. Even ADF&G, in their 1996 report the Board of Game on ORV and snowmachine use in Alaska, stated "ORV use in [Unit] 13A west of Lake Louise has caused visible environmental degradation." Apparently their opinion has changed.
0156-7	Ref. page 375: C & D are too restrictive; the plan should protect the long-standing tradition of motorized access established many years ago. BLM needs to understand the increase demand for ORV use. A key designation would be to make preservation of ORV use as high a priority as preserving the environment. The goal should be to ensure that the area is managed so motorized use will continue. The over all impact of ORV for the size of the area is small.	See our response to comment 0156-6.
0156-8	There is no conclusive evidence that demands an immediate or at any time in the near future a need for new regulations that restrict the use of ORV in Unit 13.	We disagree. BLM's regulations for Off-road vehicles state: "No person shall operate an off-road vehicle on public lands in a manner causing, or likely to cause significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, improvements, cultural, or vegetative resources or other authorized use of the public lands." (43 CFR 8341.1). Impacts are described in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 168-171, 182, 188, and 195.
0156-9	Any potential regulations deemed necessary by BLM, state, private and native agencies should be for specified lengths of time and be reviewed at regular intervals to determine if they remain appropriate.	We can't speak for "state, private and native agencies" but this would be a part of our implementation and monitoring process.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0159-1	BLM needs to adopt, as part of the Final Plan a requirement that at the moment the ROD is signed, all 7,000,000 acres, for however long they remains in BLM's management and ownership are Limited, to OHVs, to existing trails. In effect, freeze the footprint. ...[T]he Preferred Alternative indicates that in the main, BLM will "manage" OHVs on the 5,000,000 acres of selected lands by adopting the state's Generally Allowed Uses on State Land. This policy has not worked as any survey of the state's general lands would show. In fact, one of the highest concerns expressed in scoping was the continued proliferation of OHV trails and the accompanying resource damage. The policy is so loose that anyone at any time can create a new trail and claim they are following the policy. … Keeping OHVs on existing trails would also provide some benefit to the quiet recreationist, by enabling them to backpack in areas that at least theoretically do not have OHV traffic.`	We agree and the intent of the Preferred Alternative (D) is to limit OHV users to existing or designated trails. However, in order to designate trails in any given area and enforce no OHV travel off of designated trails, the following must occur: a) complete inventory of all existing trails in the area; b) determination of which trails are necessary based on public input, providing for subsistence, recreation, resource development, etc; c) publishing the designated trails in the Federal Register; and d) enforcement. BLM recognizes that it is not ready for that level of detail in this RMP decision. Therefore, it must set the stage in this RMP and prioritize areas for implementation-level planning. Logically, the first priority is for areas that we know we will manage long-term. In the meantime, BLM will increase it's OHV management on other lands (such as State-selected lands) through education and enforcement.
0159-2	The Plan makes virtually all of the lands currently managed by BLM open to snowmachine use. The Preferred Alternative closes all of 44,000 acres to snowmachines. This is not enough; it is unfair and BLM is not meeting its responsibilities to provide recreational activities for all users of its lands.	Please see response to comment 0006-19.
0164-12	Ahtna Inc. supports more active management of selected lands in regards to OHV use that is outlined under Alternative C	Thanks for the comment.
0164-15	Limitations on recreational snowmachine use in known caribou and moose winter range should be put in place, monitored, and enforced.	Under Alternatives B and C, designated trails for snowmachines are considered in very specific areas, based on moose or caribou winter ranges. See the Draft RMP/EIS pages 35-50. These would be considered in implementation-level planning, with input from the State, Native corporations, and the public. The State of Alaska, ADF&G, currently does not support such restrictions.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0164-16	Ahtna supports the subsistence use of any vehicle that is 1500 pounds or less and monitoring the use of these vehicles in relation to resource damage and disturbance of fish and wildlife.	See response to comment 0164-17 regarding vehicle weight limits. Trail and OHV monitoring is described in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 33.
0164-17	Ahtna supports a weight restriction on all trails for vehicle use of over 1500 pounds	On 17(b) easements, there is currently a 3,000 pound GVW limit for OHV on 25-foot wide trail easements. In the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 33-50, BLM clearly shows the intent under implementation-level considerations to apply weight limits to some specific trails. These will be determined based on other factors such as resource considerations or maintenance of recreation experiences. Consultation will take place with Native corporations, other land managers and the public.
0169-3	We support all types of trails and recreational development. This support includes single use trails such as hiking and biking trails as well OHV trails. Certain terrain types lend themselves to the different types of trails, i.e. steep and rugged terrain is more suitable for hiking trails. While most trails should be multiple use to provide for equal access, there could exist within the trail network single or compatible use trails to maximize the recreational experience.	We agree. BLM is committed to providing different recreational experiences and to providing access to public lands for recreation, subsistence, and hunting. The factors you describe to be used in trail management will be applied in implementation-level planning to determine how specific trails should be managed, re-located, or maintained.
0173-36	Access within the planning area should not be limited and all trails should remain open. Access should be provided to all mining claims and private property.	Providing access is a clearly stated goal of the BLM under Travel Management in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 32.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0175-11	Page 32, Goals. The State would appreciate explicit acknowledgement of the need to ensure access for resource development. In many instances off-highway vehicle (OHV) access to mining claims and exploration areas is the most efficient, cost-effective and least intrusive means available. A goal statement at the beginning of the OHV discussion, acknowledging this resource development need and an explanation as to how access can be achieved within the structure of this plan and Issue 1 would be helpful.	BLM's goal to provide access is clearly stated. In the Draft RMP/EIS page 32, the issue statement includes "commercial uses". Land Use Requirements in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 33 clearly state that permitted activities and uses would allow OHV use, subject to stipulations to minimize impacts. This is consistent with the Required Operating Procedure ROP-Soils-b-3.
0175-19	Page 38 and 44, Delta Range Area (including Canwell and Augustana Sub-units). The Bureau proposes to close the Canwell and Augustana sub-units to off-highway vehicles without a substantiated justification for closure. The State strongly supports OHV access particularly for resource development in this area when needed to facilitate exploration and development of subsurface resources and opposes such closures at the RMP level. The State requests that Alternatives C and D be revised to move the discussion regarding closure of the Canwell and Augustana sub-units to snowmachines from (a) RMP Decisions to (b) Implementation-level Considerations. As previously discussed, the State requests that such closures be developed in a more focused consultation with the user community and resource managers through development of an implementation-level plan that includes a public process.	These areas are proposed (Delta Mountains sub-unit) to maintain an existing non-motorized winter recreation experience in rugged, glaciated terrain. This justification has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on page 70 and 73. The Draft RMP/EIS also considers Alternatives A and B that do not consider designation of these areas. Under the Preferred Alternative, the current withdrawal against mineral leasing would be maintained but mineral entry would be permitted outside the inner corridor of the pipeline. BLM would permit OHV exploration or access into this area, consistent with ROP-Soils-b-3 (Draft RMP/EIS, page 611) and through development of a Plan of Operations (Draft RMP/EIS, Locatable Minerals, page 124). Identification of these subunits in an RMP is consistent with BLM land use planning direction and 43 CFR 8342.1.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0175-20	Pages 38 and 44, Denali Highway Area, Implementation-level Considerations. Off-highway vehicles use this area extensively for hunting and fishing access and recreational riding, which is consistent with the State's Susitna and Copper Basin area plans. We request the Bureau not pursue restrictions, other than the "limited" designation consistent with State regulations, on current uses until a joint planning effort completes an evaluation of the resources and habitat concerns. Furthermore, it is likely that during implementation level planning the state will object to limitations on OHVs that limit areas based on minimizing impacts to the viewshed, maintaining a diversity of recreation opportunities, or any snowmachine restrictions based on trail densities.	The Draft RMP/EIS page 33 described that implementation level planning would include public, State, and Native corporation coordination. It is likely that the BLM, during implementation level planning, will propose reasonable designation of trails to minimize impacts to the viewshed and to maintain a diversity of recreational experiences. This is consistent with objectives for the area stated in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 61 and 62.
0175-21	Management of the Tiekel Area within the plan has the potential to restrict users inconsistent with the State's regulations for uses on state lands. There are some additional restrictions on use of off-highway vehicles under State regulations for hunting within the area. The BLM proposed restrictions are not substantiated in the plan based on biological concerns beyond those already addressed under state restrictions on use of off-highway vehicles for hunting. We request the Bureau provide substantiated reasons for increased restrictions in this area or delete the considerations.	The alternatives described in the Draft RMP/EIS consider a wide range of travel management options in this area, including leaving the area "open" to all OHV use. Justification for managing the sub-units as non-motorized in alternatives C and D is described on pages 59 and 63 (to maintain a primitive recreation experience). It is not biologically-based, but is consistent with the stated recreation goal to manage recreation to maintain a diversity of recreational opportunities (page 55). These proposals, while restricting motorized access to the area, would not be inconsistent with the existing State Tonsina Controlled Area, which is closed to using motorized vehicles for hunting, including the transportation of hunters, from July 26 to September 30.
0175-36	Page 167. Please include a reference to 11 AAC 96.025 Conditions for Generally Allowed Uses as well as 11 AAC 96.020.	Thanks for the editorial comment. 11 AAC 96.025 is a critical part of the statute and a reference to it will be included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 44, 49, and 192).

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0175-37	Page 168, Subsistence Use of OHVs. This section discusses access by off-highway vehicles for subsistence activities, but the plan does not define the reference as 'federal subsistence only' or 'federal and state' subsistence activities. Since much of this area has appreciable hunting under state regulations that include subsistence uses, OHV restrictions could adversely restrict subsistence uses.	ANILCA allows for "appropriate use for subsistence purposes of snowmobiles, motorboats, and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents, subject to reasonable regulation." (page 34, Draft RMP/EIS). For travel planning purposes, this includes both federal and state subsistence activities.
0175-52	Page 573, Delta Range SRMA. The State recommends that under Alternative D for the Delta Range SRMA, Trails/OHV management be amended to specifically provide for permitted motorized use associated with resource development. As currently stated, Alternative D appears more restrictive than Alternative C. In addition, the State was unable to find documented justification for such a closure either in the narrative in Chapter II or in the summary table. We request that limits on use be justified and documented for the public.	First portion of the comment: The change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 52). Thanks for the comment. Second portion of the comment: Justification will be strengthened in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, based on maintenance of the current primitive experience and public comment (page 52 and 73).
0175-53	Page 575, Delta River SRMA. The State recommends that under Alternative D for the Delta River SRMA, Trails/OHV management be amended to specifically state that there are no snowmachine restrictions provided adequate snow cover exists, rather than the language "open in winter." This approach would be consistent with other tables and provide additional clarity.	Thanks for the editorial suggestion. The change has been made in the Proposed RMP/EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0180-1	There is a sense of direction in this document for limiting the use of off-road vehicles. This is not a good thing for me. The closing of and/or limiting vast amounts of area to control a very small "footprint" seems extreme. Furthermore, I do not see the brazen expansion efforts to blaze trails all over creation. There are high use areas and lots of increased use so coming up with OHV guidelines seems like a more reasonable direction to take rather than the closing of areas.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternative management strategies for OHV management. However, even under Alternative C, the most potentially restrictive alternative to OHV users, only 4% of all BLM lands within the planning area is proposed for closure to motorized vehicles. Under alternatives C and D, most areas would be limited, with OHV use limited to designated or existing trails. BLM is committed to maintaining access to public lands and is not looking at closure of areas or trails on a large scale, under any alternative.
0181-1	Please provide for adequate non-motorized recreational uses for BLM lands in Alaska. Motorized use is simply not compatible with non-motorized uses. Motorized uses are excessive in some areas, particularly the Knik River drainage. Excessive motorized uses cause wildlife disruption, soil erosion, and pollution.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternative management strategies for OHV management. Alternatives C and D include the designation of some non-motorized areas as well as management intent in implementation level planning to manage specific trails for non-motorized use (pages 33-50, Draft RMP/EIS). The Knik River drainage does not lie within this planning area. Impacts of motorized uses are described on pages 168, 169, 182, 188, and 195 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0185-1	Alternative C is the most reasonable option with regard to limitations and closures to OHV use. Statewide, the management of OHV use in accessible areas is quite inadequate. Managing OHV use in remote areas is impossible and does not happen. There is no mechanism to ensure wise, sustainable use. BLM should take the long term, conservative perspective in considering OHV management. ... Anadromous streams are in grave danger with one documented loss already. People are claiming motorized use is traditional where it was not and with imminent threat to the sustainability to the wetlands and extremely narrow transitional zone.	Alternatives C and D represent a significant change from the status quo and set the stage for proactive management of trails rather than unmanaged proliferation of trails. Habitat assessment of anadromous streams and rivers by BLM and ADF&G would not support the statement that anadromous streams are in "grave danger" but BLM recognizes some of the ongoing and potential impacts, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS, Chapter 3, pages 182, 188, and 195.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0187-1	My primary interest/concern is that BLM goes the extra mile to redress the years of "non-management" that have allowed mechanized recreation to overwhelm non-motorized and quiet opportunities. Alternative C is the only alternative that will truly achieve this balance, and I strongly support this option in terms of travel management and recreation management.	Thanks for the comment. Alternatives C and D represent a significant change from the status quo and set the stage for proactive management of trails rather than unmanaged proliferation of trails.
0188-1	Please do not adopt any restrictions that would interfere with me hauling my moose and caribou out to the road.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers a wide range of management actions regarding travel management, including very few OHV restrictions in alternatives A and B. Under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D), on State-selected lands, you would be encouraged to use existing trails. If you went off the trail to retreive your moose or caribou and in doing so caused significant rutting, disturbance of vegetation, or sedimentation into streams, lakes, ponds, or marshes, you would be subject to a violation notice. On unencumbered BLM lands, trails would be designated and travel off of designated trails would be restricted. Specific trail designations and restrictions would be determined in implementation-level planning.
0192-1	I am also concerned about weight restrictions being placed on off road vehicles. What I have seen this restriction would do away with the use of tracked vehicles. Please do not restrict by weight as track vehicles lay down a matt on which to travel, therefore doing less damage to the land.	Alternatives C and D would consider weight restrictions in specific travel management areas during implementation level planning. Specific determinations for which trails would have weight limitations would be determined in implementation-level planning, as described on page 33 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0200-1	When has the BLM ever attempted to map the trails used by the old timers.	As stated on page 160 of the Draft RMP/EIS, 720 of approximately 1,300 miles of trail on BLM-managed lands have been mapped. This effort continues and will continue as implementation level planning occurs. This year (2005) approximately 400 miles of trail were mapped and assessed in detail.
0253-1	Where BLM believes there are resource impacts, these can be mitigated by relocating trail to more suitable areas with better soils, or by using one of the many trail hardening techniques.	We agree, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS under Implementation-level Planning (page 33) and in the description of Implementation-level considerations under alternatives C and D, Travel Management.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0264-1	If restrictions are placed on these lands OHV users will lack the same basic right to enjoy our vast state that non motorized users have - and continue to have if access is not restricted.	BLM is committed to maintaining access to public lands, as clearly stated in the goals for Travel Management on page 32 of the Draft RMP/EIS. BLM is also committed to managing resource impacts resulting from unmanaged proliferation of OHV trails. The Draft RMP/EIS considers a wide range of travel management strategies that address this issue.
0267-1	Page 536: In general within the planning area, OHV use is expected to become more restricted . . . : (how did you arrive at the conclusion.): and then in the next paragraph you make the comment . . . With an increase in OHV users and improvement in OHV (this seems to be contradictive to the previous paragraph.) You mindset does not appear to use the information you've been provided.	The first conclusion was reached because of the anticipated increase in intensity of OHV management on BLM, NPS, and Native lands. It is assumed that this may be off-set by an increase in OHV users over time and improvements in OHV technology.
0271-1	I am greatly disappointed at the statement on page 536 that says "ORV use is expected to become more restricted over the planning period, regardless of the alternative selected by BLM.	This assumption is based on the anticipated increase in intensity of OHV management on BLM, NPS, and Native lands within the planning area.
0274-1	If your plan is to provide truly diverse recreational and educational opportunities the use of off road vehicles should not be further limited.	Thanks for your comment. Your suggested management strategy is proposed and analyzed in alternatives A and B.
0278-1	It is extremely important that the plan allow diverse recreational opportunities. Diverse recreational activities must include motorized vehicles. Access to recreational areas should be evenly distributed throughout the areas affected by this plan. There is plenty of land in Alaska that is already closed or limited in access. However that should allow for plenty of land for "diverse" recreational activities to the place near population centers and along the road corridor outlined in this plan.	BLM agrees with your stated goal and it is clearly stated as a goal for recreation (page 55, Draft RMP/EIS). The Draft RMP/EIS recognizes motorized use as part of the recreation opportunity spectrum that currently exists and will be managed for across the planning area (pages 174, 175, Draft RMP/EIS).

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0291-1	I am very concerned the BLM management plan is not recognizing the "in place" State regulations allowing tried and proven usage of many of the areas the BLM seems intent on restricting and or closing.	Alternatives C and D very clearly strive for consistency with State regulations for OHV management, particularly on State-selected lands. Pages 36 and 41of the Draft RMP/EIS describe management criteria for OHVs for State-selected lands, consistent with existing State statutes.
0306-3	Alternative C is the most reasonable option with regard to limitations and closures to OHV use. Statewide, the management of OHV use in accessible areas is quite inadequate. Managing OHV use in remote areas is impossible and does not happen. There is no mechanism to ensure wise, sustainable use. BLM should take the long term, conservative perspective in considering OHV management.	Thanks for the comment. We agree that OHV management has been inadequate and this is discussed and analyzed through a range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0311-4	We also oppose recognition of any illegal roads and trails created by illegal use of ATV/OHV's, oppose any increase in ATV trails and use areas, and support seasonal and size/weight limitations for OHV/ATV's.	Currently, all BLM-managed lands, except Tangle Lakes Archeological District and the Gulkana and Delta River corridors, are open to OHV use, including cross-country trails off of existing trails. Thus, no "illegal" trails are displayed on the map on page 163 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0312-72	We are strongly opposed to the "no action" OHV management strategy proposed in alternative A because it makes no attempt (except in limited areas) to manage OHV trails. We believe that BLM has presented very compelling and factual justification…for not choosing Alternative A for OHV management.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative A is not BLM's preferred alternative.
0312-73	The State of Alaska's Generally Allowed Uses (11 AAC 96.025) should absolutely not be the only means by which BLM administered lands are managed, even if they are selected for conveyance to the State. The widespread proliferation of OHV trails and associated resource degradation on general State lands is evidence that the State's policy to limit OHVs to existing trails "whenever possible" is simply not an effective management strategy.	As described in alternatives C and D, the BLM does not adopt the State's statute, but adopts policy consistent with the statute. The State's statute has not been effective on the ground because of the statute but because the State has chosen not to enforce it. It is the BLM's intent, on State-selected lands, to emphasize education regarding the policy and the benefits of using existing trails, but also to enforce where deliberate OHV use off of existing trails is causing resource damage as described on page 36 and 41 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0312-74	Regardless of which draft alternative is ultimately selected, trails signage, public education efforts, and OHV impact mitigation measures should be implemented immediately, especially within Wild and Scenic River corridors, sensitive wildlife habitats, non-motorized use areas, and all other special management areas discussed within this document.	We agree, and BLM has already begun to prioritize implementation planning based on the factors you mention. The Gulkana plan revision is close to completion and the Delta River plan revision is scheduled for 2006.
0313-2	We have reviewed 11 AAC 96.020 and 11 AAC 96.025 and see no indication that traveling cross country is limited to game retrieval or other reasons directly related to hunting activities. We believe the Generally Allowed Uses are written to allow cross country travel when an established trail does not exist and care is taken not to disturb the vegetative mat.	You are correct. The key is that travel off of existing routes must minimize "disturbance of vegetation, soil stability, or drainage systems; changing the character of, polluting, or introducing silt and sediment into streams, lakes, ponds, water holes, seeps, and marshes; and disturbance of fish and wildlife resources." (11 AAC 96.025)
0319-1	I encourage you to enlarge the designated no motorized vehicle areas. There are plenty of motorized areas, and some tourists will be more likely to come to these areas which epitomize the pristine wilderness.	Based on public comment, alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS has been revised in the Proposed RMP/EIS to include the McCallum Creek drainage as part of the Delta Mountains sub-unit of the Delta Range SRMA (page 73, Proposed RMP/Final EIS). This area would be closed seasonally to snowmachines.
0321-3	OHV use must be restricted to designated trails only, and must not occur within potential or designated Wild and Scenic River corridors or other sensitive and protected areas.	Alternatives C and D consider travel management options that would limit OHVs to designated trails, based on recreation objectives as well as specific resource concerns. Consistent with ANILCA (sections 811 and 1110), alternatives C and D would designate trails within Wild and Scenic river corridors, but would allow motorized use on designated trails to access subsistence resources.
0321-4	These trails must be assessed and maintained as some trails are at least 200 yards wide.	See responses to comments 0038-2 and 0200-1. On-going maintenance is clearly intended, as described on page 33 of the Draft RMP/EIS under Implementation-level Planning.
0321-5	Furthermore, we ask that the south unit of the Tonsina unit of the Tiekel area be closed to all OHV use and the north unit be closed seasonally as proposed in Alternative C.	Your request is considered and analyzed as part of Alternative C in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0323-3	EPA encourages BLM to carefully consider the long-term benefits of committing to an environmentally protective strategy now, in this RMP and EIS and in the Record of Decision, in order to: 1) define appropriate trails for OHV travel; 2) develop and implement an effective monitoring and enforcement program; 3) limit or prohibit OHV use in sensitive habitat areas, areas of high value for quiet recreational pursuits and areas where effective monitoring and enforcement cannot be assured; and 4) commit to an effective and timely notification and education effort to inform the public.	This RMP, through implementation of the travel management strategy described in the preferred alternative, would set the stage to take the steps that you describe. At this time, we simply do not have the trail inventory and assessment or level of public involvement needed to make specific trail determinations. BLM has committed to completing specific implementation level planning for travel management areas in the next five years. BLM's intent to accomplish the steps you describe is evident in the Draft RMP/EIS, particularly on pages 33-50 and the descriptions on page 33 of Inventory and Monitoring and Implementation-level Planning.
0323-4	It is particularly important for BLM to include in this document a proactive strategy for OHV management, so it may be used as a model for additional RMPs that are scheduled for completion in other parts of Alaska in the near future. In general, EPA recommends that where OHVs are allowed on BLM-managed lands, their use should be limited, to the maximum extent possible, to established existing or designated trails. As documented in the Draft EIS, this management strategy for OHV use would minimize rutting, braiding, thermal erosion and subsequent adverse impacts to soil and vegetation.	We agree. This strategy would be adopted under Alternative D, with priority for implementation on unencumbered BLM lands (those that BLM knows it will manage in the long term).
0327-1	I urge the BLM to adopt Alternative C. Winter travel does not have a degrading impact on the vegetation / tundra. ORV use by wheeled vehicles destroys and degrades any of the areas where used.	Thanks for the comment.
0329-19	The Alternative C proposal [for the Tiekel SRMA] is still overly generous to motorized use, considering the huge areas already open.	We feel that closing approximately 240,000 acres to most motorized uses is not "overly generous" to motorized use.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-27	Please consider alternative management options for OHVs. For example, many areas should be designated "closed" to OHVs, at least seasonally. It just is not practical to try and maintain a trail through some of the extensive wetlands in the Gulkana system, for example. The Tiekel SRMA could reasonably be closed in summer. Elevation limits could be put in place for winter motorized use.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers some of these options and effects of implementing them in Alternative C.
0329-28	One unexplored management option for limiting OHV damage is to simply not to encourage them. Not building ramps or big parking lots, or advertising recreational OHV opportunities, is probably the cheapest, easiest, least controversial, and most effective thing that BLM could do. Since we know that existing trails are causing harm, every extra OHV than comes increases damage. Please adopt a management practice into the RMP to not unnecessarily encourage increased OHV use. Obviously, this approach isn't sufficient by itself. But to the degree it is feasible, it should be followed.	Thanks for the comment. This is, in fact, a key factor in managing to maintain primitive recreation experiences in a non-regulatory fashion. The Draft RMP/EIS will be edited to reflect this strategy for specific areas.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-29	It is disappointing that the DEIS doesn't address the effectiveness of OHV management options. Limiting traffic to existing trails sounds nice, until you see the actual trail. And when you do see it, "designating" it for further abuse doesn't help any. Trails for ATVS are not a feasible mitigation measure in many places in this area. Areas of mud bog become impassable, which is the reason trails proliferate to begin with. "Stay on trail" signs only undermine the credibility of regulations, where the "trail" is deep muddy water. The Draft RMP/EIS correctly notes "it is increasingly difficult to find a primitive experience and the search for such an experience drives users farther into the backcountry." (pp.167-8) One implication of this is that trying to limit impacts with trail maintenance has limited effectiveness. Nice trails won't offer the primitive experience users are seeking. They'll just expand use farther into the back country. The abuse of OHVs at Tangle Lakes, which was been designated "limited" to OHVs in 1980, is a good illustration of the limits of that management approach. (p.166) So does the failure of state regulations. Powerful evidence that limiting traffic to "existing trails" doesn't work is found on the Gulkana and Delta Rivers. In chapter III, the DEIS explains: "The Gulkana and Delta Wild and Scenic River Corridors carry a "limited to existing trails" designation based on management prescribed in the 1983 river management plans for each river (BLM 1983a; 1983b). This limitation limits cross-country travel, but "existing" trails have never been defined. There are 13 trails that cross the designated wild and scenic river corridors; approximately 50 miles of trail are located within the wild and scenic river boundaries." (p. 166)	This is a major conundrum facing BLM in trail management…how to maintain trails to minimize resource impacts while trying to manage for a primitive or semi-primitive experience and not increasing use by improving the trail. Ultimately the BLM has to balance the public's desire (in some cases) to "leave trails alone" and maintain a primitive or semi-primitive trail experience with BLM's mandate to prevent resource damage associated with OHV use. In some cases, maintaining a higher standard trail will necessitate restrictions (such as weight limits or prohibition on highway vehicles) in order to prevent damage to trail hardening or to maintain a certain recreation experience. Trail hardening projects are expensive; consequently, BLM must prioritize this kind of work based on trail assessment that shows where major resource problems are occurring (such as extensive trail braiding or numerous stream crossings). On some trails, seasonal closure may be considered where boggy conditions exist and there are no options for relocation. There are no easy answers and BLM will utilize input from the public and from the State and Native and village corporations in making these implementation-level decisions.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-30	A "limited" designation is useless without a reliable public inventory of trails. The Draft RMP/EIS estimates there are 1,300 miles of ATV trails in the planning area, only 720 miles of which have been inventoried. We are concerned that "current inventories do not accurately represent all trails that are known to exist on the ground." (p.160) How accurate are they? Why is trails information lacking? Please do the necessary mapping and inventory work.	Page 33 of the Draft RMP/EIS (under Inventory and Monitoring and Implementation-level Planning) shows BLM's commitment to trails inventory and assessment as the first step in implementation-level planning. BLM is committed to this task and is making progress in inventorying all trails. Existing inventory/assessments include location by GPS and assessment of trail and resource conditions. BLM (Glennallen Field Office) has developed a data dictionary to accurately portray existing trail conditions. In summer/fall of 2005, approximately 400 miles were inventoried, adding to the existing information indicated in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-31	Rules don't mean anything without enforcement. Enforcement of trails limits will be very difficult, at best. The most important thing you can do to prevent ATV damage while maintaining access is to get more Rangers out on the land. Please hire more rangers. Pay them well. Give them the authority and backing to do their jobs. Let them live in the community—Better yet, hire them from the community.	We agree. Glennallen Field Office, within the last year, hired another law enforcement ranger.
0329-36	Please consider the erosion impacts of motorized boats.	Your concern is not considered in the Draft RMP/EIS because it is very site-specific and because it occurs on navigable State-owned waterways. This specific concern has been and will be considered in the Gulkana management plan revision and in the upcoming Delta River management plan revision (these are implementation-level plans).
0329-38	It is not true that motorized off-road travel is an "unavoidable adverse impact." (p.554) You could close areas and enforce the closures. Thinking about these impacts as inevitable masks the fact that they are a consequence of affirmative actions.	The Draft RMP/EIS recognizes that, even under the most aggressive trails management scenario described in alternative C, it would take time to inventory trails, develop implementation-level plans, mark trails on the ground and post trailheads, and conduct enforcement. In the interim, there would continue to be some off-trail use and some negative resource impacts.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0331-17	The RMP/EIS lays out many of the impacts of summer OHVs: rutting, trail braiding, thermal erosion, mud bogs, cost of trail maintenance, disturbance of wildlife, destruction of archeological artifacts, conflicts with non-motorized users. The RMP/EIS makes it clear that these are serious concerns. However, all of the alternatives fail to deal adequately with avoiding future impacts. This is because none of the alternatives restrict all summer OHV use to designated trails. Realistically, limiting OHVs to existing trails is not the answer; they must be limited to designated trails. This is because the concept of "existing trails" is unenforceable. A trail created by illegal riders becomes a legal existing trail for riders who come through an hour later. By the Glossary definition, an existing trail has not been inventoried, so the BLM cannot prove that no trail existed prior to a given rider's use. Furthermore, existing trails are often poorly sited with respect to wet areas, so they continue to braid and widen. Some may also be poorly sited with regard to fish habitat and to vulnerable, easily disturbed wildlife.	Please see our response to comment 0331-18 and 0312-73 regarding enforcement.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0331-18	Alternative C, the best of the alternatives offered, limits summer OHVs to existing trails on 48% of the land and to designated trails on another 48%. The rationale for allowing existing trail use is that the lands have been selected by the State and/or Native corporations. This is not a logical position. Final disposition of lands is still some years away, while OHV use continues to expand. If the lands end up being retained in federal ownership, they will be in a more degraded condition. The cost of repairing damage will be higher to federal taxpayers. It will be harder to keep riders away from the expanded number and length of trails. For those lands that pass into Native ownership, the problems will be similar.	Thanks for the comment. BLM feels that the strategies presented in alternatives C and D for OHV management on selected lands is logical for the following reasons: a) It represents a significant change from the status quo and sets the stage for more proactive management of OHV trails; b) we cannot possibly afford inventory, designation, marking, maintenance, and enforcement on 1,300 miles of trail so logically the emphasis occurs where we know we will retain the land; and c) this strategy allows us to be more proactive in interim management if desired by the selecting entity (for example, Ahtna has expressed the desire to work with BLM on trail limitations on selected lands to protect cultural sites).
0331-19	The specific mention of snowmachine impacts is scarce and brief. The glossary definition of OHV does not specifically mention snowmachines, nor does the definition of snowmachine say that it is a type of OHV. Page 434 says, "OHVs (including snowmachines) can adversely affect wildlife populations," but most discussions of OHV impacts address summer impacts. We could not find specific discussion of snowmachine impacts on water quality and air quality (two-stroke emissions), visual resources or subsistence. Given the vast and increasing use of snowmachines, this is a serious omission.	Page 366 of the Draft RMP/EIS states "For the purposes of this document, OHVs include snowmachines. However, most impacts described in this analysis result from OHVs used during snow-free months. Where impacts are specific to snowmachines, they are described as such." Discussion of snowmachine impacts is not lengthy because Alaska-specific data on snowmachine impacts is lacking. BLM is currently involved in funding research on predator/prey relationships in Unit 13 and effects of snowmachine tracks on these relationships. Within the Draft RMP/EIS, BLM leaves the door open for future snowmachine management, based on locally gathered information (see page 33, Inventory and Monitoring and Implementation-level Considerations under Alternatives C and D, pages 35-50, Draft RMP/EIS).

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0331-20	We support the snowmachine closures in alternative C, but these closures are far from adequate for resource protection and far from a fair allocation to non-motorized users. It appears that none of the alternatives closes areas along the Glenn Highway, Tok Cutoff or Denali Highway to snowmachine use. We request more closed areas.	Please see response to comment 0006-6.
0333-1	I don't want BLM to close all access to ORV users - but common sense should prevail - these lands and trails cannot sustain this type of use. In my thinking management of the trails should be a priority. Harden the trails that can be hardened, close others to vehicles according to weight, season of the year, etc. If trails are managed correctly, it can help protect critical wildlife habitat, protect watersheds and sustain the land for everyone to enjoy.	We agree and feel that this balanced approach is represented in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) for Travel Management. See pages 32-50 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0334-2	The Augustana Creek drainage and the Canwell and Castner Glacier drainages (not JUST the glaciers, the whole drainages) are some of the most beautiful and wild areas accessible from the road for wilderness human-powered travel. Many other places are accessible by 4-wheeler and snow machine that are just too far for weekend human-powered trips. Motorized vehicles have the entire area on the south side of the range. The areas I have mentioned above (the three drainages) should be preserved for their wilderness qualities of quiet and lack of noise and air pollution for those who prefer the benefits of human-powered travel. The use of this area for human-powered purposes does not favor a small group of people; it would be enjoyed by people across the community and political spectrum. Many skiers and mountaineers in Alaska use these areas in the winter time, including people from various parts of the community, from the university to the military bases. It is a rare activity which brings these often segregated parts of the community together. In addition, as skiers and mountaineers, we have come across an alarming number of snowmachiners gravely ill-prepared for glacier travel. Increased use by ill-prepared people could be a safety hazard. … [T]he Augustana Valley is a great length of ski in to a base camp for a second day of wilderness back country skiing with a truly wilderness feel, and not too far from the road. There are not many places like this left. Please leave this little creek valley free of the noise and pollution of machines.	Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS would manage the Augustana drainage as non-motorized (C is year-round, D is winter non-motorized). Motorized (snowmachine) access would be allowed for subsistence hunting. See also the response to comment 0346-3. Under Alternative D of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, PLO 5150 would be modified to allow conveyance to the State of 83,000 acres within the pipeline/utility corridor. This includes portions of the Augustana Glacier. Consequently, the Augustana Glacier is not included as part of the Delta Mountains sub-unit in Alternative D of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The McCallum Creek drainage, however, is included.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0336-1	Please consider my input regarding the management of 7 million acres of Federal land in eastern Alaska ...Please keep ALL of this land closed ENTIRELY to motorized off-road vehicles.	Thanks for the comment, but this would be inconsistent with BLM's stated goal to provide access to public lands (page 32, Draft RMP/EIS). The Draft RMP/EIS does consider an alternative that would close 281,000 acres to motorized use.
0337-2	I have some concerns that some of the little known / lightly used trails are not being recorded. Some of the trails in the Alaska East plan have a long history of use with little if any maintenance. These trails in some cases have 50 to 100 years of use, with little or no maintenance. It is unfair to point at them as environmentally distressed areas. Concerns about trail damaging sensitive areas will need to be address with proper maintenance as you would with any valued asset.	We agree that accurate and up-to-date trail assessment and inventory is necessary before trail designation can occur.
0338-1	Please put restrictions on use of off- road vehicles. Roads are for driving on. Roads are built to take the beating. The public lands belong to all Americans, and when one use ruins it for another use, this is wrong. Designated trails would concentrate the vehicles along certain paths and leave more of the country free of tracks., which is of value to a great part of the public.	Alternatives C and D would place some restrictions on use of OHVs on BLM-managed lands.
0339-1	[I] … oppose only 0.6% of the land closed to motorized ORVs. Not everyone in this state likes ORVs, some like myself moved here for pristine beauty, solitude, and wilderness.	Alternative C analyzes proposals for closure of 281,000 acres to motorized use.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0339-3	ORV activity has been shown to damage important land ecosystems as there is considerable damage and issues that are taking place in the deserts of the Southwest as a result if unlimited ORV use. Why can we not be more proactive in our thinking as to avoid such damage to fragile tundra which is already under enough environmental stress. I strongly urge those in the decision making process to take more into account than just money and profit.	Please see response to comment 0340-1. And there is no "money and profit" derived by BLM from any course of travel management described under any alternative considered in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0340-1	Please consider closing more area in the management planning area in eastern Alaska to … off-road vehicle use. The off-road vehicle use is particularly damaging to much of the very sensitive habitat in the planning area, and to limit to designated and existing trails will not stop or even slow the progress of habitat degradation such use is doing. Non motorized recreational uses are displaced and wildlife is endangered by the widespread and growing (mis)use of the vehicles, and w/ little resources for enforcement of the weak proposed restrictions on the use of off-road vehicles, there will be more and more damage.	BLM feels that the travel management proposals under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) represent a balance, given the public comment throughout the planning process. These proposals set the stage for a more proactive OHV management program, one that no longer condones wide-open OHV use. This represents a significant change from the status quo. Alternative C considers more areas closed to motorized use (281,000 acres) and more area-wide restrictions on OHVs.
0341-8	The option to allow use of existing but illegal trails is unconscionable. Trails that were established illegally should be closed, and legally established trails should be monitored to prevent expansion and braiding of the trails.	Currently, all BLM-managed lands in the planning area (with the exception of Tangle Lakes Archeological District and the Delta and Gulkana river corridors) are managed as open to OHVs, meaning cross-country travel is permitted. Thus, the only existing "illegal" or unauthorized trails are in TLAD. Alternatives A and B would continue this management, C and D would change it.
0341-9	Weight restrictions should also be a part of the prescriptions for OHV/ATV management.	Please see response to comment 0164-17 regarding weight limitations.
0344-1	I know that some development will probable have to occur but I hope that more than .6 % of that beautiful area is left for non-motorized use.	It will be, whether it is regulated or not. Please recognize that 63% of the area currently provides a primitive recreation experience, with little to no motorized use. Much of this area is this way because of limitations to motorized use from topography, wetlands, or dense vegetation. This is not likely to change under any alternative.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0346-3	More areas need to be dedicated to non-motorized recreation: 0.6% is not enough! Interior Alaska faces a shortage of accessible recreational opportunities for quiet, human powered recreation. I appreciate that you selected two drainages in the Alaska Range for non-motorized recreation; however, we also need somewhere not too far from the road to ski where there is snow. Please add the McCallum Creek drainage to non-motorized status. Gulkana Glacier is overrun with snowmachines - we need a quiet place to ski, where we won't face snowmachines cutting up all the powder snow and starting avalanches above us.	Based on public comment BLM's goal for the area to maintain a primitive recreation experience, BLM has added the McCallum Creek drainage to the seasonally non-motorized areas considered in alternatives C and D in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (pages 70 and 73).
0354-22	Some assumptions in the RMP are incorrect and unrealistic, and a plan based on inaccurate assumptions is doomed to failure, such as: "5) Unmanaged proliferation of trails will be maintained." The Bureau of Land Management is bound by ANILCA to minimize damages to private lands and t he damages on 17(b) easements. "Reasonable access" must be defined in a manner that does not continue to harm private lands.	We cannot find the quote that you refer to. Page 363 of the Draft RMP/EIS states "unmanaged proliferation of OHV trails will continue on accessible State-managed lands." We maintain that this is a reasonable assumption. Without specific citations from ANILCA, it is difficult to respond to your comment. The 43 CFR 2650.4-7 and ANILCA section 903(a)(1) states that 17(b) easements "should be designed so as to minimize their impact on Native life styles, and on subsistence uses." These requirements are followed when BLM identifies Sec. 17(b) easements for reservations in conveyances to Native corporations. Comments from the Native corporations, other federal and state agencies and the public are requested and considered in the easement identification process. Decisions made during the easement identification and conveyance processes are beyond the scope of this planning process.
0354-35	Protect streams from OHV use, restore ecosystems to original condition. Build bridges or limit to foot traffic. … Environmental damage could be mitigated by finding alternative routes and engage in land exchanges to consolidate management tracts.	BLM's management intent for OHVs, as described in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D), is to set the stage for proactive management and maintenance of OHV trails, rather than the unmanaged proliferation of trails. In implementation planning, designated trails can be selected and located based on long-term ability to minimize resource impacts. Specific restrictions (such as weight limitations) on specific trails may be considered based on specific resource concerns. These implementation-level considerations are described on pages 33-50 in the Draft RMP/EIS and could be altered or improved based on public involvement and coordination with the State and Native corporations.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0357-2	There is so much evidence that restrictions are for sure needed for these technologies, that Chitina Native Corporation supports the portions of alternatives C and D that would place those badly needed limitations and restrictions to OHV and ATV uses on public administered lands.	Thanks for the comment.
0379-4	And all these ATVs, I think there's got to be a limit on the weight restriction on that because you get them--I don't know why you would need a bigger motorized vehicle than a small ATV, anything over 1,500 does big time damage to the land, trees, I mean it just--I don't have an ATV, I can't afford one.	See response to comment 0164-17 regarding vehicle weight limits.
0381-3	In short, our view in regards to trail management is that we urge BLM to adopt a more active role in regards to not just management but overall control.	We agree, and believe this philosophy is reflected in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D).
ACCESS (17B EASEMENTS, R.S. 2477S)		
0010-7	We don't want uncontrolled access to rivers, streams, it affects our fish and wildlife habitat. I think we need to tell BLM that we need to look at this issue before we give access say into an area where many streams are crossed and many moose and caribou habitat areas, you know, so that you don't affect the migration of the caribou or the moose or where they pass through, you don't scare them off.	Decisions made in this RMP will not affect existing 17(b) easement reservations as recorded in conveyance documents. See response to comment 0354-22. These issues were discussed prior to reservation of the easement. Most of the lands presently owned by the Native corporations in the Ahtna region were conveyed in the 1970's and 80's. At that time, village meetings were routinely held with the Native corporations to discuss the draft easement memorandum and draft decision to issue the conveyance prior to finalizing the documents. Native comments such as adverse impact to Native culture and subsistence needs and duplicative access routes resulted in many proposed easements not being reserved in the conveyance to the Native corporation.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0016-3	I do believe a certain area has to be regulated some way because it's getting where under 17(b) easements that, you know, they have these easements and what happens is when they make a trail through there, they just keep getting wider, going around and pretty soon it's a mile wide in some areas. And if you're going to have regulation in there, I think the BLM should have some kind of enforcement, you can't just make regulation and just have everybody run all over the place. So I agree with some kind of restriction but not totally.	The Draft RMP/EIS, under Travel Management, Transportation and Facilities, 17(b Easements (page 162) has been edited to include a segment on BLM's legal responsibilities for 17(b) management including enforcement. See pp. 41, 42, and 187 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0020-12	The biggest conflict we have, I think, tends to be over access. 17(b) has to be reworded or reworked with the Native Corporations to where somehow all of our lands are protected. It must be done in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. I cannot state that enough. Your policies and guidance is really needed in this. It is your job to provide guidance on these access issues. I encourage you guys to tell Congress that it's created a really hostile environment, socially, economically and guess what, now, our subsistence is in danger.	Glennallen Field Office is committed to working with Ahtna, Inc. on a 17(b) easement implementation plan and State and other federal agencies and the public will be consulted during the process. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS provides guidance that will give the Field Office discretion to provide education and perform maintenance on specific easements, based on the priorities listed on page 41 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and available funding. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS also clarifies BLM's legal responsibilities on 17(b) easements (pp. 41, 42, 187). This RMP cannot amend or re-word ANCSA.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0020-27	BLM in its own words manages the fish and wildlife habitat, but the lack of the management on the easements from BLM and the State of Alaska, by the way, has not prevented any harm to any of these habitats. Our moose and caribou populations suffer from the destroyed habitat and encroachment from increasing numbers. We have indirect damages, especially to our spawning areas. We have contaminated soils from the accumulation of debris and fecal matter on our private lands. Mentasta is the headwaters to the Copper River. We can prove contamination in our streams and guess what, it's making its way all the way to Cordova. We have increased litigation costs from all this trespass and, of course, decreased resources available to our people on our lands. The cumulative impacts include our continuous loss of artifacts, vandalism, ecological damage, dump sites, assumption of rights by non-shareholders and increased costs for posting trespass and litigation.	The Draft RMP/EIS states that "realignment of 17(b) easements would be considered with the cooperation of the land owner on lands already conveyed." Where documented resource damage is occurring, including damage to fish habitat, BLM will, in consultation and cooperation with the land owner, State and other federal agencies and the public., consider re-location of the 17(b) easement or maintenance of selected areas, based on the priorities listed on page 34 of the Draft RMP/EIS. These actions are discretionary and will be contingent on funding approval.
0080-4	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends that the BLM take more active leadership in resolving problems with 17(b) easements, including trespass off of 17(b) easements, degradation of 17(b) easements, and failure by the BLM to enforce regulations. BLM should improve identification of easement boundaries, repair damage to easements and work with neighboring land owners to establish better consistent management standards between neighboring land owners.	The Draft RMP/EIS, on page 34, allows for BLM to participate in 17(b) easement maintenance and education, based on priorities listed on page 34. BLM's responsibilities for enforcement on 17(b) easements is explained in the response to comment 0379-3. This language and other clarification of BLM's responsibilities for 17(b) easements, under the law, has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (pp. 41,42, 187). Glennallen Field Office is committed to working with Ahtna, Inc. on a 17(b) easement plan.
0164-6	BLM needs to post land ownership changes along the easement.	See response to comment 0020-12 and 0020-27. Your suggestion would be a helpful educational tool on high-use easements.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0164-7	A trail management implementation plan should be developed for the management of 17(b) easements cooperatively between Ahtna Inc. and the BLM.	We agree. This has been added to the Management Common to all Action Alternatives section of Travel Management in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 41, 42).
0164-8	Appropriate timelines need to be put in place for the relinquishment of 17b easements. Ahtna requests BLM to reevaluate the previously submitted 17b easements relinquishment list submitted by Ahtna for reconsideration. See Appendix A.	Termination of easements will not be considered as part of this RMP process. According to regulation (43 CFR 2650.4-7(a)(13)) BLM can terminate an easement if it was a) proposed at the time of conveyance; b) wasn't used by December 18, 2001; c) doesn't access isolated public land, or d) is no longer needed. Based on these criteria, it was determined in a public process in 2001 that none of the existing easements would be terminated. This does not preclude possible terminations in the future where a sec. 17(b) easement no longer accesses publicly owned lands or a duplicative route is acquired/dedicated for public access.
0164-9	17b easements should be identified by the National Park Service, National Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management through on the ground inventory. A cooperative agreement should be made between BLM and Ahtna Inc. to identify 17(b) easement and to work together to monitor the impacts of ATVs and other off road vehicles on designated trails.	We agree.
0164-10	Ahtna requires a cooperative agreement with BLM to actively address travel management, trail degradation, trespass issues concerned with 17b easements, crossing of anadromous streams, education of users on land status, reparation of damages currently on the landscape to Ahtna lands.	BLM agrees that such a cooperative agreement is needed. See our response to comment 0164-7.
0164-11	It is the BLM's responsibility to inventory and maintain 17b easements and obtain input from those affected by the management of those easements. BLM is not currently doing this and Ahtna demands this to occur immediately.	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes clear direction on BLM's responsibilities on 17(b) easement management, according to the law (pp. 41, 42, 187). It also includes language (page 41, 42) that shows BLMs intent to work with Ahtna on specific trail maintenance and inventory, based on the listed priorities. Prioritization is necessary because these are discretionary actions, dependent on approval and funding.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0164-14	State-recognized RS2477s need to be evaluated for their validity and relinquished. Ahna Inc. does not recognize RS2477 rights of ways on their land. If there is an assertion of an RS2477, it should comply with the original purpose of the law.	Assertions of R.S. 2477 routes will not be made as part of this planning process.
0164-21	Section line easements are not addressed in this plan and Ahtna Inc. does not recognize them.	On state owned land or lands acquired from the State, easements for public highways may exist along section lines. This RMP addresses management of BLM-managed lands, not state lands, so does not address section line easements.
0164-71	All 17b easements should have a 1500 lbs. weight limit imposed on them.	Vehicle weight limits were established during easement reservation and are described in the conveyance document. For easements reserved as 25 foot trails, there is an existing 3,000 lb. gross vehicle weight limit for OHVs. Existing easement reservations, as described in the conveyance documents, will not be changed as any part of the decisions made in this RMP.
0175-12	Page 34, Paragraph 3. Please revise the first sentence to read; “To date, the State of Alaska has determined that approximately 650 RS 2477 routes throughout the State satisfy the requirements of RS 2477; the State continues to research additional routes." In addition please change the second sentence to reflect the fact that the current policy is a Department of Interior policy that is outside the scope of this plan.	Your first sentence change will be made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 42). The second suggested change is already noted in the third sentence: "Land use planning decisions do not affect valid R.S. 2477 rights or future assertions…"
0175-18	Pages 37 and 43, Delta WSR Corridor Area, Implementation-level Considerations. The Delta Wild and Scenic River is a conservation system unit under the ANILCA definition in Section 102(4), thus subject to the access provisions of Section 110(a) and Department of the Interior implementing regulations at 43 CFR Part 36.11. We request the plan provide clarification that the Bureau must complete regulations under the closure procedures in 43 CFR Part 36.11 before limiting snowmachines to designated trails within the Wild and Scenic River Corridor.	These procedures would be followed as a part of implementation level planning. Limiting snowmachines to designated trails is discussed under “Implementation level considerations” for alternatives C and D. These considerations are presented to display BLM’s management intent but could change based on public involvement and comment during implementation level planning.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0253-2	Easements should be reserved on all existing trails after they have been inventoried.	No easements are necessary if lands are to be retained as public lands. Reservation of new easements or extending reserved easements will be considered as public lands are conveyed to Native corporations.
0312-94	Identification of potential rights-of-way does not establish the validity of these claims nor the public's right to use them. In the absence of specific regulation or law, the validity of all RS 2477 rights-of-way should be determined on a case-by-case basis, either through the courts or by legally binding agreement of all landowners. We recommend that the BLM use discretion in evaluating the validity of each RS 2477 claim in the planning area. It is imperative that the routes are surveyed prior to processing.	Please see response to comment 0329-39 on R.S. 2477s.
0312-95	We recognize that there are many concerns held by adjacent private land owners, primarily Ahtna Inc., related to trespass and ANCSA 17(b) easements, as well as cumulative impacts on hunting and access issues. We support any efforts the BLM makes to address these concerns.	Thank you. As stated, Glennallen Field Office is committed to working with Ahtna, Inc. on implementation of a 17(b) easement plan, utilizing direction provided in this RMP.
0312-96	We recommend that the Proposed RMP/Final EIS adhere to the coordinated strategy to locate, identify and proactively manage 17(b) easements as established by the BLM Section 17(b) Public Easement Program. This includes prioritizing enforcement. We agree with the criteria and goals put forth in the BLM Resource Advisory Committee Resolution of February 18, 1999.	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will clearly define BLM's legal responsibilities on 17(b) easement management (pp. 41, 42, 187). It will allow for Field Office discretion in working with Ahtna, Inc. on education, maintenance, marking, and re-location of specific easements, based on priorities listed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 41). Implementation of these actions will be subject to approval for funding.
0326-1	Access restrictions resulting from the adoption of both Alternative C and D will not allow traditional means of access to continue on portions of public lands in the EARMP area and therefore are not supported by the AOC. [Alaska Outdoor Council]	The Draft RMP/EIS states (page 34) that all proposals for OHV management considered below (including alternatives C and D) would be consistent with section 811 of ANILCA. BLM will also comply with Section 1110 of ANILCA in management of the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridors.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0326-5	The AOC believes management of recreational opportunities and the conservation of natural resources values in the EARMP area can be achieved without unnecessarily restricting traditional activities and means of access that have been specifically provided for in ANILCA. Currently, State and Native lands within the EARMP are adequately being managed under a number of plans; the Copper Basin Area Mgmt. Plan (Dec. 1986), the Susitna Area Mgmt. Plan (June 1985), and the Nelchina Public Use Area. The AOC will not support any management alternative that is more restrictive than these plans or the state's "Generally Allowed Uses on State Land" policy.	The Draft RMP/EIS (page 34) clearly states that BLM will comply with ANILCA in its implementation of the Travel Management decisions made in this RMP. The BLM worked closely with the State and researched the State's DNR Area plans early in the planning process, to ensure consistency in management direction, particularly on State-selected lands. The BLM worked closely and carefully with the State to develop a strategy, on State-selected lands, that would set the stage for more proactive trails and OHV management and still be consistent with existing State statutes.
0329-39	Please don't recognize RS 2477 easements, or rely on them to provide public access. RS 2477s don't, in fact, provide public access. What they do is preclude meaningful conservation—they are a wrench in the gears of federal conservation units.	The Draft RMP/EIS states (page 34): "The State of Alaska recognizes approximately 650 R.S. 2477 routes throughout the State. The assertion of these routes has not been recognized and current BLM policy is to defer any processing of R.S. 2477 assertions except where there is a demonstrated and compelling need to make a determination. Land use planning decisions do not affect valid R.S. 2477 rights or future assertions." Decisions made in this RMP will not affect recognition or assertion of R.S. 2477 routes.
0329-40	It is good that BLM is maintaining access with 17(b) easements. Please don't terminate any 17(b) easements, even if they're not being used right now. Alaska is being locked up by privatization of the land.	It is BLM's goal to maintain access to public lands. Please see response to comment 0164-8.
0329-41	It is unclear how maintenance and management of 17(b) easements will "improve" under all action alternatives. (p. 434) If it were that simple, it would have been done already. Vowing to do better doesn't necessarily work. How will management of 17(b) easements improve?	Through a cooperative 17(b) easement plan being developed with Ahtna, Inc. as mentioned in the response to comment 0164-7. Management direction common to all alternatives (Draft RMP/EIS, page 34) allows BLM discretion to utilize education and some maintenance, on selected 17(b) easements, based on criteria as described.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0354-1	If right-of-ways [17(b) easements] cannot be controlled or maintained, they must be relinquished.	Termination of easements will not be considered as part of this RMP process. According to regulation (43 CFR 2650.4-7(a)(13)) BLM can terminate an easement if it was a) proposed at the time of conveyance; b) wasn't used by December 18, 2001; c) doesn't access isolated public land, or d) is no longer needed. Trespass or maintenance issues are not adequate justification for termination.
0354-3	Of the 1,300 miles of trails that exist in the planning area, those 17(b) easements that cross Native-owned or Native-selected lands must have "trail management implementation plans" or be relinquished, not just extended or reserved. The implementation plans must include reparation in accordance with ANILCA Sec. 1107(a)(2) "requirements for restoration, revegetation, and curtailment of erosion of the surface of the land" and Sec 1107 (a)(4) "requirements, including the minimum necessary width, designed to control or prevent (A) damage to the environment (including damage to fish and wildlife habitat), (B) damage to public or private property, and (C) hazards to public health and safety;" Sec. 1107 (a)(5) "requirements to protect the interest of individuals living in the general area of the right-of-way who rely on fish, wildlife, and biotic resources of the area for subsistence purposes;" and Sec 1107(a)(6) "requirements to employ measures to avoid or minimize adverse environmental, social, or economic impacts.". BLM is not in compliance with these issues in the Ahtna area.	As noted in our response to comment 0164-7, we agree that a cooperative agreement is needed for 17(b) easement management. Title 11 of ANILCA and specifically section 1107 deal with rights-of-way across public lands that access or cross Conservation System Units. BLM will comply with 1107 in consideration of right-of-way applications or right-of-way management within CSUs (the Delta and Gulkana wild and scenic rivers are the only BLM-managed CSUs in this planning area). However, Title 11 and section 1107 does not apply to 17(b) easements.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0354-4	Due to the considerable damage to Native-owned private lands, alternative routes with less negative impacts on streams are available and must be considered in accordance with ANILCA Sec. 201(1)(d)(ii) "the environmental and social and economic impact of the right-of-way, including impact on wildlife, fish and their habitat, and rural and traditional lifestyles including subsistence activities and measures which should be instituted to avoid or minimize negative impacts and enhance positive impacts".	Please see response to comment 0020-27 regarding re-alignment of 17(b) easements. Title II of ANILCA deals with establishment and management of new additions to the National Park System. Your specific citation is for consideration of rights-of-ways within Gates of the Arctic National Park. This does not apply to BLM's management of 17(b) easements.
0354-19	Some assumptions in the RMP are incorrect and unrealistic, and a plan based on inaccurate assumptions is doomed to failure, such as: "2) Access to private lands will decrease as land entitlements by Native Corporations are fulfilled." People already assume access rights on conveyed land that "claim 20+ years of use", which creates more conflict.	BLM stands by its assumption. As conveyance of Native-selected lands occurs, it is doubtful that all existing trails (including non-easement trails) will be maintained as easements in the conveyance documents.
0354-24	BLM's management policies must reflect more oversight on: 2) Education of the public and trail monitoring for unauthorized usage.	Page 34 of the Draft RMP/EIS identifies education as a discretionary action. BLM will consult with the landowner to identify educational opportunities, based on the priorities listed. It also states that BLM will continue to monitor use on 17(b) easements.
0354-25	BLM's management policies must reflect more oversight on: 3) Research means of rerouting right-of-ways to protect adjacent lands.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternatives that evaluate different areas for right-of-way exclusion or avoidance, based on specific resource concerns (pages 107-109).
0354-29	Actions for BLM-managed lands must include: 2) Research alternative routes to protect anadromous streams and Native allotments crossed by 17(b) easements.	Page 34 of the Draft RMP/EIS states "Realignment of 17(b) easements would be considered with the cooperation of the land owner."
0355-12	All 17(b) access routes should be identified by name and number.	They are. This is done in the conveyance document and Glennallen Field Office maintains an atlas with the mapped location, name and number of most 17(b) easements which is a public document and can be requested. Because of the large number of easements and the ability for anyone to obtain a copy of the list, we have not included a list of them in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0355-20	[U]nder ANILCA there are rights of access that cannot be adversely impacted by this EARMP. Those rights for road construction across WSR corridor should be explained in the EARMP to ensure all parties know that such rights exist as valid existing rights for access to State land, Native allotments, Native lands, and other existing rights. To not include this in the EARMP will result in major problems for projects that will require such access and for BLM to amend the EARMP when the need for such access arises. Now is the time to address this issue and include the ANILCA access rights clearly in the EARMP.	In the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, a paragraph has been included in Management Common to All Action Alternatives under Travel Management on page 42 summarizing access requirements under ANILCA. ANILCA insures "adequate and feasible access" to inholdings and valid existing rights. However, a transportation system crossing a Wild and Scenic River corridor is subject to consideration of impacts to the outstandingly remarkable values as well as consideration of alternative routes or modes of transportation. Construction of such a route is not a guaranteed "right" under ANILCA. See 43 CFR 36.1-36.9.
0355-26	In all other specific areas listed there is not justification for the access restrictions. If BLM proceeds and includes such restrictions, the EARMP should state clearly in each that ORV access for mineral exploration is allowed.	Justification has been provided for any access restrictions in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0357-4	The access the public gains through 17 (b) easements was another area we have always had great problems with. With this plan, we would like to see the development of a easement management plan for the entire area the plan covers. We fully understand the purpose behind reservation of these public access routes, we do not support the lack of management plans and the little or no presence made by those who are administratively responsible for the publics proper use of these trails, roads, and sites. And when violations are located of the easements and damage occurs, restoration and fines for the damage should be sought by those who caused the damage in the first place.	Please see responses to comments 0379-3, 0381-2, and 0020-12.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0375-6	There's also the issue of 17(b) easements and trespass. BLM had lots of money to plan and identify 17(b) easements and to put them into conveyances to the various ANCSA corporations but they haven't put any money into manage and enforce and prevent trespass by people using these easements. I heard one of the Board members suggest that it's up to the corporation to prevent trespass, it takes money, it takes personnel, it's not an easy matter to prevent trespass over a million and a half acres. The 17(b) easements were not placed there by the Native tribes, they were not placed there by the regional corporations, they were placed there by BLM in attempting to identify easements for the public, and these are the easements that the public are using and you've heard people testify at length about damage to the lands caused by use of easements. And even if they're lawfully on the lands and using an easement that is a legal easement damage to the land has to be prevented and it's got to be managed and it's got to be repaired where it happens. And if BLM is going to identify the easements and encourage the use of the easements, then you should likewise prevent trespass, repair them, identify them and force the rights that private land owners should expect in using the easements.	Please see responses to comments 0379-3, 0381-2, and 0020-12.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0379-3	And on easements, that's not enforced. Like people testified ahead of me, that if the trail is too muddy and they can't go through there, they'll just make another new trail, to go around, and these easements aren't enforced. And like somebody else said if I did that to somebody else's property I'd probably end up in jail or getting shot.	The Draft RMP/EIS (page 34) allows for BLM to participate in 17(b) easement maintenance (which, in some cases, would reduce trail braiding and help easement users to stay on the easement), based on priorities listed on page 34. Regarding enforcement, BLM has only a non-possessory interest in a reserved easement, which is the right to use the land for a specified purpose. This does not allow BLM to take civil or criminal action against uses, such as wandering from the easement, camping more than 24 hours or fishing from the easement, when the uses do not interfere with the retained rights (the use of the easement). This information will be added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, as noted above (pp. 42, 187).
0381-2	The plan reflects BLM's involvement in the management of easements, specifically as it refers to 17(b). However, this management authority seems only temporary or rather incidental. Essentially there is no management of easements and if it were so, easements would be posted, identified and marked. Trail management plans would have been implemented through possible cooperative agreements as mentioned. Enforcement of ANILCA mandates, as in Section .810 and .1107, would have already been in place and implemented and so forth.	The Draft RMP/EIS has been changed to provide a clear description of BLM's legal responsibilities in easement management (See pp. 42, 187 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS). Some of the items you mention have been done, such as easement identification and marking. It is important to understand (and it will be made clear in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS) that BLM's responsibilities for 17(b) management under law are limited to record keeping, identification and reservation, and termination of easements. Beyond that, all easement management (including locating and marking) is discretionary and subject to availability of funds, personnel and approval.
0381-4	Finally, we urge BLM to reflect in the plan, that State claimed RS-2477's for instance, be evaluated for validity in that it complies with the original purpose for which it was written. We go further to state that we do not recognize RS-2477's as being applicable to Native lands in general. The same would apply to section line easements as asserted today by the State.	Please see responses to comments 0329-39 on R.S. 2477s and comment 0164-21 on section line easements.
0382-1	So the 17(b) easements need to be managed in a, like, you know, for any land managers to have any kind of easement program, they need to enforce their policies and, you know, protect the land owners.	BLM's responsibilities for enforcement on 17(b) easements is explained in the response to comment 0379-3. This language will be added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for clarification (page 42).

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0386-4	[T]he 17(b) easements have created -- like Roy Ewan testified, has created an influx of people on private lands, specifically AHTNA lands. And that under the plans, you know, the 17(b) easements is encouraging people to access that to different places that the Federal has a responsibility for facilities, bathroom, trash pickup and things that are happening along these access places.	Please see response to comment 0312-96.

2. RECREATION

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT		
0006-1	This plan addresses a host of important issues, but perhaps none more important than the management of motorized recreational vehicles and the protection and restoration of the Natural Soundscape. Natural quiet and the opportunity to hear and enjoy natural sounds have until recently been taken for granted. No one would have thought a decade or two ago that it would become nearly impossible on so many of our public lands for both people and wildlife to find quiet refuge in the backcountry.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternative proposals that would manage for non-motorized areas, including consideration of 281,000 acres in Alternative C and 44,000 acres in Alternative D, as well as consideration of specific trails that would be managed as non-motorized. In its' Recreation Opportunity Spectrum inventory, one of the considerations was "sights and sounds of the road system". Within areas that offer a primitive recreation opportunity, sights and sounds of the road system are nonexistent. These areas currently constitute 63% of BLM-managed lands within the planning area.
0006-9	Flightseeing in the basin is likely to grow, and it can become a serious problem to those on the ground. Although at the present time overflights cannot be regulated by the BLM, landings can be. Flightseeing should be regulated wherever possible by attaching provisions to landing permits which minimize the impacts to those on the ground. Provisions can include, in addition to designated where landings can occur, no flight zones and designated flight paths to protect wildlife as well as people, curfews (for example, no flights between the hours of 6 p.m. and 9 a.m.), and restrictions on the number of flights.	The Draft RMP/EIS identifies, in Alternatives C and D, specific areas where commercial recreation use limits (including flightseeing) would be established, based on objectives identified in the RMP. In addition, specific areas are considered that would exclude heli-skiing, based on maintenance of existing primitive recreation opportunities (see pages 58-64, Draft RMP/EIS).
0035-3	I hunt on the north side of Jack Bay for goats and I've watched helicopters from the heli-skiing outfitters pass back and forth along the cliffs and actually watched goats flee from the helicopters and kick off small avalanches ... And I've also seen helicopters come zooming along down at tree level on the SouthFork of the Neamhoff River when black bear -- or	Glennallen Field Office staff monitor permitted helicopter supported skiing activities on BLM-managed lands in the Valdez and Tiekel River areas. One facet of this monitoring is identification of critical Dall sheep and mountain goat habitat. Within these critical areas, helicopters are not permitted to land and are required to maintain horizontal and vertical distances from goats and sheep. The Draft RMP/EIS, Required Operating Procedure F&W-b-6, page 615, describes stipulations that would be applied to all operations.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	brown bears are just coming out of hibernation during late April, early brown bears, and that sort of thing is very hard to regulate so I think the best idea is just to keep heli-skiers out of some of that country. They've got lots of country to use along the Richardson Highway, the State lands, I believe is all open to heli-skiing, and so I would strongly urge in the interest of goats and brown bears, in particular, and recreationists also to try to keep that area as free from motorized use as possible.	
0070-3	I'm always up for a few public use cabins perhaps on some of the trails you have along the Denali Highway, maybe put a few in, 10, 12 miles back, something that snowmachiners can use, something that hikers, bikers, whatever, multi-use trails can use.	Alternatives B and D in the Draft RMP/EIS both consider public use cabins in the Denali Highway area (pages 57 and 62).
0084-7	I also support designating the five Special Recreation Management Areas presented within the draft plan in hopes that BLM will recognize the sustainable, long-term economic and social values of responsible, low impact recreation activities on these public wild lands.	Thank you for your comment. SRMAs are considered for designation as outlined in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 58-64.
0097-1	AQRC [Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition] supports Alternative C, instead of the Preferred Alternative D, due to the greater opportunities offered for quiet recreation in backcountry or primitive settings. Alternative C designates that more area be included within Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA) and thus more lands will be managed to maintain backcountry non-motorized recreational opportunities.	You are correct. Thanks for the comment.
0164-29	Ahtna Inc. is against the development of a public cabin system but would like to see current cabins that are not in trespass remain in place for emergency purposes.	Thanks for the comments. A range of alternatives is considered for public cabins in the Draft RMP/EIS, including no public cabin system (Alternatives A and C).

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0164-30	Ahtna. Inc does not support the increase in recreation use (commercial special recreation permits, development of facilities) and feels that it should be monitored for impacts to subsistence uses and natural resources.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers no additional facilities, with emphasis on managing for primitive and semi-primitive recreation experiences. Impacts to subsistence from recreational activities and proposals are considered in Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences.. BLM will continue to monitor recreation uses (particularly trail systems) for impacts to natural resources and subsistence, as described on pages 55 and 56 and as required by ANILCA, Section 810.
0164-32	Page 55 - In all alternatives dealing with recreation activities, any management activities should attempt to minimize conflict with subsistence uses, possibly through segregation of activities through spatial or temporal means.	ANILCA, Section 810, requires BLM to "evaluate the effect of any use, occupancy, or disposition on subsistence uses and needs…" This is done for all recreation-related proposals in the Draft RMP/EIS in the ANILCA Section 810 Analysis (page 645). An ANILCA 810 analysis is also done on every implementation-level project that BLM undertakes. This assures that consideration is given to minimizing impacts to subsistence resources and uses.
0164-33	Ahtna Inc. demands that the BLM develop Required Operating Procedures and Stipulations for recreational activities to meet the objective :" Maintain and protect fish and wildlife habitat on public lands, and provide for the habitat needs to fish and wildlife resources necessary to maintain or enhance such populations."	ROP-Soils-b-3 (page 611, Draft RMP/EIS) provides operating procedures for the use of Off Highway Vehicles associated with permitted activities. OHV management strategy identified in Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS sets the stage for proactive management of casual use OHV associated with recreation, hunting, and fishing. It does this by limiting OHV use, in most areas, to existing or designated trails.
0169-2	In general, we have to support Alternative B, Development. This alternative provides the best opportunities for recreation, trail development and improvements.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative B emphasizes recreation development to mitigate impacts from increasing visitor use.
0188-2	Diversity of recreational users is provided by existing National Parks & Preserves. These lands need to be open to a wide variety of multi-user to insure diversity.	From a regional standpoint, you are correct. However, BLM is tasked with managing for a diversity of recreational opportunities. BLM, within this planning area, manages some of the most accessible public lands in the State of Alaska. The public has emphatically told us that they want (and need) the opportunity to easily access primitive, non-motorized opportunities as well as motorized opportunities.
0308-1	Through our work on the FishWatch water quality and human use monitoring in the Copper River drainage, we have seen several examples of increased recreational use in the region. One volunteer regularly counts 20 or more RVs at the Gulkana River pull-out along the Richardson Highway for most of the month of June. I realize this is not a BLM facility, but it is an indicator of rising visitation and use levels	See our response to comment 0312-1.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	in the region and the need for facilities and management practices that will protect the integrity of our fish and wildlife habitat.	
0312-1	There is significant need for a new and innovative supply of recreation opportunities and conservation system units to help meet the demands of the current and future population of Alaska and to strengthen the expanding tourism economy. The national demand for outdoor recreation and open spaces in Alaska is constantly rising due to the growing resident population and increasing number of tourism visitors to the state.	The Draft RMP/EIS recognizes the increasing demand for outdoor recreation in this planning area (pages 172, 173). BLM's response to this demand is outlined in the range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS, but includes consideration of increased and improved recreational facilities as well as designation of Special Recreation Management Areas, where management emphasis would be on continuing to provide a diversity of quality recreation experiences.
0312-75	The commercially guided helicopter skiing activities that take place on BLM lands within the planning area were not sufficiently addressed in the Draft RMP/EIS. The Draft RMP/EIS should lay the groundwork for determining what level of commercial recreation use might be appropriate in the planning area. The RMP/EIS is the planning document that is to determine if the activity should be deemed suitable on BLM administered lands, and if determined to be suitable, where and under what conditions. OHVs are handled in a similar manner in the RMP, and it is unclear why the RMP did not specifically address the commercially guided helicopter skiing activity. Please clarify for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.	The Draft RMP/EIS does lay the groundwork for determining what level of commercial recreation use might be appropriate for specific areas. It does this by identifying management objectives based on Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classes. The Draft RMP/EIS also identifies, in Alternatives C and D, specific areas where commercial recreation use limits (including heli-skiing) would be established. Developing use limits for heli-skiing (or other commercial recreation activities) for a given area includes characterizing the area's user, knowing their tolerances for certain activities, and setting limits based on those tolerances; along with consideration of resource impacts, economic impacts, and safety concerns. To make those decisions at this level of planning would be arbitrary and capricious.
0312-76	We share concerns with local residents and users that there are no quiet areas set aside in the BLM administered lands for quiet winter recreation. Please include this in the preferred alternative in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to offer a full spectrum of alternatives to the public.	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes consideration of the Delta Mountain sub-unit in the Proposed RMP (Alternative D), which would manage these areas for a non-motorized winter experience.
0317-2	Also, non-motorized recreation deserves a	This is considered in Alternative D. Alternative C considers 281,000 acres of non-

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	fairer shake in the management plan. Please increase the amount of land set aside for bi-pedal locomotion to 1 percent.	motorized area.
0329-42	More inventory and monitoring of recreation use is critical, but nobody is doing it. Why aren't you doing more? Particular needs include: total use numbers; use trends; delineation of user groups, by area and season; quantification of resource damage.	We agree that monitoring is critical, and BLM is committed to continue, as described on pages 55 and 56 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Recreation monitoring is difficult in this planning area because so many activities are dispersed. Budget constraints also sometimes limit monitoring activities.
0329-46	The Draft RMP/EIS fails to consider impacts of proposed actions on wildland recreation and tourism. For example, a big mine would diminish sport-fishing opportunities. Oil and gas development, with its security requirements, would privatize and lock up what are now open public lands.	We disagree. Impacts to recreation (including wildland recreation and tourism) are presented on pages 379-397. Cumulative impacts are described on page 537.
0329-49	The visitor centers on Denali highway are a bad idea. You shouldn't fancy this road up at all. Maintenance for safety should be a priority, but this is not a normal road that would be improved by being "improved." First, existing use is already at capacity, and additional use would be unsustainable. Second, part of the value of this road is its sketchiness. Nobody depends on this road being maintained to get anywhere. But it is worth driving as a way to see a vastness not normally encountered, and perhaps a glimpse into the difficulty of overland travel. "Improving" the area would actually decrease access to this type of recreational experience. Adding facilities to problem areas is a double-edged sword that is not appreciated in the Draft EIS. (p.455) As we note above, actively not encouraging increased use is a useful management tool that should be used.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative C would not implement any new recreational facilities along the Denali Highway. Objectives described for the Denali Highway under Alternative D (under long-term management) would be to maintain existing recreation experiences. This shows BLM's intent to try to manage the Denali Highway "as is". However, BLM also recognizes that as visitor use levels increase, some facilities are necessary to minimize impacts and to continue to provide a quality experience along the road. This drives the need for the facility develop/improvement listed under Alternative D (page 62, Draft RMP/EIS).
0329-50	Please put in place some upper use limits. There is a limit to recreational carrying capacity	The need for upper use limits is recognized for several specific recreation areas in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D). See Delta WSR Corridor Area, Denali Highway

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	that needs to be appreciated sooner rather than later.	Area (for commercial uses), Tiekel Area (for heli-skiing), and Delta Range Area descriptions, pages60-64, Draft RMP/EIS.
0337-1	Planning for 20 to 50 years down the road is needed for the trail expansions, trail head parking, and trail maintenance in sensitive areas. If anything, these trails and trail heads should be expanded to allow for future increases in populations. It seems that a snap shot in time was used, and deemed nothing would change in usage or population.	The Draft RMP/EIS certainly considers increasing user trends, not just a "snap shot in time". See pages 172, 173. The alternatives consider a range of recreation facility develop, from very limited (Alternative C) to increased facility development to handle increased visitor impacts.
0339-2	This is some of the highest wilderness quality lands in the United States visible from some of the most treasured scenic roadways in Alaska. Alaska receives more and more tourists each year and our focus needs to shift to ecological tourism generating a benefit for the land, the people who live here and the tourist who seek wilderness.	Thanks for the comment. BLM, as clearly stated in the goals for recreation (page 55, Draft RMP/EIS) is committed to managing for a diversity of recreation experiences.
0340-2	Please consider closing more area in the management planning area in eastern Alaska to …mineral leasing …[M]ineral leasing and the mining which can often follow are incompatible w/ the recreational, wildlife, archaeological, scenic, and subsistence value in much of the planning area. Please consider some more exclusions for some of the most popular recreational areas such as the Denali highway corridor, Tangle Lakes area, and Delta River valley. The recreational and scenic wilderness value of this land is much greater and will benefit more people for a much longer time than any minerals which could be extracted from them, so I ask that you manage the area accordingly.	The Draft RMP/EIS does consider maintenance of withdrawals that would keep these areas closed to mineral entry or mineral leasing (Alternative C descriptions, pages 58-60). Alternative D recommends a withdrawal for 16,000 acres in the scenic portion of the Delta River Wild and Scenic River corridor that is currently not closed to locatable mineral entry.
0342-5	The Denali Highway is a valuable recreational resource both for its own sake and as a scenic travel link between Denali and Wrangell-St. Elias National parks. Although the recreational	Thanks for your comment. It is possible, in the Record of Decision that goes with the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, for elements from different alternatives to be combined in the final decision. The developments listed under Alternative B may not be consistent with trying to manage the Denali Highway to maintain existing recreation opportunities.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	opportunities are identified and planned for, the plan does not highlight the role of the highway in connecting two of Alaska's great scenic destinations. The quality of experience along the highway could help determine the type and amount of visitation on the travel corridor, and the interest of independent and package tour travelers to plan trips that link the two national parks. The types of recreational facility development described in alternative B seem appropriate to support the "scenic corridor" vision. However, the scenic resource protection provisions of Alternative C or D would also seem important if the vision is to be accomplished.	Maintaining existing conditions along the Denali Highway is a common theme in public comment.
0342-6	The NPS supports the development of a multi-agency visitor center or visitor contact station in the vicinity of the Parks Highway-Denali Highway junction, which is identified as one of two such visitor facilities in the Recreation section of alternative B. If the BLM chooses the strategy identified in alternative D, in which facilities would be developed only if lands in the area are maintained in long-term federal ownership, we recommend that alternative D (BLM preferred alternative) include this visitor contact station in the list of visitor facilities to be developed (see page 62).	Thanks for your comment. See response to comment 0342-5.
0342-7	The National Park Service is interested in cooperating with BLM and other public landowners on regional planning for recreation, to insure that recreational opportunities on the various public lands are clearly identified and that visitors to the region have sufficient information to guide them to the places most compatible with their recreational interests.	Good. Because of the proximity, GFO staff work closely with Wrangell/St. Elias National Park and Preserve staff. This planning process has opened lines of communication between BLM and Denali National Park and Preserve planning staff. BLM would like to keep these lines of communication open during implementation-level planning.
0343-1	I think [Tangle Lakes, Thompson Pass, Alaska Range] should all remain open to the public for	These areas will remain open to the public for outdoor recreation under all alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS. There would be some limit on motorized vehicles

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	outdoor recreation with some limit on motorized vehicles.	imposed under Alternatives C and D.
0354-8	RECREATION. We oppose ALTERNATIVE D. Management to minimize resource impacts and user conflicts is impossible without a major education effort on land ownership, allowable trail usage and private property rights and laws. Money for enforcement of said laws and regulations is required. ORV use results in "unquantified resource impacts", which must be rectified.	Thanks for the comment.
0369-1	I am concerned that your plan appears to favor resource extract over … consideration of recreational and tourism opportunities on these public wild lands.	We believe that the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) represents a balance and considers recreational and tourism opportunities while allowing for some level of resource development. In addition, Alternative C considers a management scenario which would retain withdrawals and apply area-wide restrictions to the point where very little resource development would occur.
0371-1	Careful planning should be made on what area to open up mineral and other leasing. A lot of the area on the north side of the Denali hwy region is used for recreational purposes.	Much of the area north of the Denali Highway has been conveyed to the State of Alaska and would no longer be covered by this RMP. However, for BLM-managed lands, the Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternatives, including maintaining withdrawals along the Denali Highway so that no locatable mineral entry or mineral leasing would occur. The other alternatives would open most of the area for mineral entry and leasing.
SPECIAL RECREATION PERMITS		
0164-24	All land status must be settled before commercial use can be permitted.	We disagree. ANILCA (Section 906(k)) provides guidance for permitting on selected lands. This guidance is described on page 104 of the Draft RMP/EIS. It requires consultation and, in some case, concurrence.
0173-4	Recreational uses other than recreational mining should be focused in areas that do not have significant mineral potential. Trying to develop a plan that mixes both together and meets the best interest of each group is similar to mixing residential housing in the middle of commercial businesses. Neither group is happy and conflicts will inevitably arise.	As you have noted, BLM is a multiple use agency. For safety purposes, recreational use would not be permitted in areas being actively mined. However, BLM will not consider limiting recreational use simply on the basis of mineral potential.
0175-6	We are concerned about the statements regarding limitations to be applied to Special Recreation Permits within the Tiekel SRMA and Bering RNA (stated in summary tables on	The same changes as noted in response to comment 0175-7 will be made to the tables in Appendix B in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, for consistency and clarity.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	pages 586 and 603). We recommend noting that decisions on this issue will be developed through an implementation level planning process. In general, the state supports implementation of the least restrictive means to mitigate impacts and achieve management goals, such as education, increased enforcement of existing regulations, voluntary guidelines, commercial use permit stipulations (e.g. seasonal or temporal requirements), and other management tools.	
0175-7	The State concurs with the statement regarding Commercial Use included on page 66 in Table 4, Recreation Summary. We recommend that this statement be carried forward to the summary tables in Appendix I in order to further clarify BLM's intent.	This change will be made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for clarification (Appendix A).
0175-54	Page 580, Denali Highway SRMA Please edit Alternatives C and D, Denali Highway SRMA, Special Recreation Permits (SRP) to include "based on management objectives and anticipated encounters as determined through an activity planning process."	Please see response to comment 0175-7.
RECREATION OPPORTUNITY SPECTRUM		
0044-15	Recreation, wherever not already developed (p. 177) should remain primitive and non-motorized. I support the Clearwater Creek non-motorized area and would like to see it enforced. The map on page 177 should show continuous green swath of non-motorized habitat.	Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS would manage the Denali Highway to maintain existing recreation experiences, including primitive where they exist. The Clearwater Creek non-motorized area has been dropped from consideration because this area was conveyed to the State in 2004.
0049-2	Another point that we'd like to see some clarification on is in the lands that are marked as primitive. What we'd like to know is that in a primitive experience, that doesn't mean that you can't use a motorized vehicle to get there.	This has been clearly defined in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 201) to state that motorized trails do not occur in these areas. Some seasonal motorized use occurs (snowmachines) but at a very low density.
0188-3	None of this area should be classified as	Why? As stated (Draft RMP/EIS, page 174) the areas are characterized by an

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	"primitive". The term is misleading.	unmodified natural environment of fairly large size. Concentration of users is very low and evidence of other users is minimal. Sights and sounds of the road system are nonexistent and the area is remote. Human built structures are few and far between or are inconspicuous.
0360-1	I urge you to consider creating an inventory for all land in your jurisdiction that is currently roadless, and keeping such lands in their natural state.	As part of the planning process, BLM conducted a Recreation Opportunity Spectrum class inventory (pages 174, 175 Draft RMP/EIS). Because sights and sounds of any road system are non-existent in a primitive class, this inventory serves to show roadless areas.
AREAS OF CONCENTRATED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES (SRMA)		
0006-12	The Denali Highway SRMA would create a unique opportunity; this designation would benefit not just the resource, and quiet recreationists on foot or on skis, but both resident and non-resident sightseers traveling in one of the few places in the state where lands above timberline can be enjoyed from an automobile at a leisurely pace--due in large part to the fact that the highway is unpaved.	We agree. Please see our response to comment 0312-71.
0037-1	I am advocating for the 6 non-motorized recreation areas, areas to get away from snowmachine noise, and protection from mining.	Alternative C considers 281,000 acres managed for non-motorized use, and maintenance of withdrawals that would prohibit mining on approximately 50% of BLM-managed lands.
0045-2	Regarding snowmachine use, over 99 percent of the planning area is open to snowmachine use. This in my opinion is too great. In the earlier phases of this planning effort, 6 areas were considered for quiet recreation (non-motorized) and unfortunately, only two made it to the preferred alternatives. At the least, please support the two Delta Range non-motorized areas.	Alternative C considers four different sub-units, totaling 281,000 acres, that would be managed as non-motorized, at least seasonally. Other areas were analyzed but not considered in detail for reasons explained in the Draft RMP/EIS (Stuart Creek non-motorized and Clearwater Mountains non-motorized, see page 31).
0060-16	We strongly urge BLM to develop a comprehensive trails plan for each of the SRMAs, and for other unencumbered BLM lands. Each plan should provide for a balance of motorized and non-motorized trails, and should also specify locations for development	We agree. See page 33 of the Draft RMP/EIS, under Implementation-level Planning and note that specific travel management areas described on pages 35-50 coincide with areas considered for SRMA designations (Delta and Gulkana Rivers, Delta Range, Tiekel, and Denali Highway). In other words, OHV and trail management will be a part of implementation-level plans for SRMAs.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	of trailheads and specific maintenance plans for trails. These plans should include designated non-motorized trails for the Denali, Gulkana, and Tiekel SRMAs. Trail plans should include: a list of designated trails and allowed uses; weight or technical restrictions for use of OHVs on designated trails; minimum snow cover depth requirements for winter travel; a specific enforcement plan for each trail or each area.	
0060-21	As described in our initial comments [July 1 2004] we support the designation of SRMAs in the Delta National Wild & Scenic River Corridor, the Gulkana National Wild River, the Delta Range and the Tiekel Area. We would like to reiterate all statements and suggestions made in those comments. We further support the addition, as proposed in Alternative C, of a much larger portion of the Tiekel Area (848,000 acres as opposed to 120,000 acres) and 559,000 acres of the viewshed from the Denali Highway. The Tiekel area and the Denali Highway viewshed are important recreational areas for Alaskans and for visitors and tourists who are seeking a primitive landscape. As such it is both ecologically and economically important to protect and maintain the primitive, semi-primitive, and roaded-natural recreation experiences available in these areas	Thanks for the comment. The SRMA designations you mention are proposed in Alternative C and effects of implementing such a proposal are considered in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0060-22	In keeping with the objective of managing for wild and scenic values, we support the proposed and existing closures to development of minerals, oil and gas, roads, public use cabins, airstrips, and military activity. Closure of SRMAs to locatable mineral entry is crucial, in order to protect recreation and viewshed values.	Your first sentence is considered for the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridors under Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS. Your second sentence (closure of SRMAs to locatable mineral entry) is considered under Alternative C.
0068-2	We've been restricted off of the Gulkana River	The regulations you refer to were implemented by Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	on fishing over the years, it just goes from one to the other. Now, you can't catch kings until you get all the way down to the West Fork.	and will not be affected by this RMP.
0084-6	I support the BLM's nomination to designate the Denali Highway as a National Back Country Byway. The pristine scenery, wildlife viewing, and natural recreation opportunities available along this road are highly treasured values in need of protective management to ensure their future vitality.	Please see our response to comment 0312-71.
0097-3	In regard to winter quiet recreation, we support Alternative C since it proposes four areas amounting to 281,000 acres to be Closed to snowmachines[.]	You are correct. This is proposed under Alternative C and the effects of the proposal are analyzed. Thanks for the comment.
0104-1	The BLM must designate the Denali Highway as a National Back Country Byway. The pristine scenery, wildlife viewing, and natural recreation opportunities available along this road are incomparable and any profit that the corporations would pay to the state of Alaska would be worth far less than the loss of tourism dollars that would come if it was destroyed or damaged.	Consideration for designation as an SRMA is included in Alternatives C and D. Consideration as a Backcountry Byway is in Alternative B. Please see our response to comment 0312-71.
0164-23	Ahtna Inc. does not support the Denali Highway being designated as BackCountry Byway, as outlined in Alternative B because it is a primary hunting and migration route. Increased use that would come from such a designation would adversely affect our subsistence lifestyles.	Please see our response to comment 0312-71.
0164-25	Ahtna opposes the designation of Special Recreation Management Areas on selected lands because it would open lands up for impacts associated with increased recreation. It would also create possible trespass issues once lands were conveyed.	Designation of SRMAs on selected lands is only considered in Alternative C. The other alternatives analyze SRMA designation on unencumbered BLM lands or no designations. Effects of recreation and SRMA designations are described for natural and cultural resources on pages 398-499 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0164-26	The recreational use in designated Special Recreation Management Areas needs to be	We agree. SRMA designation does not necessarily promote an area. Sometimes the management emphasis may be to maintain existing recreation experiences, in which

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	monitored to be sure that it is not adversely impacting subsistence resources in those areas.	case promoting use would be counter to the objectives. In other cases recreation facilities may be necessary to mitigate the impact of increasing recreational use. Under Alternatives C and D, management proposals would set the stage for more proactive management of Off Highway Vehicles.
0164-28	We support the designation of the Gulkana Wild and Scenic River Corridor as a Special Recreation Management Area to protect the river and surrounding lands to keep them in pristine and natural state.	Thanks for the comment: This is considered in Alternatives C and D.
0173-20	Delta Range Area: Locatable Minerals claims in the Canwell and Augustana sub-units should be allowed with no access restrictions. Snowmobile access can be necessary to make an exploration project cost effective. Snowmobile access should not be restricted as a form of access to the area.	Under Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative), the withdrawal against locatable mineral entry in the inner corridor of the pipeline/utility corridor would remain in place and the outer corridor would be open for locatable mineral entry. Most of the Canwell and Augustana sub-units lie within the outer corridor, so would be open to locatable mineral entry. Snowmachine access would be permitted for exploration. Access for development would be permitted through a site-specific Plan of Operations. There are currently no federal claims in these areas.
0173-21	Delta Range Area: Alternative D is also too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures"	Alternative D considers road construction avoidance areas based on specific resource concerns or in order to maintain recreational opportunities. Your suggestion is considered and analyzed in Alternative B.
0173-22	Denali Highway Area: The BLM should not pursue the designation of this State-owned highway as a Backcountry Byway. This highway is one of the few major highways in the State. Upgrades and new construction are necessary to maintain the viability of the road and it should not be restricted by such designations.	Please see our response to comment 0312-71.
0173-23	Denali Highway Area: The Denali Highway is an important area to the economy of the State of Alaska. The majority of the Denali Highway area is State selected. It is totally inappropriate to include State and Native lands in the designation of the SRMA. These selected lands will in all likelihood become State or Native lands in the future. Therefore, no	Only Alternative C would consider designation of selected lands along the Denali Highway under an SRMA. Alternative D would consider SRMA designation if lands along the Denali are retained in federal management. Only Alternative C considers maintenance of existing withdrawals along the Denali that would exclude mineral entry or mineral leasing. Alternative D would allow these uses, with application of Required Operating Procedures to reduce impacts to the viewshed, should development occur. SRMA designation recognizes recreation as a dominant use of an area…it does not preclude other uses.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	restrictions should be imposed on these lands.	
0173-24	Denali Highway Area: Alternative D is also too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures"	Alternative D allows road construction for resource development in this SRMA, utilizing guidelines for maintenance of VRM Class II and III viewsheds (page 44, Draft RMP/EIS). Only Alternative C prohibits road construction. Your suggestion is considered in Alternative B.
0173-28	Tiekel Area: Locatable Minerals in the Tiekel area should remain open and PLO 5150 should be revoked to open portions of the pipeline/utility corridor (inner corridor) except within a 1/2 mile wide corridor centered on the TAPS.	Closing the area to mineral entry is only considered in Alternative C. Revoking PLO 5150 is considered in Alternative B.
0173-29	Tiekel Area - PLO 5150 should be revoked and Leasable minerals (Coal) should be opened for coal leasing and deemed suitable for development by all mining methods.	Revocation of PLO 5150 is considered in Alternative B. As explained on page 123 of the Draft RMP/EIS, all BLM-administered lands within the planning area subject to leasing under 43 CFR 3400.2 are open to coal exploration and study. The coal screening process (as identified by 43 CFR 3420.1-4) has not been conducted in this planning area. Interest in exploration or leasing of Federal coal would be handled on a case-by-case basis. This approach was chosen in this planning process because of the low potential for coal as well as the lack of interest in coal development in the area in the last 30 years.
0173-30	Tiekel Area - Lands and Realty should grant FLPMA and R&PP leases. FLPMA 302 permits and Rights of Way should be granted.	Only Alternative C would exclude these uses, in areas managed for a primitive recreation experience. Alternative D would consider these uses, consistent with recreation management objectives. Alternatives A and B would not designate an SRMA for this area.
0173-31	Tiekel Area - It is totally inappropriate to include State and Native selected lands in the designation of this SRMA. These selected lands will in all likelihood become State or native lands in the future. Therefore, no restrictions should be imposed on these lands.	Only Alternative C considers designation of selected lands within the Tiekel area as an SRMA. Management of the area with an emphasis on recreation is not inconsistent with State of Alaska (DNR) management direction for the area as prescribed in the Copper Basin Area Plan.
0173-32	Tiekel Area - Alternative D is too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures".	Thanks for the comment. Your suggestion is considered and analyzed in Alternative B.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
0187-2	I am also concerned and interested in seeing BLM take actions to conserve unique landscapes and resources identified in the plan as deserving of potential Special Rec[reation] Mgt. Areas. To this end, I strongly support the SRMA's identified in Alternative C, especially for the Tiekel area	Thanks for the comment.
0308-2	Implementation of the Denali Highway SRMA as outlined under Alternative C with the interim management provisions for state selected lands articulated under Alternative D.	This is exactly what is described under Alternative D for the Denali Highway. Under that alternative, lands retained in federal ownership along the Denali Highway would be managed as an SRMA, with objectives as described under Alternative C.
0312-62	We support the Alternative D proposals to establish Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) for the Delta and Gulkana National Wild and Scenic River (WSR) corridors. These designations will direct BLM management to maintain the existing primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities available along the rivers.	Thanks for the comment. This is also considered under Alternative C.
0312-63	We recommend the BLM designate the Delta and Gulkana WSR corridor SRMAs as "limited" to designated trails for OHV use, with an emphasis on designated points for river crossings and sensitive areas. This standard will allow enforcement to be initiated immediately on the unencumbered lands within and adjacent to the river corridors and provide protection until implementation level planning is completed. We are concerned that this [existing as described in the draft RMP] network of trails and associated resource degradation will continue to expand and their impacts compound unless immediate action is taken to manage the use of these trails.	This change has been made. The Proposed RMP/EIS designates specific trails within the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridors (see pp. 51, 53 of the Proposed RMP/ Final EIS).
0312-64	We support the creation of the Delta Range SRMA. We appreciate and strongly support the Alternative D proposal to prohibit motorized use within the Augustana and Canwell sub-	Creation of a Delta Range SRMA is considered and analyzed in Alternatives C and D, along with management of the Augustana and Canwell subunits as non-motorized (year-round in C, seasonally in D). Under Alternative D, allowances would be made for snowmachine access to subsistence hunting. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes the

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	units. Opportunities to enjoy quiet, peaceful experiences free of motorized sounds are cherished by local users, and therefore we also support the option to prohibit commercial helicopter activities within areas managed for primitive recreation experiences.	McCallum Creek drainage as part of the Delta Mountain sub-unit (page 73, Proposed RMP/Final EIS). There is no alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS or the Proposed RMP/Final EIS that analyzes prohibition of heli-skiing in all areas to be managed for a primitive recreation experience.
0312-65	We urge BLM to persuade the State to acknowledge the primitive recreation values of the area [Tiekel SRMA] and to reach a formal agreement that if the selected lands are conveyed, the State will also strive to maintain a diversity of recreation opportunities on these public lands according to the model format presented in this draft plan.	The State already seems to recognize this, as stated in their Copper Basin Area plan for the Thompson Pass area: "The management unit should be retained in state ownership and managed for multiple use with emphasis on expanding recreation opportunities. Certain recreation activities (particularly winter recreation and OHV use) also need, or soon will need, more active management for public safety and for avoiding conflict between users."
0312-66	We also support the Alternative D proposal to designate 120,000 acres of unencumbered BLM lands as the Tiekel SRMA. Emphasis should be placed on allocating designated trails and areas for the pursuit of both summer and winter non-motorized sports. We request that consistent interim protection measures are applied to the 728,000 acres of adjacent State and Native-selected lands. In the event that these selected lands are not ultimately conveyed, the existing high quality resource condition of the lands would still remain and at that time they should be considered for inclusion within the Tiekel SRMA as proposed in Alternative C.	Thanks for your comment. Alternative C considers "consistent protection measures" on all 728,000 acres of adjacent State- and Native-selected lands. Alternative D would manage this larger area of selected lands consistent with the SRMA only if they are retained in long-term Federal ownership.
0312-67	We support the adoption of the alternative C proposal to create the 559,000 acre Denali Highway SRMA and urge BLM to take immediate management actions to mitigate the growing impacts of motorized vehicle use within the viewshed.	Thanks for your comment. Alternatives C and D both analyze proposals that would limit OHV use, in most areas to existing or designated trails. One criteria for trail designation in the Denali SRMA proposal under Alternative D, would be to locate and maintain trails to minimize impacts to the viewshed. Specific trail designation would occur under implementation level planning (see Implementation-level Considerations, pages. 38 and 44, Draft RMP/EIS).
0312-68	We also support the proposal to maintain the current ANCSA d(1) withdrawals against leasable mineral entry and the	These are both proposals that are analyzed in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	recommendation to withdraw the area [Denali Highway SRMA] from locatable mineral entry. Prohibiting these two invasive, surface disturbing activities is absolutely necessary for preserving the scenic integrity of the landscapes along the corridor.	
0312-69	We encourage BLM to work with the State to ensure that measures more stringent that the State's "Generally Allowed Uses" are applied to any lands conveyed along the Denali Highway.	The State has showed willingness to adopt BLM's designated trail management in lands conveyed to the State in Tangle Lakes Archeological District. BLM will continue to work with the State on these issues.
0312-70	We support the Alternative D proposal to provide interim management [along the Denali Highway] for roaded natural, semi-primitive non-motorized, and semi-primitive motorized recreation experiences, to mitigate impacts to the viewshed, and to provide education and interpretation opportunities.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative D is BLM's Preferred Alternative.
0312-71	We also request that BLM give additional consideration to the Alternative B proposal to designate the Denali Highway Backcountry Byway as a means to maintain the current unpaved experience of the Denali Highway in a safe manner while also enhancing the BLM's authority to proactively manage recreation uses and impacts.	The BLM is committed to maintaining the existing recreation opportunities along the Denali Highway, as described under Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative), page 61 of the Draft RMP/EIS. If designation of the Denali Highway as a Backcountry Byway is consistent with these objectives, it will be considered for incorporation into the Record of Decision for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Ultimately, the decision to pave the Denali Highway (or not) is the State of Alaska's.
0312-77	The Denali Highway should be kept "as it is." It diversifies the Alaska tourism product by providing a moderately paced alternative to the high speed Glenn, Richardson and Parks Highways. It also has fewer limitations for camping and recreation than are found along the road to Wonder Lake in Denali National Park or the road to McCarthy at Wrangell St. Elias NP. It provides a type of linear "park system" for pleasure drivers, tourists, hikers, cyclists, and Alaskans desiring a quiet, unhurried, scenic route along the Alaskan Range. The Denali Highway should be	Thanks for the comment. Alternatives C and D (long-term management in D) would manage the Denali to "maintain existing recreational opportunities (primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, and roaded natural). See pages 59 and 61 in the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM agrees with your vision but also recognizes that some facility development may be necessary to minimize impacts from increasing visitor use along the road and to maintain a quality roaded natural experience.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	managed to preserve this unique recreational driving experience for future generations to enjoy.	
0321-10	We support alternative C's designation of 848,00 acres of the Tiekel Area and also designating 559,000 acres of the viewshed from the Denali Highway as SRMAs to maintain the primitive, semi-primitive, and roaded-natural recreation experiences available in the areas.	These proposals are considered and analyzed under Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Thanks for your comment.
0331-7	We strongly support SRMA provisions of alternative C over alternative D because: Alternative C has a Denali Highway SRMA; alternative D does not. For many of us, the Denali Highway is a favorite area for hiking, subsistence hunting, picking berries, and canoeing. All these activities are enhanced by the scenic beauty along the highway. A Denali Highway SRMA would protect this special viewshed.	Thanks for the comment. Please note, for Alternative D, that under Long-Term Management (page 61, Draft RMP/EIS), SRMA designation would be considered, with objectives as described for the Denali Highway in alternative C.
0331-8	[We strongly support SRMA provisions of alternative C over alternative D because] the Tiekel SRMA would be seven times larger under alternative C than under alternative D. This provides for more protection for wildlife and a fairer allocation of land for quiet sports.	Thanks for the comment. Total area managed for non-motorized recreation in Alternative C amounts to 281,000 acres.
0331-9	[We strongly support SRMA provisions of alternative C over alternative D because] alternative C prohibits commercial heli-skiing north of the Tiekel River and Stuart Creek; alternative D does not. In other communities around Alaska, the failure of land managers to set fair limits on helicopter-supported recreation when it is in its early stages has created bitterness. Residents are dismayed when the noise of helicopters invades their homes; non-motorized recreationists cannot find the solitude they seek. People do have	Thanks for the comment. As you point out, the Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternatives for the management of helicopter supported recreational activities…from only site-specific limitations under Alternatives A and B to identification of areas where this activity would be prohibited, based on specific management objectives under Alternatives C and D.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	residences in the Tiekel and Tonsina areas, and those areas are also desirable for cross-country skiing and snow-shoeing.	
0331-10	[We strongly support SRMA provisions of alternative C over alternative D because] new road construction would generally be prohibited under alternative C; it would be permitted under alternative D "if no feasible alternative exists". New road construction would conflict with the purposes of providing primitive and semi-primitive experiences.	Thanks for the comment. As you point out, the Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of alternatives for areas identified as avoidance areas or to be excluded from new road construction. Impacts to recreation (both negative and positive) are discussed in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 381, 384, 389, and 393.
0331-11	Alternative C prohibits motorized watercraft on Tangle Lakes; Alternative D merely recommends horsepower limitations. There are a number of reasons for a total prohibition of motorized watercraft: 1) Tangle Lakes are part of a Wild and Scenic River System; motorcraft are incompatible with that concept. Visiting canoeists would be disappointed to encounter motorcraft and their noise. The noise carries well beyond the lakes, so hikers in the corridor are also disturbed; 2) These are not large lakes; motors are unnecessary, even for transporting game meat; 3) Motorcraft pollute the air and water. Two-cycle engines in particular release considerable unburned fuel. This is unhealthy for waterfowl, fish, and the people who eat them; 4) Motorcraft are more likely to disturb wildlife; 5) There have already been some instances of jet-ski and hovercraft use on Tangle Lakes. These are exceptionally noisy, and are generally disliked by all but the users. A prohibition should be in place now, before the use of these machines becomes established.	Under Alternative C, BLM would recommend to the State that motorized watercraft be prohibited on Tangle Lakes. This is a management action that would be consistent with objectives for the area described under Alternatives C and D and would be considered in implementation level planning, subject to coordination with the State and Native Corporations and public involvement. Thanks for your comment.
0341-13	We support ...designating 559,000 acres of the view shed from the Denali Highway as an SRMA to maintain the primitive, semi-primitive,	This is a proposal that is analyzed in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter # - Comment #	Comment	Response
	and roaded-natural recreation experiences available in the area. p.66	
0355-19	[I]n the Delta WSR Corridor Area and the Gulkana WSR Corridor Area, the reference to being the same as Alternative C in inconsistent and not correct.	If your comment is referring to pages 43 (for the Delta) and 45 (for the Gulkana) the statements "the same as under Alternative C" refer to the area which would be designated, not specific management actions or objectives.
0355-21	[U]nder Delta Range Area, the reference to being the same as Alternative C is inconsistent and not correct.	The text "the same as Alternative C" refers to the number of acres that would be designated as an SRMA, not specific management actions or objectives.
0355-22	There is no justification for limiting snow machine use of the area. [Delta Range Area]	Justification will be added in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (pp. 70, 73). It is based on a) managing to maintain an existing primitive non-motorized experience; b) managing to maintain a diversity of recreation experiences when snowmachine use is starting to increase in a traditionally non-motorized area; and b) public comment supporting such management.
0355-23	Also, the comment on road construction references only land within the corridor; it should not be limited to just the corridor.	The "comment" referred to is language from ANILCA, section 1110, which allows for construction of roads in Conservation System Units (this reference is to the Delta River Wild and Scenic River corridor). Road construction is permitted if it can be demonstrated that the road is compatible with the values for which the river was designated, and if there is no feasible alternative route. This section of ANILCA does not apply on BLM lands outside of Conservation System Units.
0355-24	There is no justification for requiring only non-motorized hiking trails [in the Delta Range Area]. Alaska contains 165 million acres for such activity; no such restrictions are needed here.	There is no alternative that considers only non-motorized trails for the whole proposed Delta Range SRMA. Justification for managing the Canwell and Augustana sub-units as non-motorized is addressed in our response to your comment 0355-22.
0355-25	Similarly, under the Denali Highway Area, the reference to being the same as Alternative C is inconsistent and not correct.	The wording "same as Alternative C" is used in the comparison table on page 579 of the Draft RMP/EIS. The reference here is correct: OHV management along the Denali on lands retained long term by the federal government would be the same as described under Alternative C: limited to designated trails.

3. NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES		
0044-24	The military reserve is already large enough so that other BLM land need not be usurped for military uses. "Dog fighting" by military aircraft should be curtailed over the Denali highway corridor as it affects wildlife and tourists. Sonic booms have started avalanches. The Chaff and fuel purging by both military and non-military aircraft may be causing fires or degrading water and vegetation quality. Perhaps BLM can work with ADFG to investigate the role of these activities with miscarriages, deformities and other wildlife problems.	The tables on pages 573-604 of the Draft RMP/EIS include a row that shows BLM's management intent regarding permitting of military activities on BLM-managed lands, for specific areas. This varies by alternative. BLM cannot regulate air space but has provided (and will continue to provide) input into military Environmental Impact Statements regarding military aircraft. This has resulted in realignment of Military Operations Areas (MOAs) in order to avoid low-level overflights in areas such as the Wild and Scenic River Corridors.
0164-38	BLM must develop a proactive, ecosystem approach to natural resources throughout the planning area.	BLM feels that management proposed under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) represents a more proactive approach than under current management, particularly in addressing issues such as OHV management and management of 17(b) easements.
0354-23	BLM's management policies must reflect more oversight on: 1) Damage to the environment, critical habitats and historic sites, that include plans for reparation.	Chapter III of the Draft RMP/EIS describes resource impacts that occur from different activities on BLM-managed lands. Chapter II considers a range of alternative actions that prescribe management to address these impacts. Chapter IV considers the environmental consequences of implementing these different management alternatives. In other words, where we know there is damage occurring to the environment, it drives the need for management actions.
0367-1	I am very concerned about your agency's plans to open 3.9 million acres of Alaskan land to oil and gas leasing and 6 million acres to hard rock mining. It would appear obvious that these actions would permanently change the land and wildlife habitat in those areas, as well as damaging traditional activities and recreation.	3.8 of the 3.9 million acres "opened" to mineral leasing under Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative) are currently State- or Native-selected. Because of a segregation against mineral leasing on selected lands, no leasing could occur on these lands until a) they are conveyed to the State or Native corporation, at which time the decision to allow mineral leasing is up to them, or b) the selections are relinquished and the land is retained in long-term Federal ownership. Just because an area is "opened" to leasing or locatable mineral entry, it doesn't mean that development will occur. There are many other factors that come into play, including mineral potential, access, and marketability. See Draft RMP/EIS, page 122, under Management Areas.
0376-6	The second one I had written down is BLM	Title 11 of ANILCA and specifically section 1107 deal with rights-of-way across public

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	needs to enforce ANILCA, Section .1107 for protection of the lands and water resource.	lands that access or cross Conservation System Units. BLM will comply with 1107 in consideration of right-of-way applications or right-of-way management within CSUs (the Delta and Gulkana National Wild and Scenic Rivers are the only BLM-managed CSUs in this planning area).
	SOILS	
0175-50	Page 399, Impacts to Soils from Recreation. It is incorrect to state that recreational activities generally do not cause long-term impacts to soil. Extensive studies have shown that heavily used hiking trails, particularly in tundra ecosystems, can cause long-term impacts to soil, including erosion and compaction. Please revise this section to properly acknowledge recreational impacts.	Although such impacts from foot traffic can occur, we are not aware of a hiking trail on BLM-managed lands in the planning area where such impacts exist. From our perspective (based on experience maintaining trails), any impacts attributed to hiking in this area pale in comparison to OHV impacts.
	WATER QUALITY	
0010-6	We'd like to see good water quality, mainly because it's good for the environment. It's good for the ecosystem as well. And for you that are not aware, that some communities actually depend on--maybe an individual depends on some of the river water for drinking. Gulkana Village, where I come from gets its water from the Gulkana River. Not directly, we drill a well near the river because we cannot get water anywhere else that is good for drinking. So we're very concerned about the quality of the water. The pollution of water is a concern.	Thanks for the comment. The Draft RMP/EIS recognizes impacts to water quality from different activities that are currently occurring in the area (pages 187, 188, 410, 461, and 462). Within the range of alternatives considered, different management actions are considered for protection of water quality, including restrictions on OHV use, maintenance of minerals withdrawals in specific areas, and application of Required Operating Procedures for permitted activities (see Chapter II as well as ROPs, pages 617, 618, Draft RMP/EIS).
0010-10	What as a group, Ahtna people want to bring up is that we have a concern about what's being dumped into our rivers and what happens when these off-road vehicles cross streams and so forth, what effect it has. You are right there's very little said about the effect of these access crossing streams and the effect on quality of the water down below.	Effects of OHVs on water quality is discussed on page 410 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Impacts to fish and fish habitat from sedimentation and OHV use is discussed on pages 461 and 462, Draft RMP/EIS.
0044-23	All major lakes and streams should be tested	Pages 73 and 74 describe BLM's intent, common to all alternatives for water quality

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	yearly for baseline of data.	monitoring. Testing yearly for all major lakes and streams in the area would be cost prohibitive.
0055-3	There is no mention of water quality for humans or fish habitat when discussing locatable minerals. The Pogo gold mine near Delta is described (p. 373, first paragraph) without mention of the cyanide leaching of ore and subsequent containment of tailings that will occur. Water contamination is recognized as a risk associated with containment of toxic substances in settling ponds at mining operations (p. 449, first paragraph).	Impacts to water quality from mining are discussed on pages 411 and 418. Impacts to fish and fish habitat are discussed on pages 461 (sedimentation), 463, and 471. Required Operating Procedures for mining operations to protect water quality are listed on pages 616 and 617, Draft RMP/EIS.
0164-27	Ahtna Inc. support the active management of water quality in the Copper River watershed as it directly impacts traditional use of the water. Water quality monitoring should be conducted to gather baseline inventory data to compare changes in water quality.	We agree. See our response to comment 0376-1.
0175-38	Page 187, Water Quality. Please acknowledge those existing non-point source water pollution prevention measures that are in place.	This is acknowledged in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 215).
0329-74	What does it mean that mining now happens under state water quality standards? (p.187)	Mining operations must comply with State Department of Environmental Conservation's Water Quality Standards (18 AAC 70). These include standards for color, fecal coliform, dissolved gas, dissolved inorganic substances, petroleum hydrocarbons, pH, radioactivity, sediment, temperature, toxic and other organic and inorganic substances, and turbidity. Different standards are set based on the water use (recreation, domestic water supply, aquaculture, fisheries, etc.).
0355-37	Under the discussion of Water Quality impacts from Mineral Exploration and Development (page 411), the wording suggests that mining would cause "degradation of water quality through sedimentation and other pollutants". This statement is repeated at various places (including page 418) later in the document. This statement is not correct. Mining is required to meet very stringent discharge requirements and impacts, if any, would be very minor. All mines are required to recycle	It is implied in the water quality section that there is potential (key word) for degradation of water quality from mineral exploration and development. It is true that current mining laws are stringent and most operators are diligent in meeting stipulations. However, some operators are not as diligent and as a result there is degradation of water quality from stream bank erosion and higher sediment loads, as well as hydrocarbon pollution. This is not just an operator problem but a State of Alaska and BLM compliance problem.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	their process water and to treat any water before it is discharged in accordance with the applicable State Water Quality Standards.	
0357-3	When those types of vehicles [OHVs and ATVs] impact water resources, greater enforcement and monitoring are needed to ensure the environment they entered is not permanently damaged. And when possible, through planning and monitoring, better and more management plans should be developed to protect all water resources and water bodies with regards to fish.	BLM is committed to monitoring OHV impacts through ongoing trail inventory and assessment (see page 33, Draft RMP/EIS, under Inventory and Monitoring). One of the primary concerns in considering designation of trails (as described in alternatives C and D) is minimizing stream and river crossings and the potential for water quality degradation.
0376-1	Chitina supports the active management of water quality of the Copper River watershed as it directly impacts traditional use of the water. Water quality monitoring should be conducted to gather baseline inventory data to compare changes in water quality.	We agree. See page 74 (Draft RMP/EIS), 5th bullet statement under Inventory and Monitoring: "Develop water quality data base in priority fish habitats and important recreation use areas to establish baseline for monitoring."
0390-3	And we are concerned about the water, if it was coming from Klutina, you know, the Pipeline runs right underneath the Klutina River, and so if there's any disaster, you know, it'll ruin the water and it will ruin all the fish that comes up the Copper River.	Thanks for the comment. The Trans-Alaska pipeline is located on a right-of-way which is co-managed by BLM (Joint Pipeline Office) and Alyeska. An Environmental Impact Statement considering the effects of renewing the pipeline right-of-way was completed in 2002. This RMP will not effect administration or maintenance of the Trans Alaska Pipeline. In response to your comment, the Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes a discussion on pipeline administration (page 326) and a discussion in Cumulative Effects, water quality regarding potential impacts of a spill (page 584).
AIR QUALITY		
0044-22	Periodic air quality data throughout the planning region should be in place (p.189) as the plan moves forward.	BLM will continue to comply with State requirements for air quality on activities that potentially adversely effect air quality, such as prescribed burning (see page 190, Draft RMP/EIS).
VEGETATION (INCLUDING SENSITIVE STATUS SPECIES)		
0044-2	Several locations (i.e. page 367) mention "vegetation treatments." What are they? Would they degrade species diversity, pollute air or water or bioaccumulate like poisons and carcinogens? Subsistence activities on land through this planning region - regardless of "ownership" - would create liabilities for those	Vegetation treatments include timber harvest, wildland fire, prescribed fire, fuels reduction projects (pages 300-310, Draft RMP/EIS). A general discussion of vegetation treatments proposed by alternative can be found in Chapter 2, pages 113-121. Effects from vegetation treatments are described in Chapter 4.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	using such "vegetation treatments". Perhaps the best vegetation treatment is a person with a shovel.	
0044-5	Regarding noxious weeds and invasive plants (p.196, 544 and other locations), my informal twenty five year surveys show that trails and staging areas used by horse, OHVs, boots, tires, etc. add new species to those trails or areas. In this draft planning area, trails already show evidence of this. One example is a horse and boot trails to Clearwater Creek.	Thanks for the information. This is a developing program for BLM in Alaska and the Glennallen Field Office is currently working on inventory and education (page 544, Draft RMP/EIS). Required Operating Procedures ROP-Soils-a-10, ROP-Soils-a-12, ROP-Veg-a-2, and ROP-Veg-a-3 (pages 610-620) are designed to prevent spread of invasive species and noxious weeds.
FISH AND WILDLIFE(INCLUDING SENSITIVE STATUS SPECIES)		
0019-1	But I also think that we should also look at Alternative C, which is the conservation alternative. Because it's not only important to preserve hunting opportunities, it's also important to protect the habitats of the animals that you would like to hunt, and Alternative C does that. So I would ask people to have a close look at some of the things that are being protected under Alternative C that are not being protected under the other alternatives, or at least not as well. … 200 years ago there were probably billions of passenger pigeons in North America. They're gone. Every last one of them. None of us has ever seen a passenger pigeon. I would hate to see that happen to any of the critters that we appreciate around here today, and it's important for us to protect them and their habitat for that reason.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative C does consider more area-wide protective measures than does Alternative D. Effects of both approaches on wildlife habitat are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0026-1	[W]e oppose the sale of lands in Slana because a lot of that area is migratory bird habitat, too, and we think that areas should be preserved.	The Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges the loss of habitat that would occur with the disposal of all remaining BLM lands in the Slana area (Draft RMP/EIS, page 457, under FLPMA Disposal"). The Draft also considers alternatives that would not dispose of lands in the Slana area in Alternatives A and C.
0084-5	I am concerned that there are zero protective designations for wildlife and fisheries habitat within the Preferred Alternative.	We disagree. The Bering Glacier RNA identifies several measures for protection of fish and wildlife and unique ecological values. In addition, a cooperative habitat management plan would be developed with ADF&G for the Delta Bison Calving Area; area-wide protective measures would be applied for the West Fork Gulkana Area (see

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
		page 84, Draft RMP/EIS); designated trails would be located with protection of wildlife habitat in mind; and the ROPs and Stips described on pages 612 - 615 would protect wildlife habitat.
0312-106	BLM also states in its summary of alternatives for Leasable Minerals, Oil & Gas that all "essential habitat" for threatened and endangered species will be avoided. See EIS at page 132 (Table 10). BLM should provide a definition of "essential habitat."	This definition will be provided in the glossary of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0321-7	In addition, We are also concerned about the impacts on the Copper River watershed and fish and game populations if mining exploration is allowed in the Tangle Lakes area.	The preferred alternative would maintain current withdrawals within the Delta Wild and Scenic River corridor that prohibit mineral entry. Tangle Lakes is within this corridor. It also recommends withdrawal of 16,000 acres within the corridor that is currently open to locatable mineral entry. Other alternatives consider opening the area (Alternative B). Effects of these different management options are discussed in Chapter 4.
0329-57	A Copper River Watershed ACEC would benefit wildlife by preserving a keystone species: salmon. Salmon protection can serve as a reasonable surrogate for other, more complex resource values. For example, conserving riparian areas for salmon also tends to preserve migration corridors.	A Copper River Watershed ACEC was considered during the planning process, but was eliminated from detailed analysis for the following reasons: a) BLM currently manages only approximately 15% of the lands within the watershed, 50% of which are selected lands that will probably not be retained under Federal management; b) strong protective measures will be continued along the Gulkana River, BLM's largest piece of unencumbered land in the watershed, through the proposed SRMA designation and continued management as a Wild and Scenic River; c) protective measures will be put into place through measures identified for the West Fork Area and the Tiekel SRMA (see Tables on pages 598 and 583); and d) application of ROPs and Stips for permitted activities apply strong protective measures for anadromous streams. This information will be added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS under Alternatives Analyzed but not Considered in Detail (page 39).
0331-14	Wildlife habitats best protected under alternative C, through many of features: ACECs, the Bering Glacier RNA, and SRMAs. In addition, alternative C places more protections on moose winter range and fish habitat than does alternative D.	Alternative C does consider more area-wide protective measures than does Alternative D. Effects of both approaches on wildlife habitat are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0341-7	[T]he BLM's Preferred Alternative proposes: 79% increase in the amount of lands open to oil and gas leasing (5,637,000 acres = 79% of entire planning area) 78% increase in the amounts of lands open to locatable mineral entry (6,032,000 acres = 85% of entire	Of the acres "opened" to mineral leasing under Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative), most are currently State or Native selected. Because of a segregation against mineral leasing on selected lands, no leasing could occur on these lands until a) they are conveyed to the State or Native corporation, at which time the decision to allow mineral leasing is up to them, or b) the selections are relinquished and the land is retained in long-term federal ownership. Just because an area is "opened" to leasing or locatable

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	planning area) These are unnecessary and unreasonable increases, especially in light of the fact that the impact to fisheries habitat has not been fairly evaluated. In addition, impacts to caribou and moose habitat have from this proposed increase has not been evaluated.	mineral entry, it doesn't mean that development will occur (see page 122, Draft RMP/EIS). Effects of potential mineral development to fish and wildlife by alternative are discussed on pages 434-476 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This includes a discussion of impacts to caribou and moose habitat. For example, discussion of impacts to the Nelchina caribou calving grounds is discussed on page 445.
WILDLIFE (INCLUDING SENSITIVE STATUS SPECIES)		
0020-7	Thirty five percent of the Trumpeter swan population and the Nelchina herd is in our area [Mentasta] and yet, your book doesn't even show trumpeter swans being up there. We have a beautiful trumpeter swan breeding area. That includes all the way up to the headwaters of the Copper River.	The Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges the importance of the Copper Basin for trumpeter swan habitat (page 241, Draft RMP/EIS) and shows trumpeter swan breeding and nesting habitats on Map 38, which includes the Mentasta area.
0020-26	Migratory bird habitats are in danger now, mainly from human encroachment. These trails are not being maintained. There's four migratory bird treaties that affect four counties [countries], much less our migratory bird treaty that hasn't been considered in all this, in the plan.	The Draft RMP/EIS discusses migratory birds in general (page 229) and the specific status of Sensitive Status migratory bird species on pages 231 - 243. Alternatives C and D consider travel management proposals that would limit OHVs to designated or existing trails, thus minimizing cross-country travel and the proliferation of unmanaged trails. Effects of this strategy on wildlife habitat (including migratory birds) is described on page 454 for Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative). Specific Required Operating Procedures were developed to protect migratory bird habitat and species, based on requirements in the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (See ROP-F&W-a-14, p. 613). The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 was also used in development of Required Operating Procedures and stipulations and will be cited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0020-28	The trumpeter swans and Dall sheep breeding areas in the Mentasta area were not included but they need to be protected. Those two particular, the Dall sheep and the trumpeter swan is supposed to have additional protections under the law and they don't.	Dall sheep habitat and trumpeter swan breeding and nesting habitats are specifically shown on Maps 32 and 38 of the Draft RMP/EIS, including the Mentasta area. The Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) considers area-wide protective measures for the trumpeter swan in the West Fork Gulkana area (page 84). In addition, the Preferred Alternative identifies the following Required Operating Procedures and stipulations for all trumpeter swan and Dall sheep habitat: ROP-F&W-a-12, ROP-F&W-a-13, ROP-F&W-b-1, and ROP-F&W-b-6 (pp.613 -615). Dall sheep and their habitat are not afforded any special State or Federal protections under law, as this species is biologically sound and stable throughout their range. However, where Dall sheep lambing habitat is located within BLM-managed lands, ROPs and Stipulations (Appendix C) apply to protect their habitat.
0044-6	The Caribou Habitat map (p215) does not show the complete extent of the summer foraging area. My knowledge is only about the	All wildlife habitat maps within the Draft RMP/EIS were compiled from ADF&G wildlife atlases (and other valid sources where available); the caribou's habitat map that you refer to on page 215 is based on information gathered from ADF&G's Susitna Area Plan,

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Clearwater foraging areas thus far not taken into account.	circa 1983. Because caribou are known to be highly nomadic in their search for food throughout the year, the best land managers can do is describe in general terms the past distribution and movements of caribou herds. Caribou tend only to be tied to one specific location on an annual basis, that being their traditional calving grounds. The caribou habitat map on page 215 indicates these general patterns as described in 1983 by ADF&G; site specific variations outside of the indicated ranges are to be expected.
0044-7	Moose habitat map (p.221) does not show the complete extent of summer foraging on and around Clearwater Mountains.	Our habitat maps are based on wildlife habitat atlases obtained from the state (ADF&G). BLM will make changes based on updated information, if it is made available to BLM.
0044-8	Raptors discussion (p.225) does not mention the Northern Hawk Owl. Of special interest to tourist and naturalists would be the Denali Highway corridor where Hawk Owls hunt in the evening between Alpine and Clearwater Creeks.	As explained on page 204 of the Draft RMP/EIS, "Only those species of wildlife considered important as a subsistence resource, economically important to Southcentral Alaska, or otherwise a high profile species, will be covered in this chapter." Chapter 3 also covers Sensitive Status species. Page 225 of the Draft RMP/EIS does include the northern hawk owl in its list of common raptors found on BLM-managed lands.
0044-9	Ptarmigan were not included in the draft plan although BLM lands contains critical rearing and mating habitat.	A discussion of ptarmigan distribution has been included in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 257).
0044-10	Swan breeding and nesting habitat (p.239) changes with hydrological conditions but not all of the more "permanent" appropriate habitats were shown. Unnamed lakes, including those near Susitna Lodge and Swampbuggy Lake, should be added.	The map on page 239 is based on the latest information available gathered during the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's 2000 trumpeter swan census. Individual trumpeter swan nesting site locations may vary slightly on an annual basis, but not widely. Therefore, the information provided within the Draft RMP/EIS is as accurate as is possible for this scale of planning within the area surrounding the Susitna Lodge. The Draft RMP/EIS (page 241, fourth paragraph) specifically acknowledges the presence and abundance of trumpeter swans and their breeding habitat in the Susitna River valley.
0044-12	The Gray-cheeked Thrush (p.234) use the riparian area of Windy Creek near Susitna Lodge. I have seen them spending much of the summer in the western section of the Clearwater Mountains.	Thank you for the information. The Draft RMP/EIS concurs that the Gray-cheeked Thrush would be found in this habitat type ("prefer habitat types where shrub is the main component or where open woodlands and dwarf forests are present").
0044-13	There is no discussion of Alaska's Frogs. There are a few in the wetlands and around the unnamed lake near Susitna Lodge.	There is a short discussion (page 229, Draft RMP/EIS) on the western toad and the wood frog.
0044-14	As stated in the draft, not only is data on wildlife species, ecosystems and habitat inventory and details of subsistence uses incomplete, but also the fragmented "ownership" and use/development of the land	Thanks for the comment and suggestion.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	tends to put species at risk. Thus planners … should plan and act cautiously to protect areas until more information and better technology is available to develop carefully.	
0044-30	Memoranda of Agreement (BLM, ADFG, ADNR, and the military bases) should be established (p. 542) to create sanctuaries for calving areas for Bison, Caribou, and Moose. The Susitna Area Plan seems a reasonable place to include them. All critical habitat for wildlife (and tourists) should be protected from sonic boom and fuel purging.	BLM will work closely with ADF&G on implementation-level planning for these areas. The Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) would implement a cooperative Habitat Management Plan with ADF&G for the Delta bison calving range. It also identifies protective measures for the Nelchina Caribou Calving Area (pages 77 and 84, Draft RMP/EIS), as well as ROPs and Stipulations specific to caribou calving (ROP-F&W-b-2).
0055-5	Breeding success of Townsend's warbler (p. 242, first paragraph) has been positively correlated to size (a proxy for age) of white spruce in southcentral Alaska by S.M. Matsuoka. 1996. Habitat selection and reproductive ecology among Townsend's warblers (Dendroica townsendi) in southcentral Alaska. M.S. Thesis, University of Alaska-Fairbanks. 66 p.	Thanks for the information. We will include it in our Chapter 3 discussion of Townsend's warbler in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 268).
0055-6	Discussions of how oil and gas leasing influence wildlife populations contain what appear to be definitive statements of fact without scientific documentation. The last sentences of the third paragraphs on pages 444 and 446 contain statements that need to cite the scientific authority or be qualified as speculation.	This is a professional opinion based upon the application of the ROPs and Stipulations and based on the amount of development anticipated (two gas fields) relative to the total area of undisturbed habitat in the area.
0163-1	If the feds keep it [pipeline/utility corridor], we would hope that they would consider a shorter hunting period, giving the caribou a much needed respite from hunters, snowmachiners and the stress that occurs from being hunted in the difficult winter months. It seems to us that during these months caribou need all the support possible to successfully winter. As it is now hunters and snow machines put great	BLM coordinates closely with State ADF&G in management of the Nelchina caribou herd. Hunting seasons and harvest of cow caribou is adjusted to allow for variations in population. Latest information indicates that the Nelchina herd population is in the vicinity of 40,000 animals, thus a cow harvest is being allowed this season. Alternatives considered within the Draft RMP/EIS would not change the administrative process by which federal subsistence hunting regulations are reviewed and analyzed for implementation during harvest season..

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	stress on them in the winter months. Please consider change in policy.	
0163-2	ATV trails must have restrictions to protect wildlife. We support Special Recreation Management Areas to help curtail the spiderwork of ATV trails.	In response to resource concerns discussed in Chapter 3 of the Draft RMP/EIS (including impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat), alternatives C and D consider designating most BLM-managed lands as limited to OHVs, with specific limitations to be determined in implementation-level planning. In most cases under Alternatives C and D, on unencumbered BLM lands, trails will be designated, and on State-selected lands, OHVs will be limited to existing trails. Effects of taking such actions on wildlife and wildlife habitat are described in Chapter 4.
0164-35	Page 10 - In the first paragraph under Issue 3 there is no mention of the significance of the Nelchina Caribou Herd to subsistence users in the Copper River Basin. There is no mention of the Mentasta Herd. Ahtna Inc. requests that this information be included in the Final Plan.	Chapter 1 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes a sentence on the importance of the Nelchina herd for subsistence (page 11). A paragraph has been added to Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS discussing the location and status of the Mentasta caribou herd (page 235).
0164-37	Page 204 - In the introductory discussion of wildlife objectives there is no overall description of or data relating to the subsistence use of large and small lands mammals in the planning area (on pp. 248-250) there is a description of Subsistence Fisheries). Data relating to the harvest of moose and caribou is available from the Federal Subsistence permits issued in the area. Ahtna Inc. requests that this information be compiled and included in the Final Plan.	This information will be included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, in a Chapter 3 discussion of subsistence (pp. 373 – 375).
0164-42	The Mentasta Caribou Herd needs to be protected from associated impacts of development.	The Mentasta Caribou Herd spends little to no time on BLM-managed lands. As mentioned above, the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will include a discussion in Chapter 3 about the Mentasta herd (page 235).
0164-43	More complete trumpeter swan breeding and nesting habitat information must be included fort he Mentasta areas (to include Swan Lake, Mineral Lakes area, Indian Pass Lake etc.)	Please see response to comment 0020-28. The specific lakes you mention in your comment are not on lands managed by BLM; these are within Native-owned lands.
0164-44	BLM and HAARP must work together to minimize impacts of operations on migrating birds.	See response to comment 0020-26. HAARP is a federally-owned and managed facility (Department of Defense) and all HAARP actions and on-site developments are subject to NEPA review and federal laws for the protection of migratory birds. Decisions made in this RMP will not affect HAARP.
0173-42	We support the responsible management of wildlife and its habitat in compliance with State	The Draft RMP/EIS states, under Planning Criteria (page 16), "Wildlife habitat management will be consistent with ADF&G objectives." The BLM has coordinated

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	and federal regulations. All habitat management must be done in consultation with State of Alaska Department of Natural Resources and comply with State law regarding such resources.	closely with Alaska DNR during this planning process (page 564) and will continue to do so on implementation of this plan. This may be done on the local level, as well as local involvement of ADF&G.
0175-13	Pages 36 and 42, West Fork Area, Implementation-level Considerations. We request the Bureau cooperate with the State to evaluate off-highway vehicle use, habitat conditions, and trumpeter swan population information before developing any restrictions in this area to protect trumpeter swans.	As indicated, this would be done in implementation-level planning for Off Highway Vehicle use. BLM does consider area-wide stipulations for permitted activities in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D), pages 78 and 84. These stipulations are consistent with measures identified in the State DNR Copper Basin Area Plan for protection of trumpeter swans and trumpeter swan habitat.
0175-14	In addition, we request the Bureau cooperate with the State to evaluate snowmachine use, habitat conditions, and moose population information before developing any restrictions designed to minimize impact on moose. Few moose use the West Fork Area during winter months, unless snow levels are very deep, causing moose to move down into the flats area from the surrounding hills. Additionally, there is very little snowmachine use in this area. What little snowmachine use does occur is primarily from trappers managing their traplines. If the Bureau compounds this unnecessary restriction on snowmachine trails by designating trapping trails as public use trails, this can affect trappers by drawing recreational users to their traplines.	As stated, this would be an implementation level consideration, and consultation would occur with State ADF&G at that time.
0175-16	Pages 36 and 42, Delta Bison Calving Area, Implementation-level Considerations. Delta bison herd use is concentrated on the Delta River floodplain, where off-highway vehicles currently do not travel (until the large channels freeze). The herd currently utilizes the floodplain between the pipeline and the Richardson Highway. The herd encounters	As stated, this would be an implementation level consideration, and consultation would occur with State ADF&G at that time. In response to your comment, Glennallen Field Office staff have observed OHVs being ferried across the Delta River in jetboats from east to west and off-loaded for cross-country travel within the western portion of the Delta River floodplain and beyond. OHV use is occurring in this area.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	traffic on either side, with no documented negative impacts. We object to proposals that would unnecessarily restrict off-highway vehicles to designated trails unless additional justification is provided.	
0175-17	Pages 37 and 43, Nelchina Caribou Calving Area, Implementation-level Considerations. We concur that it is not desirable to disturb caribou during the calving season. However, additional information and coordination with state agencies is needed to adequately protect calving grounds while allowing use of the Nelchina public use area. The State currently owns the largest and most heavily used portion of the calving grounds (south of this designated area) where off-highway vehicle access is prominent. The designated area within the BLM plan lies beyond common off-highway vehicle travel. We request the Bureau cooperate with the State to evaluate off-highway vehicle use, habitat conditions, and caribou population information during implementation-level planning before developing any restrictions in this area to protect caribou.	As described on page 33 of the Draft RMP/EIS Implementation-level Planning, "these planning processes would include public, State, and Native coordination."
0175-33	Page 118, Vegetation Management, Moose. The map referenced in this section (on Page 221) is inaccurate and does not distinguish differences in winter habitat. Instead of focusing on all winter critical range (based on the map), we request the Bureau work with the ADF&G to develop site-specific priorities for areas utilized during severe winters. We also request that the Bureau place emphasis on burning (both wild and controlled) to produce favorable habitat conditions for moose.	The wildlife habitat maps were compiled from information obtained from ADF&G wildlife atlases (Susitna Basin Area Plan, 1983; Copper Basin Area Plan, 1985; Alaska Habitat Management Guide - Southcentral Region, 1985; and Yakataga Area Plan, 1993). More specific winter range information which differentiated between types of winter ranges across the area was not available at the time of RMP development. Given the vast number of acres in the planning area that would benefit from wildland and prescribed fire, BLM identified general habitat improvement priorities based on information available to us. We will continue to work with local ADF&G biologists to develop site-specific habitat improvement priorities, as was accomplished with regard to the Alphabet Hills prescribed burn and with other subsequent vegetation management efforts on the district.
0175-39	Page 206, Caribou, 4th paragraph. More current population data are available for the Nelchina Caribou Herd than presented. The	Thank you. The updated information will be included in references to the Nelchina herd in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This is a constantly changing figure based on semi-annual surveys and estimates.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Nelchina Herd currently exceeds 35,000 animals, which resulted in liberalization of both the state and federal subsistence hunting regulations. The most recent population estimate for the Nelchina Caribou herd is 36,677 (2004). The final ADF&G Management Report for the Nelchina Caribou Herd in Units 13 and 14B from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2004 contains the most recent population estimates (in press, 2005).	
0329-37	Thank you for considering that helicopters harm wildlife. Please apply this to management of Bering Glacier, and oil & gas.	It is considered in different management alternatives for the Bering Glacier. Both Alternatives C and D consider prohibiting helicopter-supported commercial recreation activities in this area.
0329-55	Our primary interest here is in conserving a functioning ecosystem. If conserved, this system will produce a sustainable supply of critters for subsistence eating, sport hunting, recreational viewing, photography, and a million other uses we have yet to realize.	We agree.
0329-56	Please consider the value of non-consumptive uses of wildlife, too.	We do. This is often a consideration when we manage an area with an emphasis for recreation (such as an SRMA). Wildlife viewing is a recognized component of most recreation experiences in the area (page 172, Draft EIS/RMP, 1st paragraph).
0329-58	We disagree with the goal: "In collaboration with the State of Alaska's identified wildlife population management objectives, the Glennallen District emphasizes wildlife habitat enhancement due to continuous and increasing pressure for natural resource agencies to produce more animals for consumptive uses by an ever-increasing local human population."(BLM 2003, MSA Wildlife, p.1) Large-scale wildlife habitat manipulation is sketchy in a vast wildland such as this, with complex interactions between species that haven't been studied, aren't understood, and are vulnerable to stresses. Wildlands aren't a farm, and a mechanistic approach is asking for trouble. (NRC 1997) Boosting populations of	The Draft RMP/EIS states goals for the wildlife program, which include "In cooperation with ADF&G, ensure optimum populations and a natural abundance and diversity of wildlife resources, including those species that are considered BLM sensitive status species" (page 72, Draft RMP/EIS). BLM's goals for management of wildlife habitat reflect an ecosystem management approach: "Maintain and restore the health, productivity, and biological diversity of forest and woodland ecosystems." (page 113, Draft RMP/EIS).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	critters for increased consumptive use by humans is not sustainable. Manipulating wildlife populations to make hunts available for more non-residents makes them vulnerable to sudden collapse—which threatens subsistence hunting. The subsistence priority includes an implicit requirement to management for sustained yield.	
0329-59	We are concerned that while hunting pressure in increasing, habitat is decreasing. This is clearly not sustainable.	BLM is also concerned about quality of habitat (see pages 206 and 208, Draft RMP/EIS), particularly for moose and caribou habitat. BLM, in it's Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) identifies approximately 1.5 million acres as a priority for habitat improvement, mostly through wildland fire or prescribed burning. If your comment is about loss of habitat, both refugia and habitat fragmentation are addressed on page 434 of the Draft RMP/EIS and is of concern to BLM under all alternatives.
0329-60	The Draft attributes increased hunting pressure mostly to increasing population, but the population of the Copper basin is not what you'd call booming. This land could sustain the number of people living there now. Hunting pressure is extreme only when outside pressure of non-resident hunters, especially from Anchorage and Mat-Su, is added. BLM has unique responsibility to defend the priority of rural Alaskans to sustainably harvest subsistence resources. Please help guard against unsustainable non-resident hunting, by limiting access. Or, at least, don't encourage increased use.	The administrative procedure for establishing federal or state subsistence hunting regulations or the state procedure for establishing sport-hunting regulations is out of the scope of this planning process. BLM is committed to providing access to public lands. No alternative considers closing of major access routes, though area-wide motorized restrictions are considered (Alternatives C and D).
0329-61	Under alternative C, "Barring the occurrence of large scale wildfires in the Copper River Basin, resource manager could expect to see a continued decline in overall habitat quality and productivity" (p.455) Why wouldn't there be large scale wildfires? The Draft EIS/RMP seems to act like this is a static system. It isn't.	Page 298 of the Draft RMP/EIS discusses fire occurrence in the area and explains "Lack of large fire occurrence is due in part to fire suppression but also to the abundance of wetlands and other natural breaks interspersed throughout the planning area." Even in 2004, when over 6 million acres burned state-wide, the largest fire in the planning area was a prescribed burn of 40,000 acres set in the Alphabet Hills.
0329-62	The Draft EIS doesn't explain the positive effects to wildlife of designating ACECs, SRMAs, RNAs, Wilderness Areas or W&SRs.	The Draft RMP/EIS does compare the effects of implementation of ACECs, RNA, and SRMAs vs. not designating these areas on wildlife. See pages 437, 440, 450, 451, 455, and 456 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	The benefits are huge. Adopting alternative C, and our recommended special areas, would increase wildlife, and have the important benefit of providing refugia. There is value in having a buffer against the unexpected.	
0329-63	It is not true that "wildlife become habituated" to disturbance, resulting in no "undue adverse effects to individuals or populations." (p.446) In many cases wildlife do not habituate, but change their behavior to avoid the disturbance. ... Human disturbance can permanently harm wildlife populations. The fact that critters don't drop dead within sight of an oil derrick, does not mean there aren't any "undue" impacts. ... What is an "undue" impact? In other cases, habituation is itself a negative impact, as when bears habituate to people's garbage and get shot, or when bunnies habituate to the highway and get squished. Just saying, in effect, "they'll get used to it," is not enough. Critters, like people, can "get used to" all sorts of awful things.	Habituation or acclimation is the development of tolerance to the effects of something acquired through continued exposure, whether positive or negative. "Undue" means excessive; in this case, individuals or populations of wildlife would not be subject to excessive or adverse effects because of exposure to routine and predictable human activities. Where known or discovered during field reconnaissance, all types of development, whether recreational, mineral or oil and gas, etc., would be sited so as to avoid areas of crucial or sensitive wildlife habitat. We agree that in certain situations, the habituation of wildlife to human activity and presence at oil and gas development sites can be negative for both the wildlife and humans, such as with bears habituated to human presence, their activities and the use of human-generated garbage and other food stuffs. In this regard, the Draft RMP/EIS stipulates that permittees will handle and dispose of all human-generated wastes to prevent the attraction of wildlife (see Appendix III, Required Operating Procedures, Hazardous Materials, in the Draft RMP/EIS).
0329-64	We are concerned that nest buffers are arbitrarily determined, and won't be effective. "To be effective, buffer zones should be based on empirical evidence of wildlife responses to disturbance." (Richardson & Miller 1997, p.637) What evidence are you basing buffer distances on?	Considering that up to 131 species of birds return each spring to Alaska, it is not possible to empirically define a minimum buffer distance for the nests of each avian species that occupies breeding habitat within the boundaries of the planning area. However, we have and will continue to provide general spatial and temporal protections for migratory bird breeding habitat as spelled out by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in their final Region 7 Migratory Bird Timing Matrix. In addition, three species of birds have received set individual minimum buffer distances due to their relatively low density across the landscape…these are the bald and golden eagles and the trumpeter swan. At a minimum, the Bald Eagle Protection Act (as amended in 1978) provides for a buffer zone of 330 feet around an active bald eagle nest. However, USFWS recommends a minimal buffer zone of at least 660 feet based on topography and vegetative screening from disturbance to the nest site. At most, USFWS recommends a buffer zone of 1/2 mile. 1/4 mile was chosen by BLM because this distance will adequately address all disturbance possibilities. Also, a minimum buffer distance of 1/4 mile has been applied to bodies of water occupied by nesting trumpeter swans, as originally defined by the ADF&G in both the Copper River Basin Area Plan and the Susitna Area Plan.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-65	There is a lot of Trumpeter Swan breeding and staging habitat in the Yakataga state game refuge and adjacent area. This is not mapped on Map 13 (p.93), or discussed in the text of the Draft. Please consider that the Bering Glacier forelands are incredibly valuable swan habitat.	The map on page 239 of the Draft RMP/EIS (Trumpeter Swan Breeding and Nesting Habitat) shows numerous sites in the Bering Glacier foregrounds and Yakataga Game Refuge; however, it should be noted that BLM-GFO manages only a small portion of the Bering Glacier foregrounds and none of the Yakataga State Game Refuge. Those lands which provide the majority of suitable breeding habitat for trumpeter swans are managed by the State of Alaska. This area and it's value as swan habitat is discussed on page 241 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Proposed protective measures for the area for alternative D are discussed on page 85, Bering Glacier Area; page 602, Bering Glacier RNA alternative comparison table; and specific ROPs and stipulations, including ROP-F&W-a-12, ROP-F&W-a-13, and ROP-F&W-b-1.
0329-93	The Draft EIS fails to appreciate negative impacts to wildlife from forestry. The Draft EIS/RMP has absolute, and blind, faith in ROPs. It says: "The ROPs adopted under this alternative would ensure that timber harvest would provide for the conservation of valuable wildlife habitats or adequately compensate for their degradation."(p.443) What is the basis for that? Is there any evidence? The ROPs for forestry are pretty standard, yet even where have been applied, negative impacts have followed. Mitigation will not be so effective as the Draft EIS/RMP supposes. Tongass timber sales, for example, typically contain much more restrictive mitigation measures. Yet, USDA routinely admits that impacts are substantial.	The Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges the potential for negative impact from timber removal and road construction on some specific wildlife species (page 443); however, forest management practices can be consistent with wildlife habitat objectives. The "faith" in the ROPs is not blind, but based on the experience of the biologist in planning and implementation of local timber sales. The forestry program at Glennallen Field Office is small (see pages 312 - 314) with an estimated harvest of 40 acres/year or 2.0 MMBF on average. Even under alternative B, this is not timber harvest on a scale anywhere near the Tongass, which has an annual projected harvest of 182 MMBF per year. The "faith" in ROPs is based on the fact that road construction associated with timber sales is, by necessity, kept to a minimum and use of temporary winter access is often utilized.
0329-186	It is interesting that the Bering glacier forelands have "genetically distinct populations of wolf and goat," as both those critters face a barrage of threats in this area. (p.451) What is the status of those populations?	This information has been erroneously reported as fact and will not be included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Thanks for catching it.
0354-2	The four (4) treaties that govern conservation, even just the Canadian treaty which provides for co-management process, or the Migratory Bird Treaty, were not considered in regulations affecting wetlands and the protection of migratory bird habitat. BLM, in it's own words (p.14), "manages fish and wildlife habitat", yet	See response to comment 0020-26 and comment 0020-10 regarding re-location of 17(b) easements.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	the lack of management of 17 (b) easements has not prevented harm to these habitats	
0354-9	Some information is missing, including the Trumpeter Swan and Dall Sheep breeding areas in the Mentasta area (p.93, Map 13).	Please see response to comment 0020-28.
0354-10	Trails must be relocated and 17(b) easements restored to original conditions to avoid further crucial habitat damage.	The Draft RMP/EIS states that "realignment of 17(b) easements would be considered with the cooperation of the land owner on lands already conveyed." Where documented resource damage is occurring, including damage to fish habitat, BLM will, in consultation and cooperation with Ahtna, Inc., consider re-location of the 17(b) easement or maintenance of selected areas, based on the priorities listed on page 34 of the Draft RMP/EIS. These actions are discretionary and will be contingent on funding approval.
0354-26	BLM's management policies must reflect more oversight on: 4) Adherence to Migratory Bird habitat treaties with stronger enforcement.	Please see response to comment 0020-26.
0354-30	Actions for BLM-managed lands must include: 3) Active research, education and monitoring of damaged habitats.	We agree. See page 74 of the Draft RMP/EIS, under Inventory and Monitoring, Wildlife. Please keep in mind that monitoring identified on this page is contingent on funding.
0385-3	And I also think of the mention of swans and the protecting of the trumpeter swans and noting that that was not mentioned in the Chitina area as well. You know, I think that needs protection as well.	Trumpeter swan breeding and nesting habitat is shown for the whole planning area, including locations in the Chitina area (page 239, map 38, Draft RMP/EIS). Measures for protection of swans are noted in our response to comment 0020-28. BLM does not manage land in the Chitina area which provides suitable breeding/nesting habitat for trumpeter swans.
FISH (INCLUDING SENSITIVE STATUS SPECIES)		
0044-4	How is BLM coordinating with Alaska DFG to enhance fisheries, as mentioned on page 541?	Currently, BLM is cooperating with ADF&G on funding and personnel to operate a fish-counting facility on the Gulkana River, which is providing critical information for setting salmon escapement goals on the Gulkana River. BLM has also worked with ADF&G on a recent habitat assessment and inventory project, and is currently involved in cooperative steelhead population monitoring projects and lake trout monitoring.
0044-11	Sensitive Fish Section (p. 250) does not mention Grayling, although they are important to this area and sensitive to development and overfishing. The Denali Highway corridor streams and lakes contain not only Grayling, but also other species of interest. The unnamed lake by Susitna Lodge contains Pygmy White Fish. Dwarf Dolly Varden are in Seattle Creek and Canyon Creeks. No doubt	As stated in the glossary (p. 693), sensitive status species are "those wildlife, fish, or plant species designated by the BLM Alaska State Director, usually in cooperation with the State agency responsible for managing the species, as sensitive. They are 1) species under status review by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service; 2) species whose numbers are declining so rapidly that Federal listing may be necessary; 3) species with typically small and widely dispersed populations; or 4) species inhabiting ecological refugia or other specialized or unique habitats." Arctic grayling, in Alaska, do not fit into any of these categories.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	there are other fish species that have not been inventoried and may affect planning and development.	
0044-29	As stated on page 540, activities upstream of BLM lands can have adverse affects on fisheries and water quality. All agencies should work together to address these concerns.	We agree. BLM is committed to coordination and consultation, both in this planning process and in implementation level planning (See Draft RMP/EIS, pp. 16, 7th bullet, and pp. 562 - 564).
0055-4	The section on wildlife effects almost completely ignores fish habitat. For example, water drawdown from lakes for construction of ice roads “would alter water levels and adjacent habitats” (p. 445, second paragraph), an effect that could be highly detrimental to overwintering fish. Development of coal bed methane involves pumping large amounts of subsurface water to the surface (p. 329, last paragraph) that could contaminate surface waters and subsurface aquifers with high mineral concentrations or methane, degrading fish habitat and potentially endangering human health with respect to drinking water. BLM suggests it would permit in-field underground injection (p. 372, last bullet point) but does not clarify whether re-injection would be required as a best management practice in oil and gas development.	Effects from water withdrawal on fish and fish habitat are discussed on page 469 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Based on geology of the area, accessibility, and marketability, the Draft RMP/EIS states "it is unlikely that industry will produce commercial amounts of gas from lignite coal within Alaska for the reasonably foreseeable future." This is also stated under Resource Assumptions on page 371. Consequently, effects analyses were based on these assumptions. Re-injection is required as a Required Operating Procedure under ROP-Haz-b-3, page 625 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0083-1	I am concerned that even the "conservation alternative" … would harm salmon by opening their spawning grounds to oil and gas drilling, mining, and other unsustainable development.	Alternative C, the "conservation alternative", prohibits mineral leasing on approximately 50% of BLM-managed lands through maintenance of existing withdrawals. However, even on lands open to oil and gas leasing, there is a No Surface Occupancy Stipulation for all lands within 200 feet of anadromous streams (pp. 130, 131, Draft RMP/EIS) as well as a Required Operating Procedure prohibiting drilling or facility location within 500 feet of anadromous streams.
0164-5	Blanket permits issues by the State of Alaska do not adequately allow Native Corporations to address individual concerns regarding anadromous streams. The BLM need to be involved in the permitting process to cross anadromous streams where it affects BLM	We are and we will continue to be involved as implementation-level planning progresses. BLM worked closely with the State (DNR) on identification and location of authorized crossings in a recent implementation level planning effort for the Gulkana River.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	managed lands.	
0164-36	Page 72 - Under A) Goals for wildlife there is no reference to ensuring the continued subsistence benefits of such resources as there is for the Fisheries and fish resources. Ahtna Inc. requests that this goal statement be modified to include the above information.	This goal is stated on p. 149 of the Draft RMP/EIS under subsistence: "Conserve healthy populations through management and protection of habitat and subsistence harvest permitting and regulations."
0164-39	Page 248-249 - The second and third paragraphs under Subsistence Fisheries contain some inaccuracies as to the events relating to the Glennallen and Chitina Sub-districts.	We reviewed the information referred to in your comment and could find no inaccuracies.
0175-26	Page 72, Goals, Fisheries, 2nd sentence. The use of "restore" in this sentence implies that the current abundance of salmon and steelhead stocks in this area are below historic levels. No data are presented to support this implication. Please consider the following information related to this issue. Until 1999, there was no measure (besides aerial survey indices) of Chinook salmon escapement into the rivers of the area. In 1999, ADF&G initiated a mark-recapture study on Chinook salmon on the Copper River and, since that time, has met the escapement goal in most years. ADF&G has monitored sockeye salmon escapement in the Copper River with the Miles Lake sonar since the early 1980s. Since 1984, the Department met the escapement goal for sockeye salmon every year but one. Steelhead in the Copper River drainage are on the fringe of their distribution, and little is known about where stocks occur in the tributaries (except for the Gulkana and Hanagita rivers).	Thanks for the information. The word "restore" was used in reference to steelhead. The word "restore" has been removed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0175-27	Page 75, 2) Maintenance and Restoration, Fisheries, 1st bullet. No data are presented to support the implication that habitat destruction or degradation limits the current population of	This statement does not say or imply that habitat destruction or degradation limits the current population of steelhead and rainbow trout on the Gulkana. We are saying that we will continue to cooperate with ADF&G on these efforts. The Draft RMP/EIS (page 247) states "Fish populations and habitat conditions in the planning area are good for

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	steelhead and rainbow trout in the Gulkana River. The Bureau and ADF&G are currently conducting a study to estimate abundance of rainbow trout. If successful, this would be the first estimate of abundance for this system. Previously, the ADF&G estimated steelhead-spawning abundance at two of the known spawning sites on the Middle Fork Gulkana (Dickey Lake and Hungry Hollow), but it is not known if these sites represent the majority of spawning steelhead that return to the Gulkana River. Since 1991, rainbow trout and steelhead regulations limit fishers to catch and release. Anecdotal information from anglers and observations of recent expansion in the river indicate that the rainbow trout population is increasing. There is no evidence that habitat is presently a limiting factor in steelhead and rainbow trout abundance in the Gulkana River.	both anadromous and resident species."
0175-41	Page 249, Third full paragraph, 2nd sentence. This sentence suggests that demand for Copper River salmon may increase slightly during the next few years “due to a combination of an increase in urban users and rural users opting to get federal permits as opposed to state permits.” We agree that an increase in the number of urban users could result in an increase in harvest, but do not understand how or why a change in the type of permit obtained by rural users might generate an increased harvest. We request the Bureau clarify this point.	Thanks for the comment. This sentence has been changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for clarification (page 280).
0175-48	Page 369, Fish, last sentence. Section 1314 of ANILCA confirms that the State of Alaska retains authority to manage fish and wildlife on public lands. Clarification of this role and a commitment to cooperate in related matters is addressed in the Master Memorandum of	This sentence has been changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to incorporate your suggestion (page 406). The State/BLM MOU has been added as Appendix K in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Understanding between the Bureau and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. We request the final plan include a copy of the Master Memorandum of Understanding as an appendix. In addition, we suggest the Bureau revise the sentence to the following: The BLM will cooperate with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to manage, protect, and maintain the genetic integrity of Alaska's wildstock populations of salmon. This revision more closely resembles the respective authorities of the Bureau and the Department to manage fish and wildlife habitats and populations.	
0186-2	I object to the elimination of the entire "Fisheries" section of the plan.	This comment is in reference to a draft alternative packet that was distributed, then replaced with another version. However, the Draft RMP/EIS addresses fish and fish habitat in all chapters. Management actions proposed for fisheries protection or for monitoring are shown by alternative on pages 73-86. A description of the current condition of fish and fish habitat is included on pages 244-251. Effects of different management actions, by alternative, are described on pages 461-477.
0312-17	BLM stated that, other than the Copper River salmon, there is no known subsistence dependence for salmon in the planning area. Draft RMP/EIS at 248. BLM provided an analysis of the subsistence harvest of Copper River salmon for the years 1998-2002 and stated that demand is likely to remain stable or increase slightly within the next 5-10 years. Draft RMP/EIS at 249. This fails to provide any subsistence analysis for any other species of fish or any other river system in the planning area. Please include analysis of the proposed alternatives for fisheries management and an analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of fisheries management decisions in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.	Subsistence use other than salmon is minor and most non-salmon subsistence use (Dolly Varden, whitefish, burbot) is satisfied through sport fishing. However, the Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes a discussion on other subsistence fisheries use in the planning area (page 280).
0321-6	The impact of soil erosion from OHVs on water quality and salmon spawning must be	Impacts from OHV management on fish and fish habitat, by alternative, are described on pages 461, 462, 463, 464, 466, 471, 472, 474, and 475. "Mitigation" of impacts is

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	assessed and mitigated.	described through different management options considered in Alternatives A-D. Alternatives C and D consider classifying most areas as limited to OHVs, which would ultimately result in less unmanaged trail proliferation and unauthorized stream crossings.
0329-33	The Draft EIS incorrectly presumes all impacts to fish from ATVs are "localized." (p.463) This flies in the face of watershed analysis. Water runs downhill. Decreased habitat decreases the overall fish population.	We disagree that this is what the analysis concludes. On page 464 of the Draft RMP/EIS, the conclusion (for effects from alternatives A or B) is: "The unauthorized and unmanaged proliferation of trails would increase under this alternative, with a resulting increase in erosion and sediment impacts." Effects of sedimentation on fish habitat is explained on page 461, Draft RMP/EIS. The analysis clearly concludes that Alternatives A or B (relative to OHV management) would have an adverse impact on fish habitat.
0329-54	The Draft (p.73) says that all action alternatives would "support continued monitoring and assessment of riparian areas." Please follow through on this. Please systematically inventory all of the fish streams in the area. According to a rough comparison of expected miles of salmon habitat in a watershed this size and type, and the existing state catalogue of anadromous fish streams, less than half the salmon streams in the Copper River Watershed are listed in the state register. This is important not just as a measure of our ignorance, but because that habitat isn't protected under the law.	BLM is committed to monitoring and assessment of riparian areas. BLM just completed participation in a cooperative effort with State DNR assessing rivers and streams in the Upper Susitna and portions of the Copper River watershed for addition into the anadromous stream catalog.
0329-67	The Draft EIS under-appreciates the importance of and impacts to Wild Copper River Salmon. It ignores the commercial fishery, except in terms of it's impact to subsistence, personal use and sport fisheries. As stated above, this fishery has immense value to a wide variety of users, and action alternatives are critical to sustainable salmon management. Yet, the Draft EIS doesn't even disclose an impact, beyond "localized" impacts.	See response to comment 0341-1.
0329-68	We are alarmed at reports that area resident fish populations show classic signs of over harvest, despite ADF&G supposedly managing fisheries to be sustainable. (p.250) That's great ADF&G is trying to "turn these trends around,"	Population management is the State's responsibility. However, BLM's goals for fisheries habitat management are clearly stated (page 72, Draft RMP/EIS). BLM is certainly sensitive to "not encouraging increased use" in certain areas we are trying to manage for a primitive recreation experience. BLM is committed to maintaining access to public lands but will consider site-specific limitations where quality of recreation experience is

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	but are they? Please protect wild fish populations from over harvest; by limiting access, not encouraging increased use, and other means. Don't pass this responsibility off to the state.	compromised or where resource problems occur as a result. This would occur during implementation level planning, as discussed on pages 33 – 50 of the Draft RMP/EIS under Travel Management.
0329-69	What is the basis for stating that "Future demand on freshwater fish resources is anticipated to remain at current levels."? (p.250) Given that demand for everything else is increasing, and that fast-growing industrial tourism specifically targets fish, this strikes us as a very dangerous assumption.	Thanks for the comment. This is an editing error has been corrected in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0329-70	The Draft EIS/RMP supposes that increased stress on salmon in the area will immediately be counter-balanced by decreased sport harvest. ... This is wishful thinking. It is entirely foreseeable that the state would neglect to manage the salmon resource sustainably, refuse to reduce sport fishing limits, and/or fail to detect a declining fishery. The consequence would be that subsistence users would be the first to feel the impact of increased use, or decreased habitat, for fish. Please consider that another, in our view much more likely consequence would be that the fishery would continue at an unsustainable rate. This could drive fish stocks extinct in the extreme, or at least have negative effects that would ripple out through the ecosystem. This would increase pressure to supplement wild stocks with hatchery fish, which further stresses the natural system and threatens wild stocks. As we note above, habitat management is just as, if not more important than fisheries harvest management to achieving a sustainable fishery.	BLM's goal for fisheries management is clearly stated and emphasizes protection of habitat (p. 72, Draft RMP/EIS). BLM believes in ADF&G's commitment to managing salmon for sustainability. They annually devote tremendous time, money and effort to monitoring through radio-telemetry, aerial surveys, videography, and other means of counting salmon (such as the fish counting tower on the Gulkana).
0329-71	What is the basis of the statement that "factors currently limiting anadromous fish populations	This sentence has been re-written in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to say: "Currently, habitat quality is not a limiting factor in anadromous fish populations in the planning

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	are not generally habitat oriented in the planning area?" (p.247) What factors are limiting? This statement is incorrect, because fish populations come directly from quality habitat.	area." The basis for this statement is explained on page 278 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and is attributed to "habitat conditions in the planning area are good for both anadromous and resident species."
0329-72	The Draft EIS fails to consider or disclose impacts to the fish in the Copper River watershed, or any other watershed. Yet, this is the critical measure of impacts, because on the watershed scale is where impacts occur. Again, we strongly urge you to consider impacts to the major watersheds in the planning area. What percentage of the watersheds is at stake? How developed are they currently? These factors must be considered.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers impacts to fisheries habitat from management actions and allowable uses proposed in the range of alternatives considered. This includes impacts from anticipated levels of OHV use, mineral development, oil and gas development, recreational use, and lands and realty actions anticipated for each alternative. These impacts are described in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 461-477 and cumulative impacts are described on pages 540 and 541. RMP decisions are broad and general and describe what activities would be allowed in what areas. This document does not propose specific locations for activities; this is done in implementation level planning. So, by necessity, the analysis of impacts is somewhat general in nature because specialists don't know exactly where (or if) development might occur. This is explained on page 361 of the Draft RMP/EIS. "Development" in the watershed (for BLM-managed lands) is described in Chapter 3, under Leasable and Locatable minerals, Land & Realty, Vegetation Management, and Recreation.
0329-73	The Draft EIS totally ignores the Gulkana hatchery, which is on BLM land. It says "fishery management activities within the planning area are currently limited to harvest of fish resources under State regulations." (p.247) That is not true. We are concerned that the Gulkana hatchery, which is at largely on public land and operates under a BLM permit, will threaten the long-term viability of Wild Copper River Salmon. Please incorporate by reference our comments on the "EA" for the Gulkana hatchery, which apparently came too late it the process to matter. Evidence is abundant and increasing that hatcheries—even low-tech, indigenous-stock hatcheries like at Gulkana—interfere with wild runs. Please take a more balanced approach, and ensure that the genetic integrity of Wild Copper River Salmon is preserved. The Fisheries MSA estimates the Gulkana hatchery produces 17.25% of the total	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will include a discussion of the hatchery (page 273).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Copper River salmon return. Strangely, that information was specifically deleted in the same paragraph in the Draft EIS. Why?	
0329-75	We are concerned about Gulkana steelhead. With the growth of use, and targeted sport fishing, this fish could be extirpated from the area. Management actions that impact salmon would generally have similar impacts to this population of steelhead. For example, limiting damage to watersheds from ATVs would have positive habitat impacts for steelhead. Wild & scenic river designation would probably have benefits. Please consider these impacts in the Revised Draft EIS/RMP.	The Gulkana River is already a Wild and Scenic River and no alternative considered within the Draft RMP/EIS would change that status. Alternatives C and D would limit OHVs in the Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridor to designated trails, to minimize river crossings and ensure that crossing occur at places where habitat impacts would be minimized. As emphatically pointed out by ADF&G in their comment 175-27, there is no evidence that habitat is presently a limiting factor in steelhead and rainbow trout abundance in the Gulkana River.
0329-109	The Draft EIS severely understates the known impact of oil spills on aquatic ecosystems, and salmon in particular. (p.470) Newer science has shown that Oil and salmon don't mix.	Which research to cite about oil toxicity to salmon is arguable. However, the bottom-line conclusion is based on a very low likelihood of large spills getting into anadromous streams. As stated (page 470, Draft RMP/EIS) this conclusion is reached based on specific Required Operating Procedures, as cited.
0329-119	We disagree that "the prevention of drilling in rivers and streams would provide fish with adequate protection." (p.469) That is an awfully low bar to set. We are further amazed that this stipulations has exceptions written into the rule. It is never reasonable to drill for oil in a salmon stream.	ROP-F&W--a-6 states the roads, well pads, and other oil and gas facilities will not be allowed within 500 feet of fish-bearing rivers and lakes. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS, in Appendix C, will include "exploratory oil and gas drilling" in this ROP and will delete ROP-F&W-a-7. This will strengthen protection of fish and fish habitat.
0330-1	After reviewing the EIS, we have concerns regarding proposed actions occurring within [Yakutat] city and borough boundaries. The chief concern is that changing water law allowing mine tailings to be placed in lakes and eliminating mixing zones creates the sense that any future mining and drilling activity in our borough has the potential to affect salmon habitat and production.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS would prohibit mineral entry or mineral leasing within this area through maintenance of an existing withdrawal. Alternative D would lift the withdrawal on the eastern 1/3 of the BLM-managed area, allowing for mineral entry or mineral leasing in the area. Because of the extreme topography, limited geological potential, and very difficult access, future mineral development in this area is considered highly unlikely. However, in the event of exploration or development, the following Required Operating Procedures would provide protection for salmon habitat: ROP-Water-a-1, ROP-F&W-a-6, and ROPs-Water-b-1 through Water-b-7 (page 616, Draft RMP/EIS).
0330-2	Our concerns are the effects on fisheries habitat associated with future extraction activities that the preferred alternative would allow. The main fishing river for Yakutat is the	Management actions proposed within the range of alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS will not effect the Situk River or the other rivers you mention (East Alsek, Italio, West Fork Situk, and Old Situk). BLM has some lands on the Malaspina Glacier, all on the surface of the glacier itself. The forelands in this area are Native lands. No

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Situk. With the warming trends, geophysical activity and present industrial uses, fish returns have become erratic as seen in a historic low harvest of Situk sockeye this season. This effects all fisheries; subsistence, sport, and commercial. As climate changes continue many rivers that presently support harvestable runs of fish will begin to decline (East Alsek, Italio, West Fork Situk, and Old Situk Rivers are present examples). Rivers that are currently glacial and sediment filled will become more productive as headwater lakes clear and primary productivity increases. This includes rivers draining from the proposed land use change. If the water quality of these areas is compromised through by-products of drilling and mining elasticity of the system will be lost.	likelihood of mineral exploration or development exists on these BLM lands.
0341-1	The BLM "Draft Plan" does not adequately address and evaluate potential impacts to salmon habitat and salmon fisheries from proposed development and land use options. …The current plan fails to adequately address land use issues affecting subsistence, commercial, and sport fisheries. As a matter of fact, the draft fails to even mention commercial fishing.	The Draft RMP/EIS includes 16 pages of description of effects on fish and fish habitat from the different alternatives (pp. 461 - 477). The effects discussion focuses on fish habitat rather than populations, because ADF&G is responsible for management and monitoring of populations, though BLM cooperates in monitoring (p. 247). Commercial fishing is mentioned in the Draft RMP/EIS (p. 249). The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will discuss commercial fishing in more detail, including the economic importance (p. 273, Proposed RMP/Final EIS).
0341-4	It remains true today that the economy and culture of the Copper River watershed relies primarily on the stability of the wild salmon runs in the Copper River ecosystem. Failure to evaluate the effects of management options on the habitat that sustains these fisheries is an omission that substantially affects the ability of the commenting public to fairly evaluate the options presented.	See responses comments 0341-1 and 0329-72.
0354-5	On (p. 369), BLM will continue to manage and protect and maintain the genetic integrity of Alaska's wildstock populations of salmon", yet	According to recent ADF&G surveys, king salmon continue to use Bone Creek for spawning and have not been "eliminated" by trail use crossing Bone Creek. The Draft RMP/EIS (page 34) allows for BLM to participate in 17(b) easement maintenance (which,

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	King Salmon have been eliminated by trail use crossing Bone Creek (Mentasta area) with no management of the 17(b) easement. ... Trespass is a problem as the right-of-way is both a contested RS 2477 and 17(b) easement used not just for access, but for unauthorized uses such as camping, hunting, fishing, etc., yet BLM does not recognize the impact of this particular 17(b) easement which also crosses a Native Allotment.	in some cases, would reduce trail braiding and subsequent trespass), based on priorities listed on page 34. Regarding enforcement, BLM has only a non-possessory interest in a reserved easement, which is the right to use the land for a specified purpose. This does not allow BLM to take civil or criminal action against uses, such as wandering from the easement, camping more than 24 hours or fishing from the easement, when the uses do not interfere with the retained rights (the use of the easement). This information is included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (pp. 41, 42, 187).
0355-38	On page 471 under Locatable Minerals, the statement is made that "Impacts to fisheries from mining activities are increased erosion, impacts associated with infrastructures (roads) and toxic pollution. This is not correct. Road construction requires strict controls and the use of silt curtains and NPDES discharge requirements do not allow any discharge that could be "toxic pollution". The following paragraph correctly states that the impacts are expected to be minor and short term.	As stated, the final conclusion, based on application of Required Operating Procedures is that "impacts are expected to be short-term and small, and are not expected to have a significant impact to fish or fish habitat in the long-term."
0371-2	Salmon is maybe as much of a valuable resource in my opinion as minerals and is sustainable, especially the Copper river drainage. I do not think any shed ways to this drainage should be sacrificed or if any mining or drilling were to take place here it should come under close scrutiny.	No watersheds to the Copper would be sacrificed under any alternative considered in the Draft RMP/EIS. The Draft RMP/EIS considers a wide range of protective measures for anadromous rivers and streams in the alternatives…from maintenance of withdrawals that would prohibit mineral entry or leasing in alternative C to site-specific ROPs and stipulations that would be applied to any permitted activity.
CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
0020-4	Identifying archeological sites, too, does not protect them, all it does is open them up to destruction. Tangle Lakes is the perfect example of our archeological sites being trampled on. So a goal, you know, you need to not only manage the trails but minimize the damage being done to our cultural resources up there.	BLM recognizes and has documented impacts to archaeological sites within the Tangle Lakes Archeological District (TLAD). See page 171, Draft RMP/EIS. This drove the need for designated trails in the area, to try and minimize impacts to the resource. BLM is committed to continue managing the area to protect cultural resources (page 79, Draft RMP/EIS).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0020-21	Paleontological resources, you haven't even inventoried them. How do you know what's out there. We want that inventoried. We're losing our cultural identity every day because of the lack of protection on our archeological sites. Every day. I mean the glacier up there is receding faster than anyone can study and, yet, the people that are up there trespassing are taking things. They're taking our artifacts. That's our history that's being robbed right out from under our noses.	The Draft RMP/EIS recognizes paleontological resources (pages 270-272) and the need to increase inventory and knowledge about them (page 73, Cultural Resources, 4th bullet statement). Theft of artifacts is a crime. If you have specific information on this activity occurring, BLM law enforcement rangers would be willing to follow up on your concern.
0020-25	Our subsistence dependent lifestyle is currently damaged by, and will continue to be damaged by direct damages to our archeological sites. Some of the sites we have had to identify and once we do access must be provided. The only problem is nobody protected the sites. We have archeological sites up at Tangle Lakes that have been thoroughly damaged. Trespassers up there have burnt the lodges down for firewood.	The Draft RMP/EIS recognizes cultural resources (pp. 252 - 279) and the need to increase inventory and knowledge about them (p. 73, Cultural Resources). Theft or destruction of artifacts is a crime. If you have specific information on this activity occurring, BLM law enforcement rangers would be willing to follow up on your concern.
0164-34	Known and potential cultural sites and resources must be protected and their status monitored throughout any resource development. Ahtna Inc. requests a cooperative agreement between the State, BLM, and Ahtna Inc. to protect and review the areas that are of cultural significance to the Ahtna People.	BLM is committed to protection of cultural resources, as stated in our goal (page 72, Draft RMP/EIS). We are also committed to expanding our knowledge of known cultural sites through increased inventory and monitoring (page 73, Draft RMP/EIS). BLM is currently working with Athna on a Memorandum of Understanding, one facet of which would facilitate protection and review of culturally significant areas.
0164-46	The Draft Plan must discuss the paleo/cultural significance of Lake Ahtna and include measures for the monitoring and preservation of cultural sites discovered.	This is identified (page 73 of the Draft RMP/EIS) as a specific inventory and monitoring need.
0312-135	The following areas are identified as historical Native subsistence sites by local experts in Yakutat: • Galyax-Kaagwaantaan • Teikweidi' Bear House • Kwa'ashk'i Kwaan • Telkweidi' Drum House • Lukaax adi- L'uknax.adi •	Thank you for the information. A description of the prehistory and history of the Bering Glacier-Icy Bay Region is included on page 255 of the Draft RMP/EIS. However, your specific information will be added to the data collected through contract as part of this planning effort and will be used in future coordination in implementation level planning efforts. BLM's Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) proposes management for the area

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Shungukeide While not all of these sites are located on BLM administered lands, certainly the management decisions of BLM lands will affect them. Please prioritize the protection of the natural and cultural resources on BLM lands in the Bering Glacier-Icy Bay region.	to protect and enhance the ecological integrity of the Bering Glacier area.
0312-136	Though it is not brought up in this land use planning document, we support the recent creation of the ½ mile corridor around Paxson Lake for protection based on archeological and historical significance.	It is actually listed as a decision under Alternatives B, C, and D, under Recreational Withdrawals (page 106, Draft RMP/EIS). Thanks for your support.
0354-11	[T]he paleo/cultural values of Lake Ahtna must be monitored/assessed.	This is identified (page 73 of the Draft RMP/EIS) as a specific inventory and monitoring need.
0354-13	Per page 270, there is no systematic inventory of paleontological resources and no way to track loss of cultural information. Ahtna's cultural archeological site at Tangle Lakes (dated over 10,000 years old) and other historical sites have been destroyed and measures to protect sites must be evaluated.	Please see response to comment 0020-21.
0354-33	Set aside special areas of interest, utilizing the history of the area without compromising archeological sites. Establish enforceable penalties for destruction of historic sites. Need research budget to pay local elders for knowledge that will disappear if not captured.	Areas of archeological significance have been identified in the past by BLM (TLAD), with a management emphasis for protection of cultural resources. Enforceable penalties for destruction of historic sites are in place. And…during this planning process, BLM contracted with Dr. James Kari to work with the Ahtna people in identifying culturally important sites and areas.
0355-40	Also on page 477, the references to negative impacts on archeological resources fails to recognize the laws and regulations already in effect that deal with such issues.	Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS (includes page 477) described general impacts to cultural resources from proposed management actions or allowable uses, by alternative. Required Operating Procedure Cultural-a-2 on page 622 describes the laws and regulations that cultural resource and conservation will be consistent with: 1) Sections 106, 110, and 101d of the Historic Preservation Act, 2) procedures under BLM's 1997 Programmatic Agreement for Section 106 compliance, 3) the BLM's 1998 Implementing Protocol in Alaska between the BLM and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer, 4) Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), and 5) Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).
0386-5	Also in the plans are the protection of the culture areas, you know, I'm really happy to hear that the Paxson area around the lake on	Thank you for the comment and information. As stated in the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 72 and 73, BLM is committed to protection and inventory of cultural sites. During this planning process, BLM contracted with Dr. James Kari to work with the Ahtna people in

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	that half a mile corridor has been implemented because those areas unknown to most people, including the Native community, there was -- the elders have told me there was two villages up along that lake there. One on the north side and one on the south side and they were very huge villages. There's also a village that used to have been right on the Tangle Lakes -- banks of the Tangle Lake area. And so those areas need to be protected in regards to some of the culture things that, you know, there may be some graves sites and stuff in those areas that needs to be further looked at.	identifying culturally important sites and areas. This data will be used in future consultation and project planning to provide greater protection of cultural sites.
VISUAL RESORUCES (VRM)		
0020-18	The Mentasta area is considered a Class IV, we want it to be reclassified to Class I, all lands adjacent to Mentasta and AHTNA lands should be Class I on visual resources. We don't want you to have the authority to put up oil rigs, mining camps and all those up there, those need to be protected areas.	Alternative C in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be changed so that BLM-managed lands within the viewshed of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cut-off road) are managed under Class III VRM objectives.
0312-53	We recommend that the preferred alternative adopt VRM Class I for the Bering Glacier, especially if the RNA proposal is adopted. These lands are adjacent to the 125-mile Bagley Icefield within Wrangell St. Elias National Park. VRM Class I management guidance for the Bering Glacier will guarantee viewsheds consistent with the adjoining federally designated Wilderness area.	Based on the criteria listed above (high quality scenic rating, high sensitivity, and seldom seen distance class) the Bering rated as a VRM class II. It is considered as Class I under alternative C.
0312-56	If the proposal to pursue designation of the Denali Highway as a Back Country Byway is adopted in the Final RMP, we recommend that the associated VRM standards for this area will reflect the BLM's commitment to protect and enhance the current high scenic values present along this corridor.	Alternative D (the preferred) would manage the Denali Highway area as a Class II viewshed, with objectives to retain the existing character of the landscape. Alternative C considers management of the area as class I, with objectives to preserve the existing character of the landscape.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0312-57	If the Delta Range SRMA or Tiekel SRMA are adopted in the Final RMP, we also recommend assigning VRM Class II to the areas in order to retain and preserve the existing undeveloped characteristics of the visual resources, particularly within the Augustana and Canwell subunits, and the Tonsina north and south subunits.	Management under VRM Class I or II for the viewsheds of these areas is considered in alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Please keep in mind that the Delta and Tiekel SRMAs, under the preferred alternative, would be entirely within the pipeline/utility corridor. Don't forget the primary purpose for which those lands were withdrawn (to provided a transportation/utility corridor). We cannot logically adopt VRM objectives that would prohibit or unreasonably restrict activities consistent with the purpose of the withdrawal.
0312-58	We are concerned that in the preferred alternative, BLM proposes to allow extensive surface disturbing activities to occur on lands that can currently be classified through Scenic Quality Ratings as meeting VRM Class I and II objectives, especially when compared on a national scale to public lands in the contiguous United States.	Please see response comment 0312-61.
0312-59	We request that BLM uphold strong visual resource management goals, especially Class I, II and III assignments. These principles will minimize the occurrence of high levels of change to BLM lands, particularly through activities which would diminish scenic values to a point where major rehabilitation would be the next necessary step.	Class I, II, and III objectives are described on page 273 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Assignment of these classes and adherence to these objectives will not necessarily decrease the occurrence of development activities, but it will mitigate the impacts of development activities on scenic quality.
0312-60	Above all, we encourage BLM to require permitted operators to strive to minimize the impacts of surface-disturbing activities on the scenic resources of all public lands, especially along the Gulkana National Wild River, the Delta National Wild and Scenic River, and lands adjacent to the Denali Highway and the Richardson Highway. Any permitted activities must be designed to blend with the landscape so that they do not attract attention or visually clash with the adjacent scenery.	The areas or viewsheds from the highways you mentioned would be managed under Classes I, II, or III under the preferred alternative, with objectives consistent with your comment.
0312-61	Recommended VRM Classes: VRM Class I: Gulkana and Delta WSR corridors and the Bering Glacier; VRM Class II: Gulkana and	VRM Classes are based on three considerations: 1) Scenic Quality; 2) Sensitivity Level; and 3) Distance zones. Distance classes were developed using viewsheds from 21 different well-used travel routes throughout the planning area (including rivers and trails).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Delta WSR corridors viewshed; Denali Highway viewshed; Delta Range SRMA, especially Augustana and Canwell subunits; Tiekel SRMA, especially Tonsina North and South subunits. All other BLM-managed lands should be managed to uphold the objectives of VRM Classes II and III in order to retain and preserve the existing undeveloped characteristics of the visual resources.	Overall VRM Class is developed by combining these three considerations. Because of the obvious scenic quality in the planning area, all areas rated out as moderate to high in scenic quality. Amount of use is a factor used in considering sensitivity, so it is possible for a highly scenic area, such as the Bering Glacier, to rate out as a Class II or III VRM class, based on lower sensitivity rating or a distance class of Seldom Seen. This is why some of the area, even under Alternative C, is classed as VRM Class IV (combination of moderate scenic quality, low sensitivity, and seldom seen distance class). BLM has not significantly changed these VRM classes in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS because alternative C does consider most of your comment request. We will not arbitrarily change all areas from Class IV to Class III.
0329-51	The proposed Visual Resource Management Classes are puzzling. At risk of sounding over-appreciative of this region, even the designations in Alternative C don't match reality. How can Klutina Lake be only Class IV? And the proposed alternative designates the Bering Glacier country only Class II?! We would support knocking the proposal in Alternative C up a notch. To call the Bering glacier country a class III viewshed is patently absurd. The Denali highway is way prettier than mediocre. How were these VRM classes arrived at? The VRM improperly assumes that the only visual resources, are those seen from a car on the highway. However, much of the area is reached by boat or plane, not car.	Please see response to comment 0312-6.
0354-12	All Native-selected lands and 17(b) easements must be protected and classified as Class I Visual, where "change to the characteristic landscape very low and not attract attention".	17(b) easements would not get a VRM class because they are easements across non-BLM managed lands. For your comment on Native-selected lands, see our response to comment 0312-61 on how VRM classes were determined.
0392-2	We support Class I visual resource management for the designated corridors of the Delta and Gulkana Rivers. And we also support Class II visual resource management for the adjacent lands within the view sheds of these rivers.	Management under Class I for the Delta and Gulkana river corridors is considered under both alternatives C and D. Management of their viewsheds under Class II is also considered under both C and D.
0392-3	For visual resource management I believe we're also opposed to any Class IV VRM	Please see response to comment 0312-61 and comment 0020-18.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	designation within the planning area. Our feeling that is too lax of a management designation for these lands that are currently in pristine condition.	
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACEC)		
0060-2	So I would stress that some of the lands that had been examined as, I'm going to get the acronym wrong, but as ACEC land in the initial scoping, should be put back on the table for that status.	ACEC designations are considered under alternative C in the Draft RMP/EIS. Designations are considered in Alternative D for the West Fork and Nelchina calving areas, if lands are retained in federal ownership in manageable, contiguous blocks. For the Delta Bison area, a cooperative Habitat Management Plan is considered under Alternative D.
0060-14	Protecting the calving grounds of the Nelchina Caribou herd is crucial to subsistence hunting in this ACEC as well as to maintaining the ecological integrity of the area. Not only should oil and mineral development and new construction not be allowed in this area, but we favor allowing ORV access between to 10/15 to 4/15 only. Even during the winter months, access should be disallowed if there is not adequate snow cover or if freeze depths are too shallow to protect soils and forage. We also favor disallowing SRPs during calving season (5/1 to 6/15).	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers and analyzes your suggestions for the area, with the exception of the seasonal closure to OHVs (alternative C would limit OHVs to designated trails). Very few OHV trails currently exist in the area.
0060-17	We support the designation of 827,000 acres of the Bering Glacier as a Resource Natural Area to protect the unique ecological values associated with the glacier and the glacier forelands, as described in the preferred alternative. However, the Preferred Alternative also proposes allowing oil and gas leasing and locatable mineral entry to occur on the eastern 1/3 of the Bering Glacier RNA, a use that is incompatible with RNA designation.	The decision to lift the withdrawal on the eastern 1/3 of the area in the preferred alternative is based on the following reasons: 1) Most research activities are focused on features associated with the glacier itself, the eastern 1/3 of the area is un-glaciated; 2) the likelihood of mineral development in the eastern 1/3 of the area is very low due to the remote nature of the area, difficult access, and extreme topography; and 3) protection provided under the stipulations and Required Operating Procedures described on pp. 610-629 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0060-20	The West Fork of the Gulkana River provides important breeding grounds for Trumpeter Swans and other waterfowl; nesting sites for bald eagles and osprey; moose habitat; and spawning grounds for sockeyes and kings. All	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers maintenance of withdrawals that would keep the area closed to mineral entry or mineral leasing. No FLPMA or R&PP leases would be considered for the area. The OHV dates (5/1 to 8/31) were chosen based on the season of trumpeter swan breeding and nesting. If carrying capacities for SRPs were determined in implementation planning under Alternative C, areas of highest value

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	of these uses are incompatible with mining, drilling, logging, and other commercial developments; as such, these uses should be disallowed. In addition, we recommend that OHV use should be restricted from 4/15 to 10/15 with adequate snow cover and freeze depths, rather than only from 5/1 to 8/31 as stated. In formulating carrying capacities for SRPs, areas of highest value as nesting sites for swans and raptors should have a designated carrying capacity of zero during the nesting season.	as nesting sites for swans and raptors would be seasonally excluded from commercial operators.
0061-1	These large tracts of land [ACECs], as has been said, are really critical, but the notion that it's calving grounds and nesting areas is particular important. And I just want -- and I haven't looked at all the different alternatives for the motorized use of the different areas, but want to just emphasize that the seasonality of motorized use in terms of reproduction is always a critical issue and that gestation should also be considered part of that phase because stress during gestation, of course, is problematic.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers ACEC designations for the Delta Bison calving area and Nelchina caribou calving area that would limit motorized use to designated trails, located to avoid critical calving areas. Effects of these actions on wildlife are described (by alternative) on pp. 434-461 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0080-7	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends establishment of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) as described in Alternative C, to protect habitat for the Nelchina caribou, migratory waterfowl, and trumpeter swans.	ACEC designations are considered under Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Designations are considered in Alternative D for the West Fork and Nelchina calving areas, if lands are retained in federal ownership in manageable, contiguous blocks. For the Delta Bison area, a cooperative Habitat Management Plan is considered under Alternative D.
0086-2	I support BLM's proposal for a 827,000 acre Bering Glacier Research Natural Area but I oppose opening one-third of this RNA to the exploration and for oil, gas, and locatable minerals. Such land uses are incompatible with the goals of the RNA.	Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS would manage the area as a Research Natural Area, with an emphasis on protection of the unique ecological values of the area. Alternative D would lift the existing withdrawal on the eastern 1/3 of the area. Exploration and development on the BLM managed lands in this area are highly unlikely due to rough topography, very little existing infrastructure, and very limited access.
0097-2	Further we support Alternative C for its creation of the Delta Bison Calving, Nelchina Caribou	Thanks for your comment. A "limited" designation for most BLM-managed lands is also considered under alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Calving, and West Fork Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Bering Glacier Research Natural Area (RNA). These designations set forth management actions which put constraints on summer OHV usage, such as limiting use to designated trails.	
0167-2	I am opposed to the proposal to open a third of the Bering Glacier Research Natural Area to oil, gas, to mineral exploration. I believe the natural values of these wild areas far outweigh any benefit from extractive industry.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers maintenance of the withdrawal on the entire area that would prevent mineral entry or mineral leasing.
0173-6	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. The 1979 Alaska Legislature established the 90,000-acre Delta Junction State Bison range. The ADF&G actively manages and limits the "pre-calving" herd size to 275-300 bison with a hunting permit program. Since herd size is actively managed, an ACEC is not justified.	The ACEC designation is considered under alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. An ACEC would not be considered under alternatives A, B, or D. In alternative D, a cooperative Habitat Management Plan would be pursued between BLM and ADF&G.
0173-7	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. … Documentation of mining claims and the presence of minerals in the proposed area should be developed and provided in the Plan. It is unclear at this time whether the BLM is unencumbered.	See response to comment 0173-6. In addition, a map showing federal mining claims will be included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (Map 50, Mineral Terranes and Producing Placer Districts). And, this area is unencumbered BLM land.
0173-8	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. … The area should be opened to entry for Locatable Minerals and Leasable Minerals (Oil and Gas and Coal). Entry should be open	See response to comment 0173-6. Your suggestion for opening the area to entry for locatable and leasable minerals is considered in Alternative B. Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative) would maintain the current withdrawal (PLO 5150) where locatable mineral entry is closed in the inner corridor and open in the outer corridor.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	for both the outer and inner corridors.	
0173-9	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. … Lands and Realty should grant FLPMA and R&PP leases. FLPMA 302 permits and Rights-of-way should be granted.	See response to comment 0173-6. Leases and permits would not be granted only under alternative C in the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative D would grant leases and permits, consistent with protection of the bison calving area habitat.
0173-10	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. … Alternative C is unjustified and should not be adopted. BLM must manage its lands for multiple use. This alternative further restricts multiple use.	The Delta Bison Calving Area is only designated as an ACEC in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS (see pages 80 and 83).
0173-11	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. … Alternative D is also too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures"	See response to comment 0173-6. Also, your suggestion for road construction is considered under Alternatives A and B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0173-12	Nelchina Caribou Calving Area: It is totally inappropriate to include State and Native selected lands in any designation of an ACEC. These selected lands will in all likelihood become State or Native lands in the future. Therefore, no restrictions should be imposed on these lands that could complicate transfer or management of the lands.	ACEC designation for this area is considered in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Designation as an ACEC and the measures described under alternative C would not create an encumbrance on State-selected lands. In addition, the measures considered for the area that are considered under alternative D are completely consistent with measures described for protection of the Nelchina caribou calving area in the State (DNR) Susitna Area Plan.
0173-13	Nelchina Caribou Calving Area: a. the existing ANCSA d(1) withdrawals should be revoked for Locatable Minerals and the area opened up for all minerals. b. the existing ANCSA d(1)	Your suggestion is considered and analyzed under Alternatives B and D of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	withdrawals should be revoked for Leasable Minerals (Oil and Gas) and the area opened up for recovery of oil and gas resources. c. the existing ANCSA d(1) withdrawals should be revoked for Leasable Minerals (Coals) and the area opened up for leasing and development by all mining methods.	
0173-14	Nelchina Caribou Calving Area: The recovery of Mineral materials should be made available for permitting.	Your suggestion is considered in Alternatives A and B of the Draft RMP/EIS and is only seasonally limited in Alternative D.
0173-15	Nelchina Caribou Calving Area: Lands and Realty should grant FLPMA and R&PP leases. FLPMA 302 permits and Rights-of-way should be granted.	Your suggestion is considered under Alternatives A and B of the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative D allows for these uses, consistent with protection of the calving area.
0173-16	Nelchina Caribou Calving Area: Alternative D is also too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures"	Your suggestion is considered in Alternatives A and B of the Draft RMP/EIS. Also, proposals considered in Alternative D are completely consistent with measures described in the State (DNR) Susitna Area Plan for this management area.
0175-28	Pages 80, 81, and 84, Nelchina Caribou Calving Area, West Fork of the Gulkana. The State appreciates BLM's efforts to recognize state management intent for state selected lands as described in the Department Of Natural Resource's Area Plans for State Lands and other planning documents such as the ADF&G Bison Management Plan within the areas identified as the Nelchina Caribou Calving Area, the West Fork of the Gulkana proposed ACEC area, and the Delta Bison Calving Area. To a great extent, management strategies proposed for the Nelchina Caribou Calving Area and the West Fork of the Gulkana (trumpeter swam breeding habitat) are consistent with management strategies identified in the Susitna Area Plan and the Copper River Basin Area Plan. However, as	Thanks for the comments. During this planning process, ACEC proposals were researched for the area using, as one source of information, State (DNR) area plans. BLM is committed to continuing to work with the State in implementation of this RMP.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	indicated in previous comments, there area some issues identified within the Implementation-level Considerations described in this document with which the State has concerns. By addressing these issues through implementation-level planning we believe that many of these concerns can be successfully resolved.	
0175-55	Page 595, Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC. We disagree with the Bureau's restrictions to exclude all airstrip development in Alternatives C and D. In the Department of Natural Resources Susitna Area Plan for the Nelchina Public Use Area, "airstrips and appropriate landing patterns shall be established in consultation with DNR and ADF&G to minimize adverse effects on caribou." We request the Bureau revise the Area of Critical Environmental Concern to reflect this information.	Prohibition of new airstrip construction will remain in Alternative C. Alternative D of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be consistent with your suggested wording, under "Interim Management" (page B-6, Appendix B).
0175-56	Page 603, Bering RNA. The State objects to the use of carrying capacity as a means of limiting Public Use Cabins. Special Recreation Permits within the range of Alternatives for the Bering RNA should clearly identify the management objectives and provide justification for an RMP decision to disallow helicopter supported services. Please refer to previous correspondence from the State regarding carrying capacity and comments included earlier in this correspondence regarding limitations. The State was unable to locate a justification for the elimination of helicopter-supported services.	The wording will be changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to say "Public use cabins may be considered, consistent with objectives of the RNA" (B-16, Appendix B). These objectives will be clearly described in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for the Bering Glacier RNA for alternative D (pp. 93, 96 Proposed RMP/Final EIS). The objectives will include justification for the elimination of helicopter-supported commercial recreational activities.
0185-5	The three Areas of Critical Environmental Concerns (ACEC): Delta Bison Calving, the Nelchina Caribou calving and the West Fork trumpeter swan and waterfowl habitat as	The Nelchina caribou calving area and the West Fork trumpeter swan area were not considered as ACECs in the preferred alternative because they are mostly State and Native-selected lands. Alternative D does say (pages 594 and 598, Draft RMP/EIS) that if sizeable contiguous blocks of land are left in federal ownership after conveyance,

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	discussed in Alternative C should be included in the final plan. Why were these areas not included in the BLM preferred alternative?	ACEC designation would be considered. The Delta Bison calving area was dropped from Alternative D because most of the area would be managed under the Delta Range SRMA and a cooperative Habitat Management Plan for the calving area is considered under Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0306-1	The three Areas of Critical Environmental Concerns (ACEC): Delta Bison Calving, the Nelchina Caribou calving and the West Fork trumpeter swan and waterfowl habitat as discussed in Alternative C should be included in the final plan. Why were these areas not included in the BLM preferred alternative?	The Nelchina caribou calving area and the West Fork trumpeter swan area were not considered as ACECs in the preferred alternative because they are mostly State and Native-selected lands. Alternative D does say (pp. 594 and 598, Draft RMP/EIS) that if sizeable contiguous blocks of land are left in federal ownership after conveyance, ACEC designation would be considered. The Delta Bison calving area was dropped from alternative D because most of the area would be managed under the Delta Range SRMA and a cooperative Habitat Management Plan for the calving area is considered under alternative D.
0306-5	I support designating the 827,000 acre Bering Glacier Research Natural area. The eastern 1/3 of the Bering Glacier Natural Research Area should be withdrawn from oil and gas leasing and locatable mineral entry as proposed in your preferred alternative.	Actually, the preferred alternative proposes lifting the existing withdrawals in the eastern 1/3 of the area, which would allow for mineral entry or mineral leasing, although the likelihood is very low. Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers retaining the withdrawal on the whole area.
0312-2	We support the proposal to designate the Bering Glacier as a Research natural Aras for the protection of "unique ecological values" of the glacier and forelands and for providing continued scientific research opportunities. Please apply management guidelines and restrictions to these lands that are consistent with those of the adjacent Wilderness lands of Wrangell St. Elias National Park and Preserve.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers the strongest protective measures for the area. However, even alternative C does not prohibit motorized use in the area. It does limit OHV use to designated trails. There are few OHV trails in the area, and they are used to access subsistence resources.
0312-3	We support the entire 1,000,316 acres of BLM administered lands of the Bering Glacier region to be included in the boundaries of the Research Natural Area. If the adjacent selected lands are ultimately conveyed to the State of Alaska, interim protection will guarantee that the State receives the selected lands in the highest quality resource condition afforded by the RNA designation.	Thanks for the comment. Your suggestion is considered in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Under alternative D, State and Native selected lands adjacent to the Bering Glacier area would be managed as a Research Natural Area if they are retained in long-term federal ownership.
0312-4	We request that BLM not recommend lifting the ANCSA 17(d)(1) withdrawals on the eastern	Thanks for the comment. Maintenance of the d(1) withdrawals for the entire area is considered and analyzed in alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	one-third of the RNA which currently prevent mineral leasing or locatable mineral entry. We request that BLM recognize the importance of the pristine wildlife habitat and abundant subsistence resources traditionally used and relied upon by the native peoples of the region. Many historical sites were identified in the Coastal management Program, such as the Cape Yakatage Village, Cape Yakataga Ravens House, Simonoesko in the Cape Suckling area, trade route from the interior, from Duktoth River, Guyot Bay or Mud Bay, a pre-historic Gineixkwan camp west of Icy Bay and the village on the Kaliakh known as Ghalyaxh that are within the planning area, as identified by local experts. We believe that maintaining the withdrawals throughout the entire designated area is an essential management tool capable of helping to achieve the stated goals of the Bering Glacier Research Natural Area.	
0312-5	In an attempt to apply consistent management standards with adjacent land managers, we recommend that BLM designate the Delta Bison ACEC. Protection for the bison calving habitat present on these BLM lands would offer ecosystem-level management for this species and facilitate strong interagency cooperation.	ACEC designation is considered in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Under Alternative D, a cooperative Habitat Management Plan with ADF&G would be pursued.
0312-6	We recommend adding the following seasonal limitations to the Delta Bison calving ACEC: To protect calving bison, no surface disturbing activities exceeding fourteen days should be allowed from 5/1 to 6/30.	This Required Operating Procedure is already considered under Alternatives B, C, and D. See ROP-F&W-b-2 (page 614, Draft RMP/EIS).
0312-7	We recommend adding the following seasonal limitations to the Delta Bison calving ACEC: Limit OHV use to designated trails during the snow-free months.	This is considered in Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0312-9	We support the proposal within Alternative C to	Thank you for the comment. Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS proposes an ACEC

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	establish a 545,000 acre ACEC on lands adjacent to and including the West Fork Gulkana National Wild and Scenic River. The above stated request regarding interim protection of state-selected lands and coordination with ADF&G for the management of wildlife habitat applies to the West Fork ACEC proposal as well. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's 2001 census, this area is nationally significant trumpeter swan habitat, containing 23% of the statewide trumpeter swans and a large percentage of the world's known population of trumpeter swans.	designation as you describe. Alternative D would not designate the area as an ACEC but would adopt measures as described in the table on page 598 as well as ROPs for protection of swans and swan habitat. Alternative D would also consider designation of an ACEC in the area if land were retained long-term by the federal government.
0312-10	We recommend that these additional seasonal limitations are also incorporated into the West Fork ACEC: To protect trumpeter swans and other waterfowl activities or surface use exceeding fourteen days should not be allowed within 1/4 mile of historically active nests from 4/1 to 9/15.	This Required Operating Procedure is already considered under Alternatives B, C, and D. See ROP-F&W-b-1 (page 613, Draft RMP/EIS). However, dates in the ROP are 5/1 - 8/31.
0312-11	We recommend that these additional seasonal limitations are also incorporated into the West Fork ACEC: To protect raptor nests, activities or surface use exceeding fourteen days should not be allowed within 1/4 mile of historically active nests from 4/1 to 9/15.	This Required Operating Procedure is already considered under Alternatives B, C, and D. See ROP-F&W-b-4 (page 614 of the Draft RMP/EIS). Dates in this ROP are 4/1 to 8/31.
0312-12	We recommend that these additional seasonal limitations are also incorporated into the West Fork ACEC: To protect critical moose habitat, no designated trails or new public use cabins or surface disturbing activities should be allowed from 10/15 to 3/31.	Designation of snowmachine trails was not considered for this area because the current level of use is low and, because of the black-spruce dominated vegetation, most snowmachine use is limited to existing winter trails. Implementation-level consideration for both alternative C and D include consideration of designated trails for snowmachines IF research clearly shows definitive impacts to quality of moose winter range or significant impacts to predator/prey relationships with increased use (p. 36, Draft RMP/EIS). New public cabins are not permitted in the area under either alternatives C or D. And, surface disturbing activities exceeding 14 days are prohibited by ROP-F&W-b-3 (p. 614).
0312-13	We recommend that these additional seasonal limitations are also incorporated into the West Fork ACEC: No surface disturbing activities	Protections for anadromous streams are provided in Alternatives B, C, and D of the Draft RMP/EIS by the Required Operating Procedures, specifically ROP-F&W-a-6, ROP-F&W-a-10, ROP-Water-a-1, and ROP-Water-c-2, which provide a 500 foot buffer around

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	should be permitted within 400 feet of all anadromous streams and lakes during open water periods.	anadromous streams.
0312-15	We recommend that the following seasonal limitations be incorporated into the Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC: To protect calving caribou, no surface disturbing activities or activities exceeding fourteen days should be permitted from 5/1 to 6/15.	Please see ROP-F&W-b-2 (page 614, Draft RMP/EIS) which would be adopted under alternatives B, C and D.
0321-9	We encourage the ACEC designation for the following areas listed in Alternative C: -The Delta Bison Calving ACEC (19,000 acres) for protection of bison calving area and restoration or maintenance of habitat north of Summit Lake. -The Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC(389,000 acres) for protection of caribou calving area south of the Susitna River. -The West Fork ACEC(490,000 acres) for protection of trumpeter swan and waterfowl habitat and wetlands adjacent to the West Fork of the Gulkana River.	Thank you for the comment. Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS also considers protective measures (without designation) for these areas.
0323-9	EPA strongly supports special management of areas within the East Alaska planning area to protect subsistence, recreational, fish and wildlife, historical or scenic values. … On the basis of information presented in the Draft EIS regarding the importance of these wildlife habitat areas, EPA recommends BLM include these two areas [West Fork Gulkana and Nelchina caribou calving area] as ACECs in the final Preferred Alternative.	Thanks for the comment. Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS considers protective measures for these areas without the ACEC designation (see tables pp. 591 - 600, Draft RMP/EIS). For the West Fork and Nelchina caribou areas, Alternative D considers ACEC designation if lands in the areas are retained in federal ownership.
0323-10	The Draft EIS also documents and recognizes the unique natural features of the Bering Glacier. EPA supports the Preferred Alternative's proposal to designate unencumbered BLM lands in the Bering Glacier area as a Research Natural Area (RNA) and	Thanks for the recommendation. It is included in the Preferred Alternative (D) of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	we recommend that this RNA be included in the final Preferred Alternative.	
0323-11	EPA also recommends that BLM consider additional protection, including ACEC designation, for critical waterfowl habitat and wetlands in the West Fork Area if this area remains under federal ownership.	This is exactly what is described in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) of the Draft RMP/EIS, if lands are retained in Federal ownership. Thanks for your support.
0329-7	We are extremely disappointed you have ignored our nomination of the Copper River Watershed as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), as allowed under FLPMA. 43 USC 1712. BLM Manual 1617. This alternative was present in the original (blue) version of the draft alternatives, but inexplicably disappeared by the time the modified version came out. In the Draft EIS, it isn't even included under the "Alternatives Analyzed but Not Considered in Detail." Why not? Please designate all BLM-managed lands and tributary streams within the Copper River Watershed as an ACEC. ... The Copper River Watershed is clearly eligible on the basis of the Wild Copper River Salmon resource. Please consider designating the Copper River Watershed an ACEC. This is justified, including for the following reasons: ...ACEC designation would yield real benefit to salmon, and the watershed. A watershed-level ACEC is the best way to manage the region for the major issues presented in the Draft EIS because it would: Encourage watershed-level management; Enable habitat protection; and Benefit regional tourism, fisheries marketing. Consideration of the watershed scale is critical in regards to salmon management. … The Draft EIS/RMP takes the view that the state of Alaska will manage salmon to be sustainable, and that has nothing or little to do with BLM actions. This	A Copper River Watershed ACEC was considered during the planning process, but was eliminated from detailed analysis for the following reasons: a) BLM currently manages only approximately 15% of the lands within the watershed, 50% of which are selected lands that will probably not be retained under federal management; b) strong protective measures will be continued along the Gulkana River, BLM's largest piece of unencumbered land in the watershed, through the proposed SRMA designation and continued management as a Wild and Scenic River; c) protective measures will be put into place through measures identified for the West Fork area and the Tiekel SRMA (see tables pp. 598 and 583); and d) application of ROPs and stips for permitted activities apply strong protective measures for anadromous streams. This information has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS under "Alternatives Analyzed but not Considered in Detail" (page 39).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	approach is misguided. "The integration of traditional salmon harvest management with habitat monitoring and protection is essential to the sustainable use of Alaska's salmon resources." (Mundy 1998, p.31) In fact, the BLM plays a key role in sustainable salmon management. ... an ACEC designation would be consistent with and help implement the Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy. ... The BLM has an affirmative duty to maintain sustainable salmon harvest, for subsistence fishers. It is not O.K. to just say, "ADF&G will deal with it." Federal laws too provide for salmon habitat protection. FLPMA requires land be managed "without permanent impairment of the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment." 43 USC 1702(c). FLPMA requires land be managed according to multiple use, sustained yield. 43 USC 1701 (a)(7); 43 USC 1712(c)(1).	
0329-14	Designating this place [Bering Glacier RNA] for large-scale industrial extraction is absurd. You'd have an easier time trying to mine the moon. The impact of even just exploration here would be substantial, and the impacts of development would necessarily be immense. Any serious development of minerals, oil or gas in the Bering Glacier region necessarily would involve extensive development and infrastructure along the coast. A road would need to be maintained, and a port established, both of which would require heroic effort. Icy Bay is the only possible port site along this stretch of coast. It is not true that the land buffer between BLM lands and the coastline would protect coastal species, such as Kittlitz's murrelet, from the impacts of exploitation.	Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS does not "designate" the Bering RNA for "large-scale industrial extraction". It would manage the area as a Research Natural Area, with an emphasis on protection of the unique ecological values of the area. Alternative D would lift the existing withdrawal on the eastern 1/3 of the area. As you state, exploration and development on the BLM managed lands in this area are highly unlikely due to rough topography, very little existing infrastructure, and very limited access.
0329-16	We heartily support the Delta Calving ACEC,	Thank you for your comment. Please recognize that alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	as proposed in Alternative C, to protect the unique wildlife habitat and wildland recreation values here.	proposes that the area be managed as an SRMA, to maintain a diversity of recreation experiences. In addition, alternative D recommends developing a cooperative Habitat Management Plan specifically for the Delta bison calving area.
0329-18	We support the proposal in Alternative C [for the Nelchina caribou calving area ACEC]. This is an excellent example of how federal habitat conservation can help maintain sustainable subsistence harvest.	Thank you. Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS also considers measures to protect the area and would consider ACEC designation if lands in the area are retained in federal ownership.
0329-34	We are concerned that "refugia areas" for wildlife to escape humans are "disappearing from the landscape" due to OHVs. (p.434) This is a benefit of large ACECs, and larger blocks of managed land, as opposed to just using ROPs and stipulations.	Alternative D considers protective measures for these areas without the ACEC designation (see tables pp. 591 - 600, Draft RMP/EIS). For the West Fork and Nelchina caribou areas, Alternative D considers ACEC designation if any lands in the areas are retained in federal ownership.
0329-48	The best way to manage recreation here is to place the Copper River watershed in an ACEC. This would allow increased protection of the resources people come to see, and increased coordination with other managers.	Some of the BLM-managed portions of the Copper River watershed are considered as SRMAs in the Draft RMP/EIS (Gulkana SRMA, Tiekel SRMA).
0329-187	We are alarmed that, under Alternative D [for the Bering Glacier RNA], "Road construction would be permitted for resource development, with special consideration for protection of resource values identified for the area." (DEIS, p.46) What on earth does "special consideration" mean? More important, what good does it do? You are asking for trouble, to lock future managers into permitting a road across one of the least accessible, most dynamic landscapes in the world. Wouldn't you want to be able to say no?	Special consideration means that construction of the road would have to be consistent with objectives for management of the Research Natural Area, which are clearly described in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for the Bering Glacier RNA for Alternative D (pp. 93 and 96).
0331-5	The three ACECs are a key component of Alternative C. Protecting wildlife is vital to us because they provide nutritious food for our tables, because they are a joy to see, and because they are part of healthy, functioning ecosystems. Alternative D is seriously flawed in failing to provide ACECs in spite of an ADFG	Alternative D considers protective measures for these areas without the ACEC designation (see tables pp. 591 - 600, Draft RMP/EIS). For the West Fork and Nelchina caribou areas, Alternative D considers ACEC designation if any lands in the areas are retained in federal ownership.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	conclusion, not denied in the RMP/EIS, that "Refugia, areas inherently inaccessible to humans where wildlife populations could escape from the regular intrusion of humans, are disappearing from the landscape due to the proliferation and unmanaged use of OHVs." (RMP/EIS p. 434).	
0331-6	We support creation of the Bering Glacier Resource Natural Area as proposed in alternative C. Alternative D protects 112,000 fewer acres of land. We think it makes sense to include those state-selected lands, because there is a chance that the state will not take conveyance of them. If the state does take conveyance, no harm has been done.	Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS would manage the lands under the RNA designation, if they are retained long term in federal ownership.
0341-10	The Preferred Alternative proposes designating 827,000 acres of the Bering Glacier as a Resource Natural Area to protect the unique ecological values associated with the glacier and the glacier forelands (p.87). We support this option. However, the Preferred Alternative also proposes allowing oil and gas leasing and locatable mineral entry to occur on the eastern 1/3 of the Bering Glacier RNA. p.130-133. We do not support this, as the proposed increase fails to address potential impacts to salmon and salmon habitat.	A description of the likelihood of mineral or oil and gas development as well as potential effects from such development has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in Chapter 4, page 409.
0341-11	We support ACEC designations for any area critical to important wildlife species.	Page 275 of the Draft RMP/EIS explains what areas are considered as "suitable" for ACEC designations, under BLM's regulations. Alternative C considers designation of three different ACECs.
0342-3	The NPS supports the designation of the Bering Glacier Area as a Research Natural Area (RNA) and the measures to protect the unique ecological values associated with the glacier and glacier forelands as outlined in alternatives C and D. However, we support maintaining the locatable minerals and oil and gas leasing withdrawals under PLO 5173 as	Thanks for the comment. Please see response to comment 0086-2.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	identified in alternative C. Alternative D would revoke PLO 5173 on the eastern 1/3 of the RNA allowing mineral entry and oil and gas leasing adjacent to the Wrangell St. Elias National park and Preserve. These activities could affect the nationally significant resources and values of the park and preserve.	
0345-1	We support the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, the Special Recreation Management Areas and the Research Natural Area, which will help protect habitats and direct recreation in good directions	Thanks for the comment. These are considered, by varying degrees, under Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0355-17	Closure of the Delta Bison Calving Area (page 42) cannot be justified. The Bison population is not in danger. The Alaska Department of Fish & Game manages the herd very well without any closure or added restrictions.	No alternative considers "closure" of the Delta Bison Calving Area. Alternative C considers an ACEC designation, no new road construction, and OHVs limited to designated trails during the calving season. This is not a closure. Alternatives A and B don't consider any designation. Alternative D would implement a cooperative Habitat Management Plan, with some measures identified for protection of calving bison and bison habitat. We recognize that ADF&G manages the herd well. We are attempting to manage the habitat in a critical area so that they can continue to be successful in their management efforts.
0355-18	The Nelchina Caribou Calving area (page 43) discussion states "the same as under Alternative C". This is inconsistent and not correct. Under Alternative C no road building is allowed by in (a) it states that road construction would be permitted.	The wording "the same as under Alternative C" refers to the size of the area considered.
	WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS	
0060-11	Alternative D, the alternative preferred by BLM, includes only one recommendation for designation as a Wild and Scenic River, although 24 river segments have been shown to meet eligibility criteria. There is no clear reason why these rivers have been removed from consideration; rivers should not be de-selected based on potential future land status. Thus, we ask that all 24 rivers be placed back under consideration.	See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0070-2	I'd like to see the wild and scenic rivers maintained in current state. I'd like to see no encroachment on them. I'd like to see no bridges across them. No roadhouses next to them or hotels or whatever. I'd like to see those rivers maintained the way they are, they are good fishing and recreation opportunity and I'd like to keep it that way. If the State were to press for some type of bridge to mining access or whatever, I'd hope BLM would fight that and propose that whatever road access is available that they use that, as opposed to trying to bridge say the Delta River.	Thanks for your comment. This is also BLM's management intent in alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0084-4	I urge you to reconsider your decision that the other 23 eligible river segments are not suitable for Congressional protection. Outstanding natural values were identified on all of these rivers and they also deserve long-term resource protection. Please strive to preserve the integrity of these river values through every administrative designation available.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0147-2	We support your decision that the other 23 eligible river segments are not suitable for Congressional protection. Outstanding natural values were not identified on all of these rivers and they do not deserve long term resource protection.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0159-6	I would request that the ROD contain a commitment to reexamine, after all conveyances have been made, the "suitability determinations" made for the 25 rivers deemed eligible for wild and/or scenic designation. The Plan indicates that 24 rivers, though eligible, are deemed unsuitable due solely to surrounding selected lands. Conceivably, after conveyance, some of these rivers could be determined to be suitable.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0160-3	The BLM Manual 8351 § .32(C) governing the	See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	evaluation and designation of rivers under the WSRA emphasizes that all river segments identified at the outset of the planning process as eligible for potential inclusion in the NWSRS must be protected until the final suitability decision is made. BLM Manual provides that; …"protective management shall be initiated by the authorized officer … as soon as eligibility is determined." During the planning process and until a final suitability or designation decision is made, BLM should manage eligible and suitable river segments within its jurisdiction to protect their free-flowing characteristics and ORVs from any changes that would affect the rivers' eligibility or tentative classification. The Draft RMP/EIS fails to comply with these requirements. (a) It fails to set forth BLM's commitment to protecting all eligible rivers throughout the planning process. (b) it fails to include any discussion of the protection measures that will be used to safeguard the eligibility and tentative classification of all eligible rivers until a final suitability or designation decision is made. (c) there has been no 'public notification' regarding BLM's protective management.	
0160-4	ANILCA Title XI, Section 1110a provided for road construction in CSU's, but only if "such right-of way issued by BLM are subject to reasonable regulations issues by the Secretary to protect the natural and other values of such lands. BLM should provide an explanation so the public understands the potential impacts of the ANILCA provision and the potential impacts to WSR values.	At present, there are no proposals for road construction or access through either the Delta or Gulkana WSR corridors. Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS clearly state that it is BLM's intent NOT to permit road construction, particularly through the wild segments of these rivers. However, ANILCA does allow for transportation systems across Conservation System Units, subject to reasonable regulation. In the case of a Wild and Scenic river, this would mean NEPA analysis to consider alternative routes, impacts on subsistence, impacts on the outstandingly remarkable values, and socio-economic impacts. It would also require a Section 7 (Wild and Scenic Rivers Act) evaluation to determine there would be no adverse impacts to the free-flowing nature of the river.
0160-5	Overall, the Draft RMP/EIS must be revised to ensure that, under all alternatives, motorized	The Draft RMP/EIS considers alternative management strategies for OHV management in the two designated Wild and Scenic Rivers in the planning area, the Delta and

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	activities and road and trail construction, including the use of OHVs and snow machines, are restricted to existing trails in existing, recommended, and interim-managed Wild river areas, unless BLM provides a strong explanation, rationale, or unusual circumstance justifying its departure from the normal approach.	Gulkana. This is not presented for rivers listed as eligible in the Draft RMP/EIS. See response 0392-1. BLM did not present this information in the Draft RMP/EIS because it cannot ensure protection of outstandingly remarkable values on most rivers listed as eligible in the Draft RMP/EIS in the long-term, based on the fact that the majority of these rivers run through State or State-selected lands. We can demonstrate protective management in the short term, allowing for access consistent with ANILCA (810 and 811). See response to comment 0392-1.
0160-6	Management Common to All Alternatives pg 73 (1) (a): The section on fisheries identifies that the counting tower operations would continue. I would like to point out that the BLM promised that the counting tower operations would be a temporary operation (5 years). I understand that the project was moved to private land. This would seem to indicate that this operation could no be moved to federal lands. This permanent operation would violate several provision of the WSRA. I would point out that no federal funding should be provided to this project because; it would be a permanent operation on a wild section of the river. This reference should be dropped from the draft.	The fish counting facility on the Gulkana is necessary to enhance one of the outstandingly remarkable values (fisheries) for which that river was designated in the Wild and Scenic River system. This was clearly stated in the NEPA analysis that was conducted at the outset of this project. This is NOT a permanent facility and is removed every season at the end of the season. ADF&G has indicated that another five years of data will be necessary to obtain needed data for escapement determinations. As stated in the original analysis, this will be re-evaluated in 2006. The proposal will be consistent with this RMP and with the revised Gulkana River management plan.
0163-3	We also strongly support a Wild and Scenic determination for a 15-mile section of the south branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River to give more complete watershed protection.	Thanks for the comment. This is recommended in alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0173-17	Delta WSR Corridor Area: Locatable Minerals in recreational and scenic portions of the Delta River should remain open.	Your suggestion is considered under alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0173-18	Delta WSR Corridor Area: Current withdrawals in recreational and scenic portions of the Delta River should be revoked and opened to Leasable Minerals (Oil & Gas).	Your suggestion is considered under Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0173-19	Delta WSR Corridor Area: Alternative D is also too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but	This is a Wild and Scenic River corridor and BLM has determined that new road construction would not enhance the values for which the river was designated. However, transportation systems through Conservation System Units are allowed by ANILCA, if no feasible alternative exists and contingent on NEPA analysis considering impacts to

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures"	resource values. This is stated in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0173-25	Gulkana WSR Corridor Area: The BLM should revoke the existing PLO 5178 withdrawals in the Dickey Lake and south branch West Fork and open the area to Locatable Minerals.	Your suggestion is considered in alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0173-26	Gulkana WSR Corridor Area: It is totally inappropriate to include State and Native lands in the designation of the SRMA. These selected lands will in all likelihood become State or Native lands in the future. Therefore, no restrictions should be imposed on these lands that could complicate transfer or management of these lands.	State and Native selected lands are not included in the Gulkana National Wild River corridor.
0173-27	Gulkana WSR Corridor Area: Alternative D is also too restrictive. Proposals for new road construction should be considered on a case-by-case basis with no avoidance areas, but utilize the guidelines described in the "Required Operating Procedures"	Your suggestion is considered in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0175-24	Page 58, Delta WSR, Alternative C. The State requests that language be inserted in the Delta River SRMA Alternative C that management will be consistent with the 1983 River Management Plan for the Delta National Wild and Scenic River (Alternative C) and ANILCA 1110(a) for public access.	Consistency with Title XI of ANILCA is discussed in the Travel Management portion of Chapter 2 of the Draft RMP/EIS (page 43). Also, management direction in the 1983 Delta River Management Plan could be changed based on direction in this RMP and subsequent implementation-level planning. Language has been added in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to emphasize and clarify compliance with Title XI of ANILCA (see page 42 and individual travel management descriptions in Chapter 2, Proposed RMP/Final EIS).
0175-25	Page 60, Delta WSR Corridor Area. Consistent with the cooperative planning effort between the Bureau and the State of Alaska for the revised Gulkana Wild and Scenic River Management Plan, we request any horsepower limitations on the Tangle Lakes be cooperatively evaluated. The State owns and manages navigable waterways, thus any restrictions would need to be adopted through appropriate state planning and regulatory processes. Under the provisions of ANILCA	These determinations will be made in implementation-level planning for the area, scheduled for 2006. As with the Gulkana, the BLM is committed to working with the State on this planning effort. Language has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to emphasize that consideration of powerboat restrictions or horsepower restrictions on navigable waterways will occur as BLM recommendations to the State.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Section 103(c), federal regulations adopted for the management of the Delta conservation system unit can only be applied to the federal public lands -- i.e. the land above ordinary high water within the corridor. Thus we urge that cooperative evaluation that results in further restrictions on public uses within the waterway, such as horsepower restrictions, can be more appropriately implemented following completion of a joint Bureau-State Delta Wild and Scenic River Revised Management Plan.	
0175-42	Page 284, Wild and Scenic Rivers. The State appreciates BLM's acknowledgement of Section 1326(b) of ANILCA. In this planning area the State has noted that BLM has identified a 15 mile segment of the South Branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River, the majority of which is already designated a National Wild River, for addition to the existing CSU. While the State, in its Copper River Area Plan has also noted the exceptional recreation and fisheries values of this area and administratively designated the river as a "State Wild and Scenic River under AS 38.04.070 (4), the Legislature did not designate the Gulkana as a State Recreation River. BLM has clearly stated that designation would only be considered should that portion of the river, which currently is a high priority state selection, not be conveyed to the State (page 284). Please note that consolidated State comments submitted in 2003 regarding the Environmental Assessment for the Revision of the 1983 Gulkana River Management Plan indicated "the state would no longer consider pursuing the federal designation as a wild river" for the South Branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana.2 The State's position has not changed.	We recognize the State's position, and it is the driving factor in BLM deferring suitability determinations until State entitlements are met and land status is determined. See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0185-4	The south fork of the west branch Gulkana River should NOT be conveyed to the State of Alaska. This should be retained within BLM management for recommendation and inclusion (addition) into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	Conveyance is ultimately a State of Alaska decision and out of the scope of this planning effort.
0187-3	Also, the West Branch of the Gulkana should be retained in federal ownership in order to ensure designation as a Wild and Scenic River.	This is ultimately a State of Alaska decision and out of the scope of this planning effort.
0306-2	The south fork of the west branch Gulkana River should NOT be conveyed to the State of Alaska. This should be retained within BLM management for recommendation and inclusion (addition) into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	See response to comment 0392-1. However, BLM has no authority to tell the State which lands they should or should not convey and decisions made in this RMP will not affect the conveyance process.
0312-18	The Interagency Guidelines governing river designation under the WSRA provide that, "while only one outstandingly remarkable value is necessary for eligibility, the study report should carefully document all values of the river area." The table on page 283 of the Draft RMP/EIS provides a summary of BLM's eligibility determinations. However, the few words used to describe the ORVs in the right-hand column of this table are not adequate to constitute a "careful documentation" of all the applicable ORVs for each river. A more detailed description of the specific ORVs for each river must be provided.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-19	We request that BLM prepare a Revised Draft RMP/EIS that sets forth adequate ORV descriptions so that the public will have an opportunity to review and comment on this information before a Proposed RMP/Final EIS is issued.	The public has had an opportunity to review and comment on the list of eligible rivers and brief description of ORVs provided on page 283 of the Draft RMP/EIS. As explained in response to comment 0392-1, this list will be modified based on that public comment.
0312-20	The BLM Manual repeatedly emphasizes that all river segments identified as eligible at the outset of the planning process must be	See response to comment 0392-1. Please note that BLM's 8351 Manual also states "In cases where a particular river segment is predominantly non-Federal in ownership and contains interspersed BLM-administered lands, BLM shall evaluate only its segment as

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	managed to protect their free-flowing characteristics and ORVs from any changes that would affect the rivers' eligibility or tentative classification. These interim protective measures must remain in place until final suitability decisions are made at the end of the RMP planning process, or until a final designation decision is made by Congress. The interim protective measures being implemented by BLM "shall be included in the RMP." and BLM is required to provide public notification of its protective management measures" no later than publish and release of the draft RMP." The Draft RMP/EIS fails to comply with these requirements in several respects. First, it fails to set forth BLM's commitment to protecting all eligible rivers throughout the planning process. Second, it fails to include any discussion of the protection measures that will be used to safeguard the eligibility and tentative classification of all eligible rivers until a final suitability or designation decision is made. Third, there has been no "public notification" regarding BLM's protective management of all eligible rivers in the Draft RMP/EIS or in any separate public notice document. We request that BLM issue a Revised Draft RMP/EIS that complies with these requirements.	to eligibility and defer to the State or to the private landowners' discretion as to their determination of eligibility." In the case of this planning effort, most rivers identified in the Draft RMP/EIS as eligible have adjacent uplands that are predominantly State or State-selected lands. BLM can demonstrate (and will in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS) protective management in the short-term but cannot demonstrate this once conveyance takes place. The State has clearly stated (in their response to scoping in this RMP process) that they will not support additional Wild and Scenic river designations.
0312-21	Considering that this segment [south branch of the west fork of the Gulkana] is selected for conveyance by the State of Alaska, we support a relinquishment of the State's selection or possibly a negotiation to convey an alternate parcel of equally desirable land in order for the south branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River to remain in BLM ownership and receive protection under the authority of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. We are concerned that the	See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	State's management prescription will carry minimal restrictions and be unable to guarantee consistent ORV protection as is available under the WSRA on adjacent BLM lands.	
0312-22	We are disappointed that the following rivers were not presented as "eligible" within the draft plan and we request that they are revisited and given consideration for designation into the NWSRS. We submit that the Duktoth River is suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. This free flowing river in the Robinson Mountains east of the Bering Glacier possesses outstandingly remarkable scenery, wildlife, recreational, and cultural values. The State's Yakataga Area Plan describes the old-growth rainforest present within the river valley as well as "moose and mountain goat winter habitat, bear feeding concentration areas, outstanding habitat for Marten, swans, eagles, and anadromous fish." The 1995 DNR plan goes on to describe "the long, enclosed valley creates a visual gateway to the inland glaciers and massifs, unique within the planning area." Commercial sport fishing and hunting currently occurs on this river as it is one of the few floatable coastal rivers in the area. "The scenery and river accessibility give (the Duktoth River) potential for recreation and tourism" (DNR 1995). With a rich cultural and historical tradition as a travel route in the Eyak territory, in addition to all of its other stated outstanding values, the Duktoth is a significant system worthy of consideration and protection under the WSRA or other designation.	See response to comment 0392-1. The Duktoth is on the list of eligible rivers in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0312-23	We submit that the BLM-managed portions of the Kaliakh, Klutheith and Kosakuts Rivers are also suitable, and eligible, for designation.	See response to comment 0392-1. Kaliakh is already on the list of eligible rivers presented on page 283 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This list will be edited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS based on public comment and staff review.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	These rivers each possess outstandingly remarkable cultural values derived from historic use by Eyak and Tlingit communities along the coast. Breathtaking scenery and abundant wildlife populations made these rivers destinations of early inhabitants and cherished treasures for local residents and visitors today.	
0312-24	The draft RMP/EIS improperly states on page 76 that "A suitability analysis was conducted, with only one river segment determined to be suitable…" This misleading statement suggests to the public that final suitability and non-suitability decisions have already been made. However, BLM Manual 8351 provides that, "all eligible river segments shall be evaluated for suitability or nonsuitability using the BLM RMP process." Moreover, the planning records and documents prepared during the RMP process "must carefully describe all analyses and determinations made pursuant to this Manual," and a "narrative and rationale must be a part of the planning record and included as part of the RMP/EIS."	The BLM will defer it's suitability determinations. See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-25	We request BLM to comply with the instructions of BLM Manual 8351, which states that "at least one alternative shall provide for designation of all eligible river segments (under assessment in the RMP/EIS in accordance with their tentative classifications." No such alternative is presented within the draft East Alaska RMP/EIS.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-26	Under NEPA, the Interagency Guidelines, and Appendix C of BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook, BLM must include, and fully analyze, a reasonable range of alternatives for the use of these river areas. The Draft RMP/EIS improperly takes it as a given in all four alternatives that only one river will be	Please cite the section of NEPA or BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook that requires us to analyze alternatives for river suitability. We can't find it. Please see responses to comments 0331-2 and 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	recommended for designation and the other twenty three will not. In order to provide a reasonable range of alternatives, BLM must consider alternatives involving the designation of all rivers, the designation of only one river, and other alternatives falling between these two extremes. For those alternatives involving the designation of fewer than all of the rivers, we urge BLM to analyze other potential means for protecting the non-designated rivers' ORVs, including land use designations such as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Research Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Areas, and Special Recreation Management Areas.	
0312-27	The suitability analysis conducted on the 24 eligible rivers appears to consider land status to be the most important factor of the decision process. There are 13 suitability criteria set forth in BLM Manual 8351. For each of the eligible rivers, there is little or no discussion of (a) the reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the land and related potential uses of the land which would be enhanced or foreclosed by designation; (b) the degree to which State or local governments might participate in the preservation and administration of the river; © public support or opposition to designation under the WSRA; and (d) the estimated cost to the United States of designation and administration. Many of the other suitability criteria were also addressed inadequately. We understand that BLM may ultimately decide to make the final suitability and non-suitability determinations based on only a few of the suitability criteria. However, we request a discussion of all of the criteria and a reasoned explanation as to why BLM is weighing certain criteria more heavily than others. We also request an opportunity to review and offer	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will state that suitability determinations will be deferred. See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	comments on the suitability analysis record in which all 13 factors were considered, particularly public comment.	
0312-28	It is improper for BLM to base its proposed suitability determinations on the fact that a river is not free-flowing or that the river has no ORVs. These factors are only relevant to the eligibility determinations. By determining that the twenty-four rivers were eligible, BLM necessarily concluded that these rivers were free-flowing and possessed ORVs before ever reaching the suitability analysis. We request that BLM exclude all references to these factors in its discussion of suitability.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-29	On page 283 of the Draft RMP/EIS, BLM identifies twenty-four rivers as eligible, but on page 282, BLM refers to the existence of twenty-five eligible rivers. We request clarification as to whether twenty-four or twenty-five rivers are under consideration for possible addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. If one of the rivers identified as eligible in the 1989 review is now no longer considered eligible, BLM should explain its rationale for that decision in a revised draft RMP/EIS.	This is a typographical error. Twenty four is the correct number.
0312-30	It is not sufficient for BLM to propose non-suitability for rivers based on the fact that a portion of the river segment or the adjacent uplands are already owned by the State of Alaska, Native entities, or private landowners. By definition, the only eligible river segments under consideration in this RMP planning process are those that are at least partially on BLM-administered lands. If partial non-federal ownership is the basis for a non-suitability determination, BLM must provide a detailed explanation of how such ownership and	See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	jurisdictional issues would interfere with management to protect the river's ORVs.	
0312-31	It is not sufficient for BLM to rely on the State-selected, Native-selected, or Dual-selected status of rivers in making its proposed non-suitability determinations without providing any discussion of how these potential ownership and jurisdictional issues would interfere with management to protect the rivers' ORVs. BLM appears to assume that designation under the WSRA in only possible if federal management of the entire river area and adjacent uplands by the BLM is certain or likely. This is not a valid basis for a non-suitability decision. The BLM Manual clearly contemplates that there will be some river segments within the NWSRS that are not federally managed or that are only partially federally managed.	BLM's manual may contemplate that there will be some river segments within the system that will be non-federal, and we know that this is the case. However, this generally occurs where the non-federal entity is supportive of the designation. In this case, the State is clearly not, as documented in their response to scoping for this process. BLM's 8351 Manual also states "In cases where a particular river segment is predominantly non-Federal in ownership and contains interspersed BLM-administered lands, BLM shall evaluate only its segment as to eligibility and defer to the State…as to their determination of eligibility." This is clearly a factor in this planning area.
0312-32	It is also inappropriate for BLM to deem Monsoon Creek/Lake, Victor Creek, Hungry Hollow Creek, and 12-Mile Creek not suitable because they do "not present outstandingly remarkable values significantly different than the existing and adjacent Gulkana National Wild River." (p. 284-285). One of the factors in the suitability analysis is a river's "contribution to a river system, watershed, or basin integrity" because it is recognized that "numerous benefits are likely to result from managing an entire river or watershed…". BLM Manual 8351 .33(A)(13), at 21. The fact that the various rivers and tributaries within the Gulkana River watershed share its ORVs strongly weighs in favor of designating these rivers under the WSRA to enhance and promote protection of the larger natural ecosystem.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-33	We submit that it is premature and	We agree. See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	inappropriate to make final suitability decisions and recommendations within this RMP. We recommend that BLM use this RMP public process to collect information and conduct a preliminary suitability analysis, yet defer the final suitability decisions until after State and Native conveyances are completed. Only at this time will the ownership status of the eligible rivers be fully known and the corresponding management challenges, if any, best understood.	
0312-34	Additionally, we request that the BLM commit in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to conduct a future suitability re-analysis for all eligible rivers that are retained under permanent BLM management. At that time, BLM should make the appropriate recommendations to Congress for inclusion in the national system or apply administrative measures to appropriately manage and enhance the outstandingly remarkable river-related values that have been inventoried and presented with this draft plan.	BLM will defer suitability determinations until entitlements are met and land status is more stable. See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-36	According to BLM Manual 8351, "BLM assigns a Class I visual resource inventory to all designated rivers classified as wild." Alternative B of the draft RMP violates this mandate by proposing to assign "Class II for the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridors…", page 79.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-37	In addition, Alternative A fails to specify what VRM Class is being applied, and it should be revised to clarify this issue.	Alternative A represents the No Action alternative. Currently, there are no VRM classes established for the area managed by the Glennallen Field Office.
0312-38	Finally, in all alternatives, BLM should clarify that VRM class I status will be applied, not only to the existing Delta and Gulkana river corridors, but also to (1) the proposed addition to the Gulkana wild river corridor, (2) any other rivers proposed for designation as wild rivers	We disagree. NEPA requires a range of alternatives. VRM classes other than class I are considered in order to analyze effects of No Action or a less restrictive application.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	after a revised suitability analysis, and (3) all eligible rivers being managed in the interim in accordance with a tentative classification as wild.	
0312-39	We also urge BLM to apply VRM Class I status more broadly to all rivers designated or proposed to be designated under the WSRA, including scenic and recreational river areas. In addition, we request that BLM assign VRM Class II to the adjacent lands within the viewshed to retain the existing character of the landscape and primitive recreation opportunities.	Your suggestion for the designated rivers is considered in Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0312-40	BLM Manual 8351 provides that all "new mining claims and mineral leases are prohibited…" in wild river areas. In order to conform to this requirement, BLM must revise the Draft RMP/EIS to clarify that, under all alternatives, new mining claims and mineral leases will be prohibited in all wild river segments (including existing, proposed, and interim-managed wild rivers). The current language on pages 57, 76,80,83,86,105,107,110, and 125-128 describing the alternatives is vague and inconsistent in this regard.	Because the ANILCA designation of the Delta and Gulkana rivers included a mineral entry and leasing withdrawal in the wild segments, this was maintained under all alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will describe protective measures for the revised eligible river list (see response to comment 0392-1).
0312-41	We support the Alternative D proposal on pages 127-128 of the draft plan to close "all segments" of the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic Rivers to mineral leasing and locatable mineral entry. We also support BLM's recommendation to withdraw 16,000 acres in the scenic and recreational portions of the Delta River from locatable mineral entry. These protective withdrawals will give BLM the necessary management tools to ensure that the present high quality resource conditions and opportunities along these rivers are	Thanks for the comment.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	preserved from mining impacts within the corridors indefinitely.	
0312-42	We request that the Proposed RMP/Final EIS identify the mineral management provisions BLM will apply to protect the ORVs associated with the south branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River in order to preserve its suitability and consideration for designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.	This will be done in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (see response to comment 0392-1). In short, no mineral entry or mineral leasing can occur on selected lands in order to avoid encumbrance on the selection. This area is all State-selected.
0312-43	We urge BLM to reconsider the Alternative D provision to allow mineral material sales in the recreational portion of the Delta WSR area (p. 128-129). The operations associated with mineral material extraction are very noisy and intrusive, and they would degrade the landscape, aesthetic values, fish and wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and other values of the river area. This conflicts with BLMs duty under the WSRA to protect and enhance the values for which the Delta River was designated.	This decision is consistent with direction in the 1983 Management Plan for the Delta and BLM Manual 8351 direction for management of a recreational segment: "Existing parallel roads can be maintained on one or both river banks." Potential mineral materials extraction would be utilized to maintain the Richardson Highway, which parallels the recreational segment of the Delta. A section 7 (WSRA) evaluation would be done prior to this activity occurring.
0312-44	BLM Manual 8351 provides that, in wild river areas, "no construction of new roads, trails, or other provisions for overland motorized travel would be permitted within the river corridor." In scenic river areas, "roads or trails may occasionally bridge the river area and short stretches of conspicuous or long stretches of inconspicuous and well-screened roads could be allowed." In various places, the Draft RMP/EIS states that new road construction may be authorized in wild and scenic river areas "if it is determined that there are no economically feasible and prudent alternative routes and a determination is made that construction would be compatible with the values for which the river was established," and it refers to this in shorthand as a road	We disagree. There are exceptions to the policy described in BLMs Manual 8351 and they are a part of ANILCA, a law by which BLM must comply with in it's management of Conservation System Units in Alaska. Please see response to comment 0160-4.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	construction "avoidance area" (see pp. 35, 43, 76, 80, 86). This approach is improper and unlawful. BLM has already determined that new road construction is incompatible with wild river areas, and that roads are only compatible with scenic river areas if they comply with the few bridges and inconspicuousness requirements. There are no exceptions to these requirements based on open-ended compatibility determinations or the lack of an economically feasible alternative. The text of the Draft RMP/EIS should be revised to ensure that these requirements are applied consistently throughout all of the alternatives to all existing recommended, and interim-managed rivers.	
0312-45	BLM has determined that, for wild river areas, "motorized travel on land or water…is generally not compatible with this river classification. Normally, motorized use will be prohibited in a wild river area." All four of the alternatives fail to comply with this standard. In each alternative, the Gulkana and Delta river areas would be designated as "limited" to recreational OHV use, and there would be minimal or non-existent restrictions on snowmachines. This fails to comply with the general prohibition on motorized activities in wild river segments, and BLM has failed to present any explanation, rationale, or unusual circumstance justifying its departure from the normal approach.	Please recognize that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was amended by ANILCA. BLM must comply with ANILCA in its management of Wild and Scenic Rivers in Alaska. In some cases BLM's management direction in 8351 must be tempered to meet ANILCA requirements. OHV use is one of those cases. ANILCA (specifically sections 811 and 1110) allows for reasonable access to subsistence resources by traditionally employed means, subject to reasonable regulation. The Draft RMP/EIS, in its' consideration and analysis of management alternatives, complies with ANILCA.
0312-46	The RMP/EIS should specify that motorized activities, including the use of OHVs and snowmachines, will be limited to designated trails in existing, recommended, and interim-managed scenic and recreational river areas.	This is done in the Draft RMP/EIS under alternatives C and D for the designated WSR Rivers, the Delta and Gulkana.
0312-47	According to BLM Manual 8351, in a wild river area, "cutting of trees shall not be permitted	Consistent with ANILCA, BLM has allowed small-scale subsistence firewood gathering to occur in the Gulkana and Delta WSR corridors. This is consistent with management

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	except when needed in association with a primitive recreation experience…". In a scenic river area, "…timber harvesting could be allowed provided that such practices are carried on in such a way that there is no substantial adverse effect on the river and its immediate environment. The river area shall be maintained in its near natural condition." In a recreational river area, timber harvesting is allowed "under standard restrictions to avoid adverse effects on the river environment and its associated values." With respect to alternatives A, B, and C, the Draft RMP/EIS should be revised to clearly demonstrate to the public that the requirements set forth above will be implemented for all existing, recommended, and interim-managed river areas.	direction in the 1983 Management plans for these rivers and the RMP or the Revised Gulkana Management Plan (in Draft) does not propose to change it. This is NOT timber harvest but scattered cutting of dead trees for personal use that occurs in the winter.
0312-49	Concerning Alternative D, the Draft RMP/EIS states on page 117 that "commercial harvest would not be permitted within the Gulkana or Delta Wild and Scenic River corridors." This language should be revised to indicate that commercial timber harvest will not be allowed in recommended or interim-managed river areas, along with existing river areas.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0312-50	This section states that personal use wood gathering in the Gulkana and Delta river corridors would be "monitored closely to ensure that it does not impact the viewshed." This language is not adequate because it fails to reflect the standards listed above. Avoiding impacts to the viewshed is only one aspect of the primitive recreation experience. For instance, inappropriate firewood removal activities could harm fish and wildlife without necessarily affecting the viewshed. There has also been no showing that personal firewood gathering is "needed" to promote a primitive	See response to comment 0312-47.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	recreation experience in wild river areas.	
0312-51	We are concerned that the Draft RMP/EIS fails to analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of BLMs proposed management decisions, as required by NEPA. BLM must present a detailed analysis of the impacts of its proposed management decisions concerning visual resources, mining, timber harvesting, road and trail construction, and motorized vehicle use on fish, wildlife, ecosystems, recreational opportunities, historic and cultural values, local economies, communities, scientific and educational opportunities, subsistence users, and all other significant impacts.	The Draft RMP/EIS does not fail to analyze the environmental consequences of implementation of each alternative. This is done in Chapter 4 for direct, indirect and cumulative effects.
0317-1	Please consider designating the Delta and the Gulkana Rivers as "Wild and Scenic".	Thanks for the comment. You are in luck. They already are and they will stay that way.
0321-11	We ask that the BLM reconsider its decision to leave out 23 rivers from Wild and Scenic designation. Furthermore, we ask that the 15-mile section of the South Branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River the does qualify for Wild and Scenic designation not be conveyed to the State of Alaska, but be protected as federal land.	The conveyance decision is ultimately up to the State of Alaska. See response to comment 0392-1.
0329-17	Recreation on the Gulkana river is a key issue. Upper use limits are essential. The state will drive this river into the ground, if you let them. Please take a leadership role is conservation of this incredible place.	Upper use limits have been established in a Draft revised Gulkana river management plan. They are based on standards developed from river users tolerances to different impacts on the river. The revised Gulkana river management plan will be consistent with decisions made in the RMP.
0329-20	Trustees for Alaska has submitted additional specific comments on our behalf regarding Wild & Scenic Rivers. The following are intended to supplement those comments. There is local support for Wild & Scenic River designation of all eligible rivers. It is unclear whether BLM has conducted an eligibility review as required under the W&SRA. There is	See response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	no review in the MSAs. The Draft EIS/RMP suggests that an eligibility review of some 300 rivers in the planning area was done in 1989, which whittled that list down to the 25 eligible rivers listed in this document. There are several problems with this. First, it is incorrect to say the list of 25 came "after interdisciplinary review." (p.282) That 1989 review was not completed because the RMP process was scrapped. It is unclear what phase of the review that team was in when their work halted, but it is certain that it was not completed. Second, there is no evidence that BLM has reviewed that list of 300 since 1989. Recycling incomplete and old documents is not the careful study or thorough analysis required by the W&SRA, FLPMA and NEPA. Third, using this ancient review precludes meaningful public involvement. The original (1989) review didn't follow a full public process, and the current review is already 90% along.	
0329-21	What rationale or method did you use to determine which rivers were suitable? The DEIS contains only a table, and the MSA ignores the issue entirely. It is a mystery how this issue was dealt with. ... The Draft EIS/RMP only includes a few words and conclusory sentence fragments. (pp.283-5) It is impossible to know the basis behind these "unsuitable" and "eligible" conclusions. Please fully document the values of eligible rivers in a Revised Draft EIS/RMP, and use that careful study to inform suitability determinations. We would very much like to have an opportunity to review and comment on your suitability determination. ... We are concerned that BLM is precluding meaningful public input into the suitability study, by completing it behind closed doors and outside of the RMP process, and	See response to comment 392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	NEPA.	
0329-22	BLM must manage all eligible river segments to protect their values from degradation in the interim between eligibility and a final action. This information should be in the Draft RMP/EIS, and be revealed to the public. BLM Manual 8351§.32(C)	See response to comment 0312-20.
0329-23	What were the ORVs for Sourdough Creek and Haggard Creek, that caused them to be eligible in the first place? What has changed, to negate those values? We take issue with the "significantly different" standard for ORVs, which is used as the basis for unsuitability of Monsoon Creek/Lake, Victor Creek, Hungry Hollow Creek, and 12-Mile Creek. (p. 284-5) On page 283, being connected to the Gulkana is an ORV. But on pages 284-5, this same feature is used to determine that these sections are unsuitable. Please adopt a consistent approach. Using the standard in the Draft EIS/RMP, any given segment of any given Wild & Scenic River would become unsuitable.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0329-24	We strongly encourage you to look at intact watersheds, rather than isolated segments. If anything, the existence of other nearby rivers with similar ORVs weighs in favor of designation, not against it. One of the factors in the suitability analysis is a river's "contribution to a river system, watershed, or basin integrity" because it is recognized that "[n]umerous benefits are likely to result from managing an entire river or watershed … ." BLM Manual 8351 § .33(A)(13), at 21	Suitability determination will be deferred until land status is stabilized. See response to comment 0392-1.
0329-25	Wild & Scenic river designation would include protections of water and water quality, recreation, scenery, wildlife, fish, and other values. These benefits are ignored in the Draft EIS. (p.419) It is very unclear in this document	The value of designations in terms of protection of resource values will be examined in the suitability determination, which will be deferred until land status is resolved through the conveyance process. At this time, we can not demonstrate that BLM could protect these values in the long term on most rivers listed as eligible in the Draft RMP/EIS. Please see response to comment 0392-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	what designation would mean, in practical terms. We insist that you follow NEPAs mandate to reveal and consider environmental impacts of these designations.	
0329-26	We support recommending the following rivers for Wild & Scenic River designation: Copper River. If the Copper River is not eligible as wild and scenic, then what is? That this river isn't even considered eligible by BLM, indicates a deep lack of understanding somewhere along the line. To conclude that the Copper River does not have any outstandingly remarkable values is ridiculous. The Copper is one of the world's great rivers. Outstandingly remarkable values include millions of Wild Copper River Salmon, outrageous scenic quality, premier recreation opportunities, history of the old CR&NW Railroad, and Eyak and Ahtna historical and cultural values. Please analyze the relative merits of W&SR and ACEC designation, in protecting these incredible values. Gulkana River and wetlands. Whether or not the land is conveyed, the South branch of the West fork of the Gulkana is suitable as a W&SR. Further, the various tributaries found eligible in 1989, and listed in the Draft EIS/RMP are also suitable. Duktoth. The Duktoth is a pristine, free flowing river that has several outstandingly remarkable values. If there is a wilder or more scenic river in the world, then we'd like to know what it is. We have brought these values to your attention more than once, but have been ignored. Why? Please consider the Duktoth under the W&SRA. ... Kaliakh River- The Kaliakh River and tributaries have outstandingly remarkable scenic and wildland values, and are a historic center of Eyak and Tlingit habitation along the coast. ...Tiekel River; Susitna River; Tonsina	See response to comment 0392-1. The list of eligible rivers presented in the Draft RMP/EIS will be edited based on public comment and BLM staff review and presented in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	River; Nenana River; Tangle Lakes trail system.	
0329-43	The increased use on the Gulkana and Delta rivers is alarming, (p.173) especially given the lack of a comprehensive management scheme. Please take action before it's too late.	The Draft RMP/EIS establishes broad management direction for the Delta. The implementation level plan for this area is scheduled for 2006.
0331-2	A full range of alternatives is not offered. The RMP/EIS is deficient in that it does not provide an alternative that would recommend Wild and Scenic River status for all eligible rivers. We feel that our opportunities for learning about and commenting on this issue have been denied.	A range of alternatives displaying different suitability determinations is meaningless in this planning area, where the majority of rivers listed as eligible in the Draft RMP/EIS run through State or State-selected lands. Saying that we will make all these rivers suitable is playing a make-believe game when we cannot demonstrate long-term protection of outstandingly remarkable values and where there is clear documentation of State opposition. Response to comment 0392-1 states that suitability determination will be deferred until entitlements are met and land status is more stable. A consideration of suitability alternatives at that time would be more meaningful.
0334-1	I would like to see the Tangle Lakes remain a wild and scenic area, especially free of any strip mining. The Delta River should remain a wild and scenic river. This lake-river system has been used by all kinds of Alaskans for years as a recreational haven. Please retain the pristine quality of this special piece of land.	These areas both will remain as ANILCA designated them: A part of the national Wild and Scenic River system. Management objectives described in the preferred alternative (D) of the Draft RMP/EIS are consistent with this designation and will continue to protect and enhance the values for which the river was established.
0341-12	We support designating this branch of the Gulkana River and encourage BLM to reconsider their preliminary suitability decisions for the other 23 eligible rivers that possess Outstandingly Remarkable Values.	See response to comment 0392-1.
0355-28	On page 76 reference to WSR areas becoming State land and retaining WSR designation makes no sense. Navigable rivers are owned by the State of Alaska and the BLM manages only the uplands adjacent to such waters. Also, under (4) it states that the BLM "would" recommend inclusion. This is not consistent with the instructions given by the Secretary of the Interior found on page 15.	The Secretary's instructions referred to on page 15 are regarding wilderness designation and inventory in land use planning, not Wild and Scenic River suitability or designation.
0392-1	It is our hope that some sort of negotiation or arrangement can be made in order to convince the State to relinquish their selection on these	The section of the Draft RMP/EIS entitled "Eligibility and Suitability Review" (page 282) has been re-written in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (pp. 312–314), which now includes: 1) a list of eligible rivers, determined through this planning process and edited from the

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	lands [South branch of the West Fork of the Gulkana River] so that they can be maintained in long-term Federal management and nominated to Congress for inclusion with and protection under the Wild and Scenic River Act.	list presented in the Draft based on public comment; 2) A description of how BLM will defer suitability determination until ANCSA and State entitlements are met in the planning area. This is based on the fact that the BLM's primary criteria for suitability determination in the Draft RMP/EIS was land status and we cannot demonstrate in the long term that we can manage to protect identified outstandingly remarkable values when uplands are State or ANCSA selected; 3) an Appendix J providing a brief narrative of how BLM will provide interim (or long term) management to protect identified outstandingly remarkable values on eligible rivers and giving a more detailed description of the outstandingly remarkable values on the eligible rivers.
		ROPS AND STIPS
0044-26	The ROP system and NSO option (p. 517) seems good. But after seeing the Alaska system in action, I suggest that NO exceptions or waivers be allowed to weaken the ROPs.	Exceptions, modifications, and waivers are identified consistent with BLM guidance (Oil and gas handbook, H-1624-1). They are identified to allow flexibility, based on site-specific analysis during a NEPA process.
0175-57	Exceptions, Modifications, and Waivers, page 608 (paragraph 2). The introductory section addressing exceptions, modifications, and waivers, states that the first requirement is that "the circumstances or relative resource values in the area had changed following issuance of the lease." The State is concerned that a lease stipulation may be attached to a lease but the stipulation may not be appropriate for the entire lease area. An exception may be warranted because the specific area of activity does not justify the stipulation. As currently written, however, an exception could not be granted without demonstrating that something has changed. The exceptions themselves, included with each stipulation, are written in such a way that this first requirement is inconsistent. For example, Stipulation 2 allows exceptions, if a specific area is not actually used by moose, which has nothing to do with changed circumstances. Therefore, the State recommends that the first requirement for granting an exception be deleted, or established as a separate independent	BLM feels that the wording on page 608 is not contradictory to the actual exception, modification and waiver language in the stipulations. Page 608 is defining what conditions would need to occur, in site-specific NEPA analysis, for the exceptions, modifications, or waivers to change. This ensures that stipulations are realistic based on on-site conditions.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	justification for granting an exception.	
0175-58	ROP, Riparian Areas and Water Quality ROP-Water-c-2. Refueling of equipment within 500 feet of the active floodplain of any fish-bearing waterbody and 100 feet from non-fish bearing water bodies is prohibited. The AO may allow storage and operations at areas closer than the stated distance if properly designed to account for local hydrologic conditions. The AO should have the ability to approve exceptions to the above ROP where it would not be practicable for equipment or pumps associated with placer mining operations to comply.	Language has been added in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS authorizing modification by the AO for placer mining (ROP-Water-c-2, page C-13).
0175-59	Standard Lease Terms: Section 7, Mining operations. To the extent that impacts from mining operations would be substantially different or greater than those associated with normal drilling operations, lessor reserves the right to deny approval of such operations. The above ROP appears to be an example of a previous ROP originally associated with oil and gas development. The State suggests that it is reasonable to assume that the impacts from a mining operation would be substantially different and greater than those associated with mineral exploration drilling. The impacts from a proposed mining operation should be evaluated and minimized through the Plan of Operations Approval process, but they will likely be greater than those associated with the drilling of an exploration drill hole. It is not reasonable to expect mining companies to invest capital in mineral exploration if they cannot expect to develop the mineral resources. The State suggests that this section be deleted.	The comment refers to Section 7 of the Standard Lease Terms. This is not a Required Operating Procedure, but is part of the Standard Lease Terms. Section 7 refers to mining activities associated with oil and gas development of the lease.
0312-109	ROP-F&W-a-1 (p. 612): The requirement to “utilize existing roads and trails whenever	The language "Use of existing roads and trails shall require a site-specific exception from the Authorizing Officer" has been added to this ROP in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	possible" does not clarify what situation creates an impossibility such that it is permissible to travel over pristine fish and wildlife habitat. This ROP should require a site-specific exception from the Authorizing Officer before allowing off-road or off-trail travel by motorized vehicles.	
0312-110	ROP-F&W-a-6 (p. 612): The setback requirement of 500 feet for roads, well pads, and other oil and gas facilities from fish-bearing waterbodies is insufficient. The setback should apply to all waterbodies, and should be from the "Riparian Reserve" area as defined by the Environmental Protection Agency for all BLM land. A "conservative riparian reserve width" for fish bearing streams is "the stream and the area on each side of the stream extending from the edges of the active stream channel to the top of the inner gorge, or to the outer edges of the 100-year floodplain, or to the outer edges of riparian vegetation, or to a distance equal to the height of two site-potential trees, or 300 feet slope distance (600 feet total, including both sides of the stream channel), whichever is greatest."9 This definition leads to a minimum setback requirement of 800 feet from fish-bearing waterbodies, with the possibility that the setback would be greater depending on the characteristics of the waterbody.	EPA thoroughly reviewed the Draft RMP/EIS, and provided some comments specifically on ROPs. However they did not question the adequacy of the 500-foot buffer from fish bearing streams nor did they refer to the Riparian Reserve standards that you cite.
0312-111	ROP-F&W-a-7 (p. 612): What constitutes the location a fish-bearing stream should be determined by the definition of a conservative riparian reserve width (above), rather than the "active floodplain." Additionally, exploratory oil and gas drilling should be prohibited in fish-bearing rivers and streams and fish bearing lakes with no chance to demonstrate that impacts would be minimal or that there is no feasible or prudent alternative.	ROP-F&W-a-7 has been deleted in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. ROP-F&W-a-6 prohibits oil and gas facilities or roads within 500 feet of fish bearing rivers, streams, or lakes. It does allow for exploratory drilling under frozen conditions, utilizing ice roads.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0312-112	ROP-F&W-a-12 (p. 613): Other than illegal shooting and natural predation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lists collisions with powerlines as the major source of trumpeter swan fatalities. As such, overhead powerline construction should be prohibited rather than merely avoided in primary trumpeter swan breeding habitat.	There may be cases where we cannot legally prohibit overhead powerlines, if no feasible alternative exists. Thus the avoidance wording.
0312-113	ROP-F&W-a-13 (p. 613): Recreational developments, permits, or leases on lakes or lakeshores with historically active trumpeter swan nest sites or staging areas should only be allowed if the lessee or permittee can demonstrate on a site-specific basis that impacts will be minimal or it is determined that there is no feasible or prudent alternative. “Swans will not nest on lakes intensively developed for recreation. For example, trumpeter swans have stopped nesting on Wembly Lake and Crystal Lake in the Grande Prairie area. Management programs to control the amount and/or type of recreational activity could reduce this problem.” Swans are particularly sensitive to human disturbances.	Thanks for the comment. This is an editing error and will be changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (Appendix C) to "Recreational developments, permits, or leases on lakes or lakeshores with historically active trumpeter swan nest sites or staging areas will only be allowed if the lessee or permittee can demonstrate on a site-specific basis that impacts will be minimal or it is determined that there is no feasible or prudent alternative."
0312-114	ROP-F&W-b-1 (p. 613): The use restriction within a quarter mile of lakes, ponds, or marshes with trumpeter swan nests should be increased and should begin April 1 rather than May 1. Breeding is disrupted by activity within distances of between a third of a mile and a mile and a quarter from trumpeter swan nests.13 “Human activity and disturbance in the breeding areas may cause the death of adult birds and/or decreased survival of eggs or cygnets. Trumpeter swans are sensitive to repeated disturbance and may refuse to nest or abandon an existing nest in such situations. The birds are most sensitive from mid-April to	The buffer distances and seasons identified in this ROP are consistent with State (DNR) standards identified in the Copper Basin Area Plan. Because of the density of trumpeter swan nests in some portions of the planning area, this ROP applies over a large portion of BLM-managed lands (See Primary Trumpeter Swan Breeding Habitat, p. 93 Draft RMP/EIS). This ROP allows BLM the discretion to consider activities of less than 14 days, based on site-specific NEPA analysis.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	mid-June. Unfortunately, this also is when the eggs and cygnets are at greatest risk." The ROP as currently written allows for disturbance within any distance of trumpeter swan nests if such disturbance lasts for less than 14 days. There is no evidence to show that trumpeter swans can tolerate even short term disturbances. As such, all ground disturbance or surface use should be prohibited within a mile and a quarter of lakes, ponds, or marshes with trumpeter swan nests from April 1 to August 31.	
0312-115	ROP-F&W-b-2 (p. 614): Allowing FLPMA leases or permits within calving areas, even if the leases are less than 14 days, is not sufficient to protect the calving. Calving occurs in a very short window, and this ROP allows 13 days of FLPMA permit or leases within the calving area which could significantly disturb calving.	This ROP allows us the discretion to consider what the impacts of such an activity would be in a site-specific NEPA analysis. Some permitted activities (such as an outfitter camp during spring bear hunting season under an SRP permit) would have minimal impacts.
0312-116	ROP-F&W-b-4 (p. 614): No evidence is provided that a quarter mile buffer around bald eagle nests will be sufficient to prevent disturbance. According to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, "minimizing human disturbance near nest sites is necessary in order to protect Alaska's Bald Eagles from the potential harm caused by increasing human development." This ROP also provides for an "exemption" for mining operation. An "exemption" is not defined. There is no ROP for other raptor nests, with this ROP merely stating that "appropriate buffers around other raptor nests will be determined on site-specific analysis." The ROP-F&W-b-4 should be increased to at least a ½ mile buffer around all raptor nesting sites, with the possibility for site-specific increases depending on	At a minimum, the Bald Eagle Protection Act provides for a buffer zone of 330 feet around an active bald eagle nest. However, USFWS recommends a minimal buffer zone of at least 660 feet based on topography and vegetative screening from disturbance to the nest site. The ROP as proposed is 1/4 mile or 1,332 feet, twice the USFWS minimum recommendation. And, the wording is that an exemption "may be provided for mining operations where no feasible alternative exists and where mitigation measures can be identified to minimize impacts." Determinations for buffer zones around other raptor nests will be made on a site-specific basis during the NEPA process and dependent on species type, occupancy of the nest, and the nature of the activity proposed.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	circumstances.	
0312-117	ROP-F&W-b-5 (p. 615): This ROP repeats the previous one and should be deleted.	You are correct. Thank you. It will be deleted in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0312-118	ROP-F&W-b-6 (p. 615): Limiting helicopter landings for skiing only and not for other activities is arbitrary. Similarly, allowing helicopters to get too close to sheep and goats that happen to be outside of their critical habitat will potentially disturb large numbers of animals. Helicopters should be required to maintain a minimum distance from Dall sheep and mountain goats regardless of what range they are in, and no heli-landings should be permitted in Dall sheep or goat critical ranges regardless of the activity.	This ROP will be changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (Appendix C) to include all helicopter landings, unless for emergency purposes.
0312-119	ROP-Water-a-1 (p. 616): Please see the comments for ROP-F&W-a-6 as to why a 500 foot setback from fish-bearing waterbodies and a 100 foot setback for non-fish-bearing waterbodies is insufficient.	See response to comments 0312-123.
0312-120	ROP-Water-b-1 (p. 616): Diverting streams around mining operations will cause severe degradation to riparian areas. Mining activities should be avoided in sensitive riparian wildlife and fish habitat. This includes riparian areas that are important to migratory Trumpeter swan, Mentasta and Nelchina caribou calving areas and salmon spawning.	Closures against these activities in many areas are considered in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS and in some specific areas for resource protection in Alternative D.
0312-121	ROP-Water-b-4 (p. 617): The requirement that all roads etc. will be sited in upland areas if possible needs to be clarified to address what creates such an impossibility, such as siteing a road in a riparian area. This ROP should require an exception from the Authorizing Officer before allowing a road, bunkhouse, office, equipment storage or maintenance facility to be sited in a riparian area.	We feel that other ROPs (such as ROP-Water-c-2) preclude the construction of these facilities within the riparian area.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0312-122	ROP-Water-b-7 (p. 617): Riparian vegetation should be re-established using native species, and the area should be managed for noxious weed infestations.	We agree, wherever possible, as stated in ROP-Soils-a-10.
0312-123	ROP-Water-c-2 (p. 617): Please see the comments for ROP-F&W-a-6 as to why a 500 foot setback from fish-bearing waterbodies and a 100 foot setback for non-fish-bearing waterbodies is insufficient.	This ROP will be deleted in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and "exploratory oil and gas drilling" will be added to ROP-F&W-a-6.
0312-124	ROP-Wetlands-a-2 (p. 619): “Wetlands are considered valuable because they clean the water, recharge water supplies, reduce flood risks, and provide fish and wildlife habitat. In addition, wetlands provide recreational opportunities, aesthetic benefits, sites for research and education, and commercial fishery benefits.”16 Despite the recognized importance of wetlands, according to a 2001 BLM report describing the status of lands in central Alaska, “Where [ATV] trails traverse permafrost and wetland terrain, glistening dark scars contrast starkly with the natural green and rust colors of the tundra. Trails crossing wetlands are often in excess of thirty feet wide. Heavy rutting is common.” Road or trail construction in wetlands should be prohibited, not merely avoided.	Avoidance means they will not be permitted unless no feasible alternative exists. Alternatives would include winter (ice) roads or location of roads on upland sites.
0312-125	Stip-1: A quarter-mile buffer around trumpeter breeding areas is insufficient. Studies have shown that trumpeter swans are sensitive to human disturbances within ranges of up to one and a quarter miles.18 Additionally, there is no requirement as to what time period a nest must be abandoned before the AO may grant an exception based on non-occupancy of nests. There should be no exceptions granted for oil and gas development within a mile and a quarter of trumpeter swan breeding areas.	There is also ample evidence in this area that trumpeter swans nest and rear their young successfully within close proximity of busy highways, such as the Glenn or Richardson. However, we do not accept this as the norm and instead opt for standards that are consistent with State (DNR) standards identified for protection of trumpeter swans in the Copper Basin Area Plan. See response to comment 0312-114. Evidence of nest occupancy will be based on trumpeter swan census date (USFWS) taken every five years.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0312-126	Stip-2: There needs to be clarification as to what constitutes “actual moose use of site-specific areas” and what type of “review and monitoring” of those areas is required before an exception can be granted. The AO should be required to perform systematic monitoring for a period of three years before an exception can be granted for an area based on non-occupancy.	This will be determined in site-specific analysis in the appropriate NEPA document. "Documented non-occupancy" would be determined by examining the specific site and looking at evidence of winter use (moose pellet density, browse intensity, or presence of moose).
0312-127	Stip-3: Disturbance near bald eagle nests should be prohibited within a half mile of nests sites, particularly if there is a direct line of sight between the nest and the activity. There should not be an exception for nests that have been unoccupied for three consecutive years. “Bald Eagles frequently re-use nest structures . . . often for a period of many years.”	Please see response to comment 0312-116.
0312-128	Should deposits of coal bed methane exist in the planning area, the BLM should seek extensive public input and develop stringent mitigation guidelines before allowing development of the resource.	We agree.
0323-12	While many of the ROPs and stipulations included in the Draft EIS should provide adequate environmental protections, there are others that may not be as timely or effective as expected due to vague wording, insufficient or ill-defined decision criteria and exception clauses. It is especially difficult to predict the effectiveness of mitigation measures that rely on decision criteria that include “whenever possible”, “where possible”, “minimize”, and “if feasible” phrases. EPA is concerned that the use, monitoring and enforcement of many of the ROPs and stipulations as they are currently written will not achieve the desired environmental outcomes or mitigation.	BLM feels they will, based on meeting the objectives stated at the outset of each section of ROPs. Flexibility is built into individual ROPs to allow for the best application, based on site specific analysis for each implementation level activity in the appropriate NEPA document.
0323-13	Agency Coordination and Consultation. The	Consultation with USFWS is required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Final EIS should describe how and when resource and regulatory agencies with resource management authorities would be consulted in a timely manner when the ROPs and stipulations are used in decisions that affect those resources. For example, consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should occur prior to determining bald eagle nest buffers as described in ROP-F&W-b-4 and that requirement should be included in the ROP. Consultation with potentially affected tribes should also be conducted prior to future decisions that my impact their subsistence or cultural resources. If this consultation has been designed as part of the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that are described in Chapter V of the Draft EIS, additional detail to explain that process would be helpful.	prior to initiation of any project by the BLM that may affect Federally listed or endangered species or its habitat (Draft RMP/EIS, p. 562). The bald eagle is not listed as threatened or endangered in Alaska. As discussed in response to 0312-116, BLM utilized information from USFWS to determine bald eagle nest buffer distances. BLM is committed to consultation with potentially affected tribes (as described on page 563 of the Draft RMP/EIS) and is in the process of developing MOUs with several potentially affected tribes and Ahtna, Inc. to facilitate implementation-level consultation.
0323-14	EPA recommends that where specific numerical criteria are presented, such as set-back distances, buffer zone areas and aircraft altitudes, additional detail be provided to explain how those criteria were developed, in order to predict their effectiveness. For example, justification for choosing the 500-foot buffer distance for fish-bearing rivers and lakes in ROP-F&W-a-6, ROP-Water-a-1 and other ROPs should be included.	Most buffer distances have been explained in responses to these comments (see response 0312-116 for eagles, 0312-114 for trumpeter swans). A 500 foot buffer from fish-bearing streams, rivers or lakes was considered by resource specialists to be sufficient, when combined with other ROPs and stipulations, to minimize impacts to riparian areas, water quality, and fish and wildlife. This determination was made based on knowledge of local soils and vegetation.
0323-15	EPA recommends that a description of effective monitoring and enforcement of ROPs and lease stipulations be added to Appendix III in the Final EIS, or appropriate references to monitoring and enforcement details that are contained in the main text of the EIS should be inserted.	Thanks for the comment. There will be a section added to Appendix C of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS describing monitoring and enforcement of ROPs and stipulations (pp. C-3, C-4).
0329-118	Oil & gas mitigation measures proposed are terrible. There doesn't appear to be any enforcement mechanism, or any rhyme or	We disagree. Enforcement of ROPs or stipulations is carried out by the Authorized Officer, a field office representative who deals on the ground with the permittee. Compliance inspections are conducted as part of any permitted activity. Non-compliance

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	reason to how they were developed. The Draft EIS relies on ROPs and stipulations blindly, and almost exclusively, to deal with negative impacts from oil & gas, and mining. (for example p.444-5, p.469)	results in a notice of non-compliance to the permittee, with a time-frame to correct the problem and follow-up inspections.
0329-132	We are concerned that mitigation is non-binding, uncertain and weak. Yet, these measures are a huge portion of BLM's apparent conservation strategy. On the strength of these mitigation measures, we are expected to endorse mining and oil drilling in some of the world's most valuable, and most sensitive, wildlands.	You can endorse whatever you choose. That is why you have the opportunity to comment. We feel the proposed ROPs and stipulations offer a vast improvement over the status quo in protection of specific resource concerns.
0329-133	The Draft EIS repeatedly says that proposed mitigation measures would be more effective than current stipulations. (p.402) We seriously question this finding. Why would they be any better than the current, case-by-case approach? What are you basing this critical conclusion on?	Current stipulations are general. For example "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 or situation of any stream or lake." The proposed ROPs are designed for specific resource protection, based on objectives developed from the Alaska Land Health Standards. Current stipulations do not include any oil and gas, mining, or species-specific measures.
0329-134	It is also puzzling how "current industry practice" can be expected to be an improvement over itself?? If these things are standard anyway, then what particular benefit do you expect? How were these measures arrived at? Were they run by resource specialists? Industry?	We use knowledge of current industry practices to try and insure that ROPs and stipulations are practical. Development of a ROP is of no use if it can't be applied. ROPs and stipulations were developed by Field Office personnel, then reviewed by State Office specialists. They are subject to industry review through the normal public comment process.
0329-135	The Draft EIS/RMP says "ROPs would apply to all permitted activities…," and in the next breath that "not all ROPs would apply to all permitted activities." (p.607) Which is it? Do they apply or not? If not, who determines what applies in each case? What are the impacts of those determinations? What opportunity would there be for meaningful public involvement?	Not all ROPs would apply to every permitted activity. For example, ROPs describing buffers from riparian areas or protection of water quality would be a waste of paper and time on a permit for a FAA transmitter on a hill-top. Site-specific ROPs (which ROPS would be used for which projects) would be determined through interdisciplinary review during the NEPA process. NEPA actions are also subject to public review.
0329-136	We are very concerned that stipulations "could be excepted, modified, or waived by the AO." (p.608). These stipulations are a waste of	We disagree. Exceptions, modifications, or waivers are only permitted when there are site-specific conditions that would allow for a particular activity to take place without resource degradation. Note that some stipulations (pp. 627 - 629) have no exceptions,

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	paper, if the AO is going to determine them case-by-case anyway.	modifications, or waivers. Exceptions, modifications, or waivers provide flexibility when dealing with natural resources.
0329-137	Why are there no alternative mitigation measures presented? Would it be reasonable to make these measures more, or less, strict? What about adding some enforcement? Please present a reasonable range of alternatives in the Revised Draft EIS/RMP.	Alternatives were not developed around ROPs and Stipulations because we needed one set that could be applied to actions and allowable uses identified in each alternative and used to evaluate environmental consequences in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. A "weaker" set of ROPs and stipulations applied to a greater degree of resource development (such as proposed in Alternative B) would eliminate B as a reasonable alternative, because resource impacts would be unacceptable.
0329-138	These mitigation measures aren't enforceable. There are no penalties or consequences for violating them. This list is essentially a set of recommendations.	There are penalties, if ROPs are adopted as part of a specific permit or lease. These are conditions of the lease or permit. Non-compliance with conditions of the permit can result in permit cancellation. Compliance occurs through inspection by field office personnel.
0329-139	How are "operational requirements" enforced?	"Operational requirements" in this context refers to the Required Operating Procedures. These are conditions of the lease or permit. Non-compliance with conditions of the permit can result in permit cancellation. Compliance occurs through inspection by field office personnel.
0329-140	Lease stipulations for oil & gas leases wouldn't be applied until there were a lease being issued. At that point, what impact does Appendix III have on the stips? We are concerned that you are ignoring impacts today by relying on very uncertain future contract provisions. There is no guarantee—not even close—that these stipulations will be applied.	Required Operating Procedures apply even in areas open to leasing subject to the standard lease terms. Appropriate ROPs and stipulations are applied during the NEPA process after a lease sale has occurred and when Applications for Permit to Drill (APDs) are received.
0329-141	It is our overwhelming experience that when they conflict, industry economic needs ALWAYS trump ecological impacts. The theoretical ¼-mile bird nest buffer that prevents an oil reservoir from being fully developed is not a fair characterization of reality. If this situation occurred (and it does), BLM would certainly issue an exemption. In fact, on the next page, the Draft EIS/RMP discloses that standard lease terms "may not require the lessee to relocate drilling rigs or supporting facilities by more than 200 meters…" (p.608)	The reference on page 608 applies to areas that would be open to mineral leasing, subject to the standard lease terms (Draft EIS/RMP pp. 130 - 134). Where more resource-specific stipulations were required, the lands would be open subject to minor or seasonal constraints (see table pp. 130 - 134). And, where stipulations apply, exceptions are clearly defined. For example, in the case of eagle nests, "nests unoccupied for three consecutive years may be considered for exception."
0329-142	The Draft EIS/RMP suggests that the AO "may add additional more-restrictive stipulations as	No. However, exceptions may be granted based on site-specific information, as stated in many of the ROPs.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	determined necessary through further NEPA analysis…" (p. 608) Is it true that they could also just as easily (and, more likely) adopt less restrictive stipulations?	
0329-143	What "environmental analysis document" would there be for oil & gas development? (p.608) What is the basis for the three-pronged requirements in those documents to exempt, modify or waive stipulations?	At least an Environmental Assessment would be done for oil and gas development. Developing exceptions, modifications, and waivers for stipulations is based on BLM guidance (Oil and gas handbook, H-1624-1).
0329-144	What is an "unacceptable impact?" (p.608)	In this context, an "unacceptable impact" would be one which a ROP or stipulation is designed to prevent.
0329-145	What is a "substantial unanticipated environmental effect?" (p.608)	Effects not anticipated during analysis of the activity.
0329-146	Changes in "relative resource values" (p.608) is an awfully sketchy loophole to offer oil companies. Given that they are the only ones to judge the value of their holdings (info. is proprietary), we don't see how an oil company could ever fail to meet this requirement. Also, are we correct in understanding that this means mitigation measures will become less restrictive as the price of oil goes up? Increased industry profitability is an illogical reason to relax environmental safeguards.	"Resource values" as used in this sentence means the resources that the ROPs or stipulations are designed to protect, not the monetary value of the resource (oil and gas).
0329-147	ROP-Soils-a are all standard practice for any logical person. That ditches are on the uphill side of the road, for example, is self-evident.	Thanks for the comment.
0329-148	ROP-Soils-a-12 is a Jedi mind trick. Just saying, "prevent and control noxious weed infestations," doesn't do anybody any good. It is misleading to say that's the case.	I haven't seen the latest Star Wars, so don't know what a Jedi mind trick is. However, this ROP does do what it is intended to do if it is made a part of a permit or lease. If compliance inspections show introduction of noxious weeds as a result of permitted activities, the permittee or lessee will need to correct the situation. If not, this could be used as grounds for permit cancellation.
0329-149	ROP-Soils-b It would be good to require winter-only operations, not just suggest it. Please also require adequate snow cover and freezeup, to account for "weird weather," and global warming.	It is not practical to require that every permitted activity that requires overland movement be stipulated to occur in the winter.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-150	ROP-Soils-b-1 just suggests that permittees "work with the AO" to minimize disturbance. What does this mean?	This means that there is a tremendous amount of variability in soil stability based on slope, soil type, vegetation, permafrost, and aspect. Therefore, it is hard to generalize with a Required Operating Procedure that covers all situations for overland moves. So, site specific work between the BLM (Field Office representative working on the ground) and permittee will occur to determine the best route or vehicle type or vehicle prohibition.
0329-151	ROP-Soils-b-2 is obviously a good idea, but won't do any good when operators want to bulldoze vegetation.	This ROP obviously is not applicable where removal of the vegetation and topsoil is required, such as in mining. In this case, other ROPs are applicable to provide for reclamation of the site (ROP-water-d-8).
0329-152	ROP-Soils-b-3 is redundant, as trail limitations apply to permittees as well as everyone else. Making a law that says to follow the law, begs the question.	It doesn't hurt to remind a permittee by putting this in as a condition of the permit.
0329-154	ROP-F&W-a-2 What is "crucial spawning habitat?" We have very little faith this will be actually applied.	Crucial spawning habitat has been identified by ADF&G for some rivers and streams, consistent with AS 41.14.870. This has been applied already on the Gulkana River, where BLM has worked with ADF&G and ADNR in identifying suitable trail crossings to avoid crucial spawning habitat.
0329-155	ROP-F&W-a-6 How was 500-feet arrived at? We doubt whether this will be enough to prevent impacts to fish. Is it enough to avoid dewatering, disturbance and subsidence impacts? What does "minimal" mean?	See response to comment 0323-14.
0329-156	ROP-F&W-a-7 It is amazing that you would allow drilling IN fish streams. Please put a period after "lakes" in this paragraph, and drop the loophole.	See response to comment 0312-111. Exploratory drilling would not be allowed IN fish streams, even under frozen conditions.
0329-157	ROP-F&W-a-10 We are disappointed this mitigation measure is so weakly worded. Please use a 500-foot minimum buffer around all fish streams, and tributaries to them. Just saying, "it depends" doesn't do much good. Please also require winter operations. We don't see any particular benefit to the BLM encouraging them.	The objective here is clearly set: prevent disturbance of fish habitat and possible sedimentation into streams. The ROP gives BLM the discretion to determine the appropriate buffer to meet the objective, based on site-specific analysis. Winter logging may not be possible to accomplish some vegetation treatment objectives (such as scarification of soils for the most vigorous re-sprouting to enhance wildlife habitat).
0329-158	ROP-F&W-a-12 What does "avoided" mean? That's not a very tough requirement. What is "primary" trumpeter swan breeding habitat?	Avoid means that the activity will not be permitted unless no feasible alternative exists. Primary trumpeter swan habitat areas were identified based on the clustering of three or more documented swan nests within close proximity and allowing for a 1/4 mile buffer around the cluster.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-159	ROP-F&W-a-13 Please insert the word "not" before "allowed." How are "historically active" nest sites determined? Please apply this same standard to all commercial activities, not just recreation. We recommend you adopt the standard used in the Tongass forest plan, which requires a verified empty nest for two consecutive years, before allowing activities near a known nest site.	Historically active nest sites are determined utilizing USFWS trumpeter swan census, conducted every five years. And, the wording on the ROP has been changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as indicated in the response to comment 0312-113.
0329-160	ROP-F&W-a-14 What is "an assessment?" It doesn't do much good to require operators to think about things. ROPs should require that they DO things. This requirement shouldn't be very burdensome, so there is no need to add this loophole. Also, this is a requirement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act anyway, so the ROP has no special benefit.	An assessment means an on-the-ground trip to the site to see if nests are present.
0329-161	ROP-F&W-b What is a "heavy concentration? What are "sensitive" habitats? We agree with your sentiment here, but this objective is overly qualified. A better objective would be to avoid actual negative impacts to wildlife habitats. Also, we are concerned that exceptions are written so broadly in to the ROPs. Also, none of these setbacks mean a thing, without a corresponding requirement to survey for impacted critters. Please include a requirement to survey for fish and wildlife habitat, at the applicant's expense.	The words "heavy concentrations" are confusing and have been deleted in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (Appendix C). The specific ROP explains what activities are permitted or prohibited and gives a definition of the sensitive habitat to be avoided. And, setbacks do mean a thing when areas are already defined, such as documented bald eagle nests or trumpeter swan nests. Project proposals will need to be considered on a site-specific basis during the NEPA process. BLM has the ability to do cost recovery where potential survey or assessment costs would be significant. This will not be added to the ROPs and stipulations.
0329-162	ROP-F&W-b-1 How did you arrive at 1/4 -mile, May 1-August 31, and 14 days? This stipulation leaves lots of room for Trumpeter swans to be disturbed away from their nests. Please apply the same standards (or, more strict) to oil & gas activities, too. We suggest you add, "do not cause nest abandonment" to this ROP, in addition to the times and distances. This would fill the function of the	1/4 mile and May 1 - August 31 is consistent with State (DNR) guidelines identified for trumpeter swan nesting areas in the Copper Basin Area Plan. The same standards are applied to oil and gas activities (See stipulation 1, p. 627, Draft RMP/EIS). 14 days covers permitted activities outside of oil and gas activity or mining, such as Special Recreation Permits.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	ROP, without getting hamstrung with inflexible requirements.	
0329-163	ROP-F&W-b-2 How did you arrive at these dates, and the length of activity? What are the "defined" caribou and bison calving areas? This ROP should be written more broadly to apply to all permitted activities that might adversely impact caribou and bison calving. 1,000 feet vertical distance for aircraft is decent, but more important would be a horizontal distance requirement. Also, helicopters are much more disturbing than fixed-wing aircraft, and should be subjected to stricter standards.	Dates are consistent with State (DNR) Susitna Area Plan dates and are based on biological considerations to minimize stress during the calving period. Caribou and bison have traditional calving areas which are discrete and finite, and easily protected with seasonal restrictions. Helicopters are included in "aircraft".
0329-164	ROP-F&W-b-3 What is "defined" moose winter range. How did you arrive at these dates and distances? How does one arrive at "documented non-occupancy of the specific area by moose?"	Wildlife habitat maps were compiled from information obtained from ADF&G wildlife atlases (Susitna Basin Area Plan, 1983; Copper River Basin Area Plan, 1985; Alaska Habitat Management Guide - Southcentral Region, 1985; and Yakataga Area Plan, 1993). Dates are based on average occupancy of the winter range areas. One arrives at determination of "documented non-occupancy" by examining the specific site and looking at evidence of winter use (moose pellet density, browse intensity, or presence of moose).
0329-165	ROP-F&W-b-4 How did you arrive at ¼-mile? These setbacks are already required by Fish & Wildlife Service, the ROP shouldn't be expected to make any difference. What do you mean, "appropriate buffers around other raptor nests will be determined based on site-specific analysis?" When? How? By whom?	See response to comment 0312-116.
0329-166	ROP-F&W-b-6 What is "critical" sheep and goat habitat? Please don't rely too much on ADF&G to provide maps, or anything else. Whenever possible, consultation and coordination is very valuable. However, ADF&G is liable to being axed by the legislature or governor, or subjected to undue political pressures within the state. Thanks for including horizontal buffers for helicopters, and the prohibition against heli-ski landing in critical	"Critical" will be changed to "crucial" in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Crucial is any habitat occupied in the winter, and any lambing or kidding habitat. And…we find local ADF&G to be an invaluable resource and will continue to utilize them in project planning, review, and cooperation.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	ranges.	
0329-167	ROP-Water-a-1 is very weak. What are "minimal" impacts? Please apply these setbacks to all facilities, not just permanent oil & gas ones. We find it curious that this "requirement" is actually written in the negative: as in, "don't do X, if you do Y," rather than, "Do X, unless Y." Is there a difference?	Minimal impacts are those that do not create significant disturbance. Requiring setbacks for all facilities might preclude recreation developments such as picnic tables or outhouses.
0329-168	ROP-Water-a-2 is the same as ROP-F&W-a-3, except weaker. Constructing roads within floodplains is crazy, except if very unusual circumstances. Please don't allow it.	ROP-Water-a-2 avoids road construction in floodplains. To say that none would be allowed under any conditions would eliminate any possibility for future road construction.
0329-169	ROP-Water-b, c, and d these objectives are pretty mellow—not very ambitious. These requirements seem largely meaningless, as they are just repetition of state water quality standards. While the requirements contain lots of obviously good ideas, we don't see anything new here. How would these ROPs be any different from the status quo? Also, we doubt the feasibility of many of them. For example, the requirement in b-7 that "riparian vegetation…will be reestablished" is another Jedi mind trick.	These ROPs are much more specific than the current set of stipulations. See response to comment 0329-133.
0329-170	ROP-Water-c-7 is a great idea. Thanks. How effective will this ROP be? How is it different from the status quo?	We anticipate a high degree of effectiveness. Current stipulations call for general revegetation and development of a reclamation plan in larger mining operations. This ROP will apply to all permitted activities (not just mining).
0329-171	ROP-Wetlands-a please work to preserve the full range of ecosystem services provided by wetlands, rather than just those directed at specific resources. This objective is fine, while not very ambitious. Of course management will try to avoid negative impacts. As opposed to what?	Thanks for the comment.
0329-172	ROP-Veg-a-1 Please include specific notice and public review of timber sale and prescribed burn plans, and require that a BLM forester and	Timber sales or prescribed burns on BLM-managed lands are subject to an appropriate NEPA analysis and public review. All NEPA analyses involve interdisciplinary review.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	wildlife biologist concur with the plan.	
0329-173	ROP-Veg-a-3 How will this be implemented? Wouldn't it be easier to just wash them all down?	This would be implemented by making it a part of the timber sale contract and the Authorizing Officer making sure it gets done. This is standard practice in many areas in the lower 48.
0329-174	ROP-Veg-a-4 Without any scale, this requirement is impossible NOT to meet.	No, this is definitely not a prescriptive ROP. However, when combined with the vegetation objective (ROP-Veg-a), it makes it clear that intense prescribed burns that result in large-scale vegetation composition change are unacceptable.
0329-175	ROP-Veg-a-6 Why should grazing be allowed on BLM land, if they have to pack in feed?	The ROP, as stated, says "in areas of low grass production, operators will pack in weed-free hay or concentrated feed."
0329-176	ROP-Veg-a-7 Is worthless without a survey requirement. Please require surveys prior to approval of plans.	This will be a consideration during implementation-level NEPA analysis. BLM, Glennallen Field Office is attempting to refine it's information on sensitive plant species so that specific habitat types can be "flagged" to identify the need for a specific survey prior to development.
0329-177	ROP-Veg-b-1 What is the basis for these depths? Please make this a requirement.	The presence of 12 inches of frozen ground eliminates potential for any soil disturbance.
0329-178	ROP-Veg-b-3 How will this be implemented?	By site specific analysis and location of trails on ridge-tops or in areas where breakage or compaction of vegetation would be minimized.
0329-179	ROP-Veg-b-5 is a Jedi mind trick that won't be feasible to implement.	Why not? There are examples in the Copper Basin of past timber sales where natural regeneration has worked just fine and provides excellent shrub-dominated wildlife habitat in the interim.
0329-180	ROP-Cultural-b These requirements are empty. Who will do the evaluations and studies? Unless it's an archaeologist, this ROP doesn't do much good.	That's why we have a cultural resource specialist on staff at the Field Office and this is what he spends most of his time doing.
0329-181	ROP-VRM-a Through experience, we have no confidence in this measure to protect ecological functions. Visual resources should be the last priority. We don't support hiding resource extraction. If we're going to abuse the planet, then stick it out there for all to see. For the sake of honesty.	Your experience must not have been with BLM at this Field Office, because we have not had VRM classes in place until this planning effort. Please hold off on your judgment until we've had a chance to implement.
0329-182	ROP-Haz-a garbage should be hauled to the dump, not just out of site.	We agree, as stated in ROP-Haz-b-2.
0329-183	ROP-Haz-c-1 Is this in addition to existing C-plan laws? Without a way to review such plans, and assure they are sufficient, this ROP doesn't mean much.	I don't know what "C-plan laws" refers to. And these Hazardous Materials Emergency Contingency Plans would be reviewed by the Authorized Officer.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-184	ROP-Haz-c-5 What is "sufficient?" Who determines it? This is already the law.	Sufficient is enough to prevent impacts to fish, wildlife, and the environment from hazardous materials, oil spills, and other chemical spills, as stated in the objective. It is determined by the Authorized Officer.
0329-185	ROP-Haz-c-7 is great, but already the law. Also, how will this be applied in vast wetland areas?	It will be applied as written.
	CLIMATE CHANGE	
0312-137	The area covered by the Draft RMP/EIS will be dramatically affected by climate change over the time period of the plan. In a few places in the document, changes to soils, forest fire regimes and vegetation are mentioned. However, we believe that the Draft RMP/EIS does not go into enough detail on how the agency will develop management strategies to adapt to the expected changes. In particular, we encourage BLM to specify how expected changes to permafrost will be incorporated into transportation corridor planning, OHV use, and oil, gas and mineral extraction. This should include expected impacts to water quality from oil, gas and mineral leasing as the permafrost melts and impact on wildlife from leasing as migration patterns change. We also encourage BLM to proactively look at how changes to wildlife patterns will affect subsistence use in this area. Please address these issues in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.	Climate change and it's anticipated effects on vegetation cover, wildlife, and fisheries is discussed in more detail in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 315).
0323-16	EPA acknowledges that the interaction between land use and climate change is complex and not fully understood at this time. However, we recommend that BLM recognize the need for land management strategies that anticipate and mitigate for changes in land cover considering the potential for climate change and potential changes to climate change due to land use decisions and resource development. We recommend BLM	See response to comment 0312-137.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	incorporate this information into the final RMP and EIS, and strive to address potential environmental impacts relative to climate change in future land management decisions. EPA is interested in assisting BLM in these efforts.	
0329-92	We are very interested that "climate change will impact soils in the area, probably to a greater extent than any other activity analyzed in this EIS." (p.366) Impact them how? What management options are available to deal with it? How will these changes impact oil & gas exploration and development, mining, logging, beetle outbreaks, and wildfires? What monitoring are you doing to evaluate it? What impact is climate change likely to have on salmon, and fish resources?	See response to comment 0312-137.
0380-3	And another thing that I did not hear today is global warming. The fish that came up this summer, I noticed, was almost all hatchery fish. Fish don't usually turn red by the time they get to Copper Center. When they get to Gulkana, to Gakona and when they get to the tributaries, that's when they start turning colors.	See response to comment 0312-137.
	WILDERNESS	
0006-6	Some reasonable portion of the lands within the planning boundary should be managed to protect their wilderness values (I also believe that BLM should be making recommendations in the plan for lands that should be formally designated Wilderness by the Congress--in spite of Secretary Norton's order, which is quite likely illegal). By doing so the BLM will be protecting at the same time air and water quality, soils, vegetation, fish, wildlife, subsistence resources and opportunities, scenic beauty, quiet recreationists seeking a refuge from the nearly constant noise in most	We will be managing to protect wilderness characteristics by managing approximately 63% of BLM-managed lands to maintain a primitive recreation experience, which provide opportunities for solitude and a high degree of naturalness. These are not, however, de-facto wilderness areas and do not preclude other resource management activities.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	of our cities and larger towns--as well as ecotourism operators trying to market a wilderness experience which many of our visitors wrongly assume they'll be able to find in Alaska without spending hundreds of dollars to fly long distances away from the road system.	
0006-18	Secretary Norton has told the Bureau that they're not to consider lands for official wilderness recommendation. I think, still, as a multiple use manager and as an agency trying to provide a spectrum of opportunities, you have the responsibility to provide wilderness opportunities as well as more developed opportunities, that's de facto, wilderness as opposed to designated wilderness.	Please see page 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS, under Lands with Wilderness Characteristics. As explained there, in many cases, we will be managing to maintain the current primitive recreation experience.
0165-1	BLM should actually perform wilderness review of several areas of critical environmental concern--those included in alternative C: West Fork trumpeter swan habitat; Delta bison calving area; and Nelchina caribou calving area.	Please see response to comment 0367-2.
0166-1	[D]o wilderness reviews of all roadless areas.	Please see response to comment 0367-2.
0167-1	I am especially concerned that areas of Alaska be reviewed for potential wilderness description and that actions not be taken that would imperil such designation.	Please see response to comment 0367-2.
0168-1	BLM should undertake Wilderness Review for this area and ensure that resources are adequately addressed.	Please see response to comment 0367-2.
0312-129	We note that none of the alternatives specifically mention as an issue the identification of areas within the Eastern Alaska Planning Area that may warrant consideration for designation of Wilderness or Wilderness Study Area (WSA). The Federal Lands Management Act (FLPMA) states, The	Please see response to comments 0367-2 and 0312-133.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Secretary shall prepare and maintain on a continuing basis an inventory of all public lands and their resource and other values (including, but not limited to, outdoor recreation and scenic values), giving priority to areas of critical environmental concern…(43 USC 1711(a)). ...BLM should consider Wilderness in this planning process. … BLM is required to complete resource inventories and land use plans under the authority of FLMPA 201 and 202.	
0312-130	According to BLM policy, wilderness is a resource, which fits within the framework of multiple-use on the public lands. In addition NEPA requires the BLM to inventory all of resource values including the impacts to those values in land use plans. "The creation of wilderness is a reasonable alternative." Sierra Club v. Lyons, No. J00-0009-CV (D. Alaska March 30, 2001).	Please see response to comments 0367-2 and 0312-133.
0312-131	We understand that an inventory process for the Eastern Alaska Planning Area has been started but remains incomplete. Recreational Opportunity Spectrum, while important within the planning process, does not take the place of a Wilderness Inventory. This inventory should be completed and should include a thorough wilderness review and inventory of the Eastern Alaska Planning Area and forwarded to Congress. We strongly urge BLM to recognize wilderness as a resource category. Section 1320 of ANILCA also provides guidance for the BLM's management of wilderness as a resource. Wilderness is a multiple use under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. §§ 1701(a)(8), 1702(c)).	Please see response to comments 0367-2 and 0312-133.
0312-132	It is imperative at this point in the planning	Please see response to comment 0367-2.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	process for BLM to ascertain the resource values on the public lands in Eastern Alaska, and one of those resources must include wilderness quality before the Draft EARMP/EIS. We support the use of the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum and designation of deserved areas as “primitive”. However, this should not take the place of Wilderness inventory, recommendation, and ultimately, designation.	
0312-133	We strongly object to Secretary Norton’s decision. It is not a citizen-based policy. It sets up restrictive conditions that are not required by ANILCA or the Wilderness Act. The Secretary’s decision thwarts the very kind of local consensus building she calls for to support wilderness. She falsely claims that Alaska BLM lands have been exhaustively reviewed for wilderness when in fact there has never been such a review.	Please see response to comment 0367-2. Public comment played a large part in proposals within the range of alternatives for management of primitive ROS classes, including management for non-motorized recreation areas.
0312-134	The EARMP/EIS preliminary alternatives are in adherence to the Secretary’s memo. If BLM continues the public process without including a wilderness inventory and recommendations, we believe the plan is in violation of law. For the reasons discussed above, NEPA and FLPMA require BLM to consider potential wilderness as a reasonable alternative for any resource management plan in Alaska. For this reason, the draft EARMP/EIS for the must include a reasonable range of alternatives that include recommendations to Congress for new wilderness designations.	NEPA says nothing about wilderness inventory or consideration in Alaska. FLPMA , Section 603 (43 U.S.C. 1782) directs the Secretary to review roadless areas for wilderness characteristics. However 43 U.S.C. 1784 specifically exempts Alaska from this consideration. However, it does state that "the Secretary may identify areas in Alaska which he determines are suitable as wilderness and may, from time to time, make recommendations to the Congress for inclusion of any such areas in the National Wilderness Preservation System…" Clearly, as stated on page 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS, this is at the Secretary's discretion.
0329-8	We strongly support recommending the Bering Glacier country to Congress for Wilderness designation. This reasonable alternative should be evaluated in a Revised EIS/RMP. ...Wilderness designation is appropriate here.	We agree that the area possesses the characteristics you describe, which is why it classified as primitive in our Recreation Opportunity Spectrum class (pp. 174- 177, Draft RMP/EIS). For the Wilderness designation, please see response to comment 0367-2.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Indeed, this rugged, remote landscape epitomizes Wilderness, as defined by the Wilderness Act, 16 USC §1131(c) ... The Bering Glacier region is Wilderness in fact. It is one of the most remote places in the world. Nobody lives there. In all likelihood, nobody ever will. The area is traditionally entirely uninhabited by human beings, something that can't be said about other recently designated Wilderness in Alaska. There are no permanent human structures here. A person would have to look hard to find any evidence of humanity. "Primeval" is a perfect word for this place. There are outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation. Designation here would create the biggest contiguous Wilderness area in the world, together with the Wrangell St. Elias, Glacier Bay, Kluane, and Tatshenshini-Alsek parks. This extraordinary place is recognized by the United Nations as a World Heritage Site, due to its "outstanding universal value." Also, the area to the south is protected as Yakataga State Game Refuge (Mooney & Speerstra 1999), and to the west, Chugach National Forest.	
0329-10	Our earlier, repeated requests at public meetings and in written public comments that Wilderness be considered have been dismissed in the Draft EIS/RMP. The only substantive reason given is that "this proposal is inconsistent with the planning criteria described in Chapter I." (p.31) Why? What planning criteria? Your criteria ought to be based on public comment, not the other way around. If they conflict, then change your planning criteria. There is no point in soliciting public comment if you're only going to listen to the comments you want to hear.	Your page 31 citation is related to Alternatives Analyzed but Not Considered in Detail, specifically a transfer of BLM-managed lands in the Bering Glacier Area to the National Park Service. "This proposal is inconsistent with the planning criteria" does not refer to Wilderness inventory or designation in this planning process. Please see response to comment 0367-2.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-11	It is inappropriate to exclude Wilderness Inventory and Management from the scope of the plan. (p.14-15) The Secretary's policy ceding this authority to Alaska's congressional delegation is illegal. Public comments can't be erased just because they might not agree with the comments of Alaska's congressional delegation. The Draft EIS/RMP claims this alternative doesn't even need to be considered, because the it "considers alternatives that provide a full range of protection for the natural and cultural resource values found in the Bering Glacier area." (p.31) That is clearly untrue. Even the "conservation" alternative opens additional lands at Bering glacier to mining, and oil & gas drilling. There are no alternatives regarding methods of management of the science camp, which is by far the biggest impact around.	As stated on page 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS, "Congress has granted the Secretary the discretion to determine whether further wilderness inventory, review and study of BLM lands in Alaska is warranted." Clearly, she has used this discretion and made a decision. Part of her decision directs us to "consider specific wilderness study proposals in Alaska, as part of any new or revised resource management planning effort, if the proposals have broad support among the State and Federal elected officials representing Alaska." Perhaps this is who you should be directing your comments to.
0329-12	Not only does the Draft EIS/RMP refuse to consider any Wilderness Alternative, but it neglects to consider impacts of proposed action alternatives on Wilderness values. It is revealing of a misplaced ideology that the Draft EIS (p.15) deals with Wilderness Characteristics exclusively in terms of recreation. There are important values of Wilderness designation besides "primitive recreation." Our primary interest in Wilderness designation on the Bering has little to do with recreation. It has everything to do with a healthy ecosystem, humble respect for the land, The primary value of Wilderness here would be preserving the integrity of wildlife habitat, natural processes, and the intrinsic values of Wilderness. Scientific benefits are a very nice bonus. Passive use values also deserve considerations. Many people, including our members, value this wild place as	The preferred alternative of the Draft RMP/EIS would designate BLM-managed lands in the Bering Glacier area as a Research Natural Area. Measures prescribed under this management scenario would strive to keep healthy ecosystems healthy, because the unique ecosystems associated with the glacier and it's forelands are the subject of much of the on-going research.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	a wild place, with intrinsic value. People are not in charge here. That has value, to a person in Cleveland. It has even more value to a seal on Vitus Lake.	
0329-13	We aren't convinced that the proposed action is an improvement over doing nothing. The benefits of RNA designation are largely negated by opening it to oil & gas and mining. The BLM science camp at Bering Glacier is having significant negative impacts that are ignored in the Draft EIS/RMP. Please consider and disclose these impacts, and give us some reasonable alternative ways to manage them. For example, do they really need to cook with microwave ovens? To use helicopters so much? To maintain a permanent facility? To keep such a large facility? To use ATVs? What kind of implementation-level plan will there be, and how will it be enforced? We recommend a "closed" designation for motorized use here. If a researcher needs to buzz a machine around for a study, they can justify it in a permit request. The Draft plan doesn't address the threat of boats on Vitus Lake, and the other terminal lakes, rivers, and area wetlands. Airboats in particular are a potentially serious concern. (Mooney & Speerstra 1999) Motorized water vessels are a major disturbance to seals and some birds.	The likelihood of mineral development taking place in the eastern 2/3 of the BLM-managed lands in the area is very low. This due to rough topography, poor access, very little existing infrastructure, and a volatile climate. Impacts of the Bering Glacier Research camp will be considered in the implementation planning effort for the RNA. Research activities and the facility and aviation to support such activities will need to be balanced with objectives for the area.
0367-2	I understand that wilderness inventories were not conducted during your planning process. Why is this, when so much of the land included possesses wilderness characteristics?	Please see pages 14 and 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This provides an explanation of why BLM did not conduct wilderness inventory as part of this planning process and why BLM will not consider Wilderness or Wilderness Study Area designations as part of this planning process. It also explains how BLM has inventoried and considered lands with wilderness characteristics in this planning process.

4. LANDS AND REALTY

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL LANDS AND REALTY		
0354-18	Some assumptions in the RMP are incorrect and unrealistic, and a plan based on inaccurate assumptions is doomed to failure, such as: "1) ANCSA and State land entitlements will be fulfilled in the 20-year planning period." With all the contested issues, many will only be resolved in court.	BLM stands by this assumption. Recent legislation has taken steps to speed up the conveyance process and BLM is committed to fulfilling State and ANCSA entitlements.
0354-36	Maintain subsistence opportunities and resources with land exchanges and cooperative agreements (MOU's and MOA's) to enable framework for co-management of some ecosystems and affected lands.	BLM, as part of this planning process, has already entered into MOUs with several villages. An MOU with Ahtna, Inc. is currently being worked on. The preferred alternative (D) identifies several areas that would be considered for land exchanges (including the Chistochina/Slana area) once entitlements are met (p. 109, Draft RMP/EIS).
LANDS AND REALTY PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATION		
0044-3	"Airstrips in trespass" (p.165) mentions none by name. What are BLM plans for the half of the Susitna Lodge airstrip on BLM land?	The Susitna Lodge airstrip is on an 80-acre patented parcel and is not in trespass.
0175-29	Pages 103 and 104, Land Use Authorizations, Permits. ANILCA Section 1316 allows the use of shelters, tent platforms, and other temporary facilities and equipment used for hunting or fishing on Bureau lands, as follows: (a) On all public lands where the taking of fish and wildlife is permitted in accordance with the provisions of this Act or other applicable state and federal law the Secretary shall permit, subject to reasonable regulation to insure compatibility, the continuance of existing uses, and the future establishment, and use, of temporary campsites, tent platforms, shelters, and other temporary facilities and equipment directly and necessarily related to such activities. Such facilities and equipment shall	BLM feels that the preferred alternative is already consistent with Section 1316. It allows for construction of such temporary facilities, under the appropriate permit and subject to reasonable regulation. The wording has been changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, (page 122) to say "No new permanent structures would be built…".

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	be constructed, used, and maintained in a manner consistent with the protection of the area in which they are located. All new facilities shall be constructed of materials which blend with, and are compatible with, the immediately surrounding landscape. Upon termination of such activities and uses (but not upon regular or seasonal cessation), such structures or facilities shall, upon written request, be removed from the area by the permittee. We request the Bureau revise alternatives in Chapter II Lands and Realty and in related tables to reflect this provision.	
0329-47	Why not give lands to the Park? One manager is better than two are. One big management unit is better than two small ones.	Please see Planning Criteria #1, page 16 of the Draft RMP/EIS: The principles of multiple use and sustained yield as set forth in FLPMA will be applied in the RMP.
PUBLIC LAND ORDER (PLO) 5150		
0003-1	[T]his hunting and fishing needs to be kept primarily for the local people because we live here. …[A]s I see it now the proposals that maintain the Corridor in Federal ownership would be the best for the people of this Valley.	Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's Preferred Alternative) propose to maintain the Corridor in Federal ownership.
0004-1	But most of the area over here is closed to caribou hunting and that little section [PLO 5150, transportation and utility corridor] is about probably the only place where you could go and just get a permit and be able to go there without going through the Tier II process. So we really do not want the BLM to turn that over to the state of Alaska.	Please see response to comment 0379-1.
0006-11	The pipeline corridor should remain in federal hands. Many local subsistence users lack opportunities on state land and depend on being able to hunt on federal lands, including, very importantly, the pipeline corridor, which constitutes 63% of the federal subsistence lands in the region (and ones which, significantly, are accessible to those who don't	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	hunt with an ORV).	
0006-15	Like everybody else already this evening, I oppose transferring the pipeline corridor to the State. It would have a devastating affect on subsistence uses in this area. And I also am not really terribly confident about how the State would manage those lands in other ways, I don't think that they do a terribly good job of managing general State lands in lots of instances, of course, there are exceptions.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0007-1	I prefer to hunt under the federal regulations rather than the state regulations. The federal seasons are longer and generally easier to obtain permits. I do not have a boat, a snowmachine, or a four-wheeler. I do not have an airplane to access federal hunt areas in unit 11. The federal hunt areas in unit 13 are along the highway where I have access them. If the pipeline corridor is transferred to the state, it will be very hard or impossible for me to meet my subsistence needs. I am strongly opposed to any alternative that would reduce or restrict federal subsistence hunting opportunities.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0008-1	I am opposed to any alternative that would allow the transfer of the pipeline corridor to the state of Alaska. … The area covered by Public Land Order 5150, or the pipeline corridor, represents some of the Ahtna people's traditional hunting grounds. This area is a key hunting area, and has been recognized as that for a long time. … I am unable to get a state tier II subsistence permits for caribou and moose. The federal lands in unit 13 are the only viable option for continuing to live and teach a subsistence lifestyle. The federal hunting areas are especially valuable for teaching young hunters who may never qualify for a state permit. The transfer of the pipeline	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	corridor would significantly reduce the area where local hunters could legally hunt under federal regulations. The federal hunting areas in Units 11 and 13 outside the pipeline corridor are generally inaccessible except by boat, off road vehicle, or by air. This would create an even bigger hardship for elders and low income individuals who do not have the means to access these remote parcels.	
0009-1	I'm here to represent my son, Shawn Sanford, Jr., and he was born with multiple allergies of all kinds. What he was eating in the end was just caribou and cranberries. And the only way we can get it is through the Paxson area. If we're not allowed to hunt there [pipeline/utility corridor] anymore then he won't be able to get caribou, which is the only thing he eats.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0010-1	There aren't that many jobs, year-round jobs here in the Basin, and a lot of people depend on subsistence hunting to supplement their food supply, caribou and moose especially. I've been out with airplanes, hired airplanes to take me out hunting, and that's costly. A lot of our elders and Native people who are unemployed can't afford this kind of transportation, they can always get a ride to hunt up and down the road. Alternative B I'm opposed to, period. I would not want to see the state of Alaska take over subsistence hunting and fishing within here, although I don't think fishing is included here. The reason is that it's pretty understandable that the state of Alaska generally over the years has opposed subsistence hunting preference for rural people, rural Alaskans like the Copper River Basin residents here.	Please see response to comment 0010-3. Social/economic effects of this action are displayed in the Draft RMP/EIS in Chapter 4, page 528.
0010-3	The reason that revocation of 5150 was so important is that it would negatively impact our	Thank you for the comment. The impacts of revocation of PLO 5150 on subsistence are analyzed on pp. 525-529 of the Draft RMP/EIS as well as in the Section 810 Analysis on

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	subsistence lifestyle if the State of Alaska took over the management of the pipeline corridor lands.	pages 651-652. This (pp. 525 - 529) includes a discussion of the effects to social and economic conditions and environmental justice. Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's preferred alternative) propose the maintenance of most or all of PLO 5150. BLM has complied with ANILCA in this planning process by providing the opportunity for public testimony on an action that would cause a significant impact on subsistence use or resources, even though it is NOT the BLM's preferred alternative. BLM is committed to complying with ANILCA in this planning process and in implementation-level planning, as described on page 149 of the Draft RMP/EIS, # 2.
0010-5	In 1972 I was one of the first employees of AHTNA, Inc., and we met with BLM, I'm talking about BLM, nationwide BLM, we're talking about the director of nationwide and their assistant and regional director here in the state of Alaska, to protest the utility corridor. At that time we found out that the utility corridor was, in places, eight miles wide, we didn't see any reason why a pipeline needed that much land to build a pipeline in certain locations. AHTNA, Inc., wanted to select these lands and we stated our concern about this whole issue at that time. But now we're where we are today and I just can't strongly enough say that we oppose Alternative B as proposed in the Resource Management Plan which would revoke PLO 5150.	Please see responses to comments 0010-3 and 0375-4.
0016-1	And right now that's where the elders hunt, they road hunt when caribou go through and by taking that [PLO] 5150 away it would put a burden on them because they can't get out to where the caribou is at.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0017-4	[T]his is an ANILCA .810 hearing and I am strongly opposed, as is my organization, to Alternative B, to lift that withdrawal 5150, both the voices of the residents and the numbers show that that would cause significant impact, and under ANILCA .810, that's what you're asking for tonight, will this cause significant impact and I'd like my testimony to be on the	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	record and say, yes, we believe it would.	
0020-10	PLO-5150, please don't give it to the state of Alaska. They're the most hostile government that us poor Natives can deal with and they do not protect our subsistence needs. And that's the one Federal hunt that some of our elders are allowed, and if it's removed that's the only Federal hunt they have.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0020-14	The PLO 5150, you want to do away with our Federal hunt, now is that in accordance with the policy to protect subsistence? No, it is not.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0022-1	When you say that subsistence is a separate issue from these withdrawals, but, de facto, if these withdrawals of the Pipeline Corridor are made, that's exactly what it is, is a near termination of subsistence.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0024-1	I just want to briefly say that opening or giving that pipeline corridor back to the State would be just drastic because my dad's been hunting down there for years, you know, he's old. It gives all the elders a place to go road hunting.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0028-2	The Federal lands or the Pipeline Utility Corridor, which is in Paxson, Sourdough and Tonsina, these are the traditional areas of the AHTNA people. These are the places where most of the AHTNA people hunt to get their caribou and moose. We also pick berries on these lands. We have used these areas for thousands of years to have our subsistence needs met. The reason we use them is because we're not able to, or we cannot afford to buy ATVs or other off-road vehicles, we hunt with automobiles. And because these Federal lands are along the road system, that's where most of us hunt because it's easy, it is accessible. Now, the remaining lands that would be left if this decision is made and the Federal public lands or the Pipeline Utility	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Corridor is revoked, then that would be 63 percent of the land that would be taken, and the remaining lands would be inaccessible for our people, the AHTNA people, because these lands that would be left would be 20 miles or more off the road system. We would never be able to go up and hunt at the Gulkana upper river portion of the Wild and Scenic River, that upper portion where it is because we don't have the means to travel off-road. Our region is one of the most highest unemployment rate in the state of Alaska and most of our people are below the poverty level so we can't purchase ATVs, like I said, to hunt with and to travel 20 miles off the road. According to BLM, 80 percent of our harvest takes place within the Pipeline Utility Corridor. This shows that we hunt in this area and that's where our moose and caribou are taken. The rural priority would be useless to us if these lands were revoked because the lands remaining would be accessible. We would not have our ANILCA needs met if this is revoked. The only other lands that I saw was Unit 11, Wrangell-St. Elias Park and Preserve and the upper portion of Gulkana River, they're both inaccessible unless you have a boat or an airplane to travel across, it would be hard to access that area to hunt in. And I want to say that under the State management system, since the McDowell decision was made in 1989, everyone in the state of Alaska has reasonable opportunity to hunt and to harvest caribou and moose. Since 1989, when the Alaska Supreme Court made this decision it has greatly affected our subsistence use. The reason is and I've said over and over again, is that, you know, we don't have ATVs to hunt with and we have an impact in Unit 13 during the hunting season.	

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	The last point -- there are other points I wanted to make but since I've got one minute left I just want to state that in ANILCA it states in Section .810 that no withdrawal, reservation, lease, permit or other use occupancy or disposition of the public lands which would significantly restrict subsistence uses shall be affected unless a hearing is held and three determinations are made by the Federal agency. One of the determinations that can be made is that a significant restriction of subsistence use is necessary, consistent with sound management, principles of the utilization of the public lands. According to this section of ANILCA I want to point out that revoking the Pipeline Utility Corridor and transferring these lands to the state of Alaska would drastically and adversely impact the AHTNA people in the AHTNA region. Alternative B would give lands back to the State and restrict our hunting subsistence hunting areas. This would unnecessarily restrict us to hunt on those remaining lands that are inaccessible to us and our subsistence needs would not be met under ANILCA because our Federal lands would be greatly reduced, as mentioned earlier, 63 percent of the lands would go back to the state of Alaska. I am opposed to Alternative B and prefer Alternative A for Public Land Order 5150, which is to take no action.	
0031-1	I'm just up here to oppose transferring the pipeline corridor over to the State. Being from the Gulkana area, we have many trails crossing the pipeline corridor to where we do our trapping and subsistence activities. I feel it would be detrimental to us if it were transferred over to the State.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0041-2	I oppose the transfer of the Fels Glacier and	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	the lower Canwell Glacier to the State of Alaska. Under State mismanagement, considerable damage has occurred in the Canwell area (while Nevada Star was exploring for minerals).	allow conveyance of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0042-2	One of the most beautiful areas, the Canwell, has even been opened to mining exploration. I oppose the transfer to the State of these areas on the grounds that they haven't shown good management!	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0045-1	I oppose transfer of the Fels (Eel on some maps) Glacier and lower Canwell Glacier to the State. These areas, contiguous to the Castner Glacier, should be managed in a similar manner. I am not happy with state mismanagement in the Canwell area where considerable resource damage has been allowed unchecked by Nevada Star Company, in the process of their exploring for minerals.	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0055-2	I oppose transfer of Fels (Eel) Glacier and lower Canwell Glacier to the State because of the history of unnecessary surface damage allowed by the State in the Canwell area during mineral exploration by Nevada Star.	Thank you for your comment. Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's preferred Alternative) do not propose allowing the conveyance of this land to the State of Alaska.
0059-2	Some things we strongly disagree with on alternative B's proposal is to relinquish lands to the State along the pipeline corridor. These lands are vital to subsistence hunting and any transfer would impact communities who use this corridor for hunting.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0060-4	I'd like to briefly touch upon the question of the Pipeline Corridor, and very, very strongly suggest that Alternative B should be avoided in this case, particularly because this hearing is addressing subsistence issues. Transferring management of this land back to the State would be deleterious for a wide range of stakeholders, including subsistence users, in	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	this case.	
0060-15	The State of Alaska would like the BLM to lift withdrawals that are currently in place to make lands in the Pipeline Corridor available for State selection. This action is included in the RMP in Alternative B. … We oppose this alternative, based on the fact that is would unnecessarily impinge upon traditional hunting practices. Economic impacts to rural families and communities dependant upon subsistence hunting in this area would be devastating. We also oppose this alternative on the grounds that it would increase traffic in the pipeline corridor, thus exacerbating the habitat fragmentation caused by that corridor.	Please see response to comment 0010-3. Social/economic effects of this action are displayed in the Draft RMP/EIS in Chapter 4, page 528.
0062-2	I also want to voice my opposition to removing the pipeline withdrawals, allowing the state to select the pipeline corridor. It appears that this action would jeopardize the Delta Mountains non-motorized areas.	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0075-1	We would like to go on record as opposing that component of Alternative B in the Draft East Alaska Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement that would revoke PLO 5150 withdrawals and allow conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor lands to the State of Alaska. Such an action would have a negative impact on federally qualified subsistence users in the area, particularly with regard to their access to caribou, and has the potential to also result in increased hunting pressure on the lands and resources in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.	Please see response to comment 0010-3
0075-2	Alternative B would revoke PLO 5150; this act withdrew some Federal public lands from selection by the State of Alaska. This would allow future transfer of ownership of Federal	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	public lands to the State of Alaska; this would effectively eliminate the applicability of the ANILCA protections that currently insure the continuance of customary and traditional subsistence cultural and social practices. We strongly oppose these alternatives because of their adverse effects on subsistence users.	
0077-2	The transfer of the Fels Glacier and lower Canwell Glacier to the State should not take place, since the area is contiguous to the Castner Glacier and should be managed in a similar manner. Further, witness the State mismanagement in the Canwell area where they allowed Nevada Star company to significantly damage an area I have used for recreational purposes for many years.	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0080-1	Now therefore be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council strongly recommends that the transportation and utility corridor remain under the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board, because of the unanimous opposition of the subsistence users to revocation of PLO 5150. The testimony and personal knowledge of the Regional Council members demonstrated high reliance on the Federal subsistence hunt for moose and caribou in this area, with Elders and young hunters particularly depending on road access in to these Federal lands. Local testimony emphasized the expectation that the Federal government should protect the subsistence rights under Title VIII of ANILCA. Testifiers notes that the State lacks a rural subsistence priority, and that the State Tier II provides a very limited alternative opportunity. Few local residents of Units 11 and 13 obtain the Tier II permits, and young people are especially unlikely to obtain Tier II permits.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0081-1	Whereas, the Ahtna people have harvested and used subsistence resources in the lands under consideration since time immemorial, and; Whereas, the Gulkana Village and other Ahtna Villages have been recognized as having customary and traditional use, and; Whereas, under the Federal Subsistence Management Program over 3000 permits were issued to residents in the communities recognized as customary and traditional users, and; Whereas the transportation and utility corridor provides 80% of the moose and caribou harvested by these communities, and; Whereas under the State of Alaska Tier II permit system for the same period only 243 hunters from these communities received a permit to harvest caribou and moose, of which Gulkana received less than 10, and; Whereas the State of Alaska does not have the capability to provide a meaningful subsistence priority use for rural residents of the Ahtna villages, and; since 1991, the Federal Subsistence Management Program as managed these lands in order to meet the subsistence needs of the local and rural residents, and; Whereas the Bureau of Land Management through the Glennallen Field Office has been working with the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and local residents to address their subsistence concerns, and; Whereas, the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council, after preliminary review of the draft plan, spoke out strongly against the conveyance of these lands to the State of Alaska, among other concerns. Now therefore be it resolved that the Gulkana Village Council strongly re-comments that the transportation and utility corridor remain under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, because	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	of the irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under the Federal subsistence regulations that would result from the transfer of these land to the State of Alaska, and; Further be it resolved that the Gulkana Village Council requests that the BLM carefully consider the recommendations from the Southcentral Regional Council and Ahtna villages (local subsistence users) about the other concerns raised about the draft resource management plan.	
0082-1	Whereas, the plan notes that the "conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor to the State as proposed under Alternative B, would constitute an irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under Federal subsistence regulations, and; Whereas, the Ahtna people have harvested and used subsistence resources in the lands under consideration since time immemorial, and; Whereas other communities in the Copper River Basin and surrounding areas have been recognized as having customary and traditional uses along with the Ahtna villages; Whereas, under the Federal Subsistence Management Program over 3000 permits were issues to residents in the communities recognized as customary and traditional users, and; Whereas the transportation and utility corridor provides 80% of the caribou and moose harvested on Federal lands, and; Whereas, under the State of Alaska Tier II permit system for the same time period, only 243 hunters from these communities received a permit to harvest caribou and moose, and; Whereas the State of Alaska does not have the capability to provide a meaningful subsistence priority use from rural residents of the Ahtna villages,(within the planning area) and; Whereas since 1991, the	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Federal Subsistence Management Program has managed these lands in order to meet the subsistence needs of the local and rural residents, and; Whereas the Bureau of Land Management through the Glennallen Field Office has been working with the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and local residents to address their subsistence concerns, and; Whereas the Southcentral Regional Council, after a preliminary review of the draft plan, spoke out strongly against the conveyance of these lands to the State of Alaska, among other concerns. Now Therefore be it resolved, that the Native Village of Gakona strongly recommend that the transportation and utility corridor remain in Bureau of Land Management because of the irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under the Federal subsistence regulations that would result from the transfer of these lands to the State of Alaska. Be it further resolved, that the BLM carefully consider the recommendations from the Southcentral Regional Council and Ahtna villages (local subsistence users) about concerns raised about the draft resource management plan.	
0084-2	[A]ccording to your draft East Alaska RMP, the proposal to transfer of 438,000 acres of federal pipeline corridor land to the State of Alaska would "constitute an irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under federal subsistence regulations." I am shocked that BLM would consider an option that would cause such devastating economic impacts to rural families and communities dependent upon subsistence hunting in this area. I urge you to keep these lands in federal ownership and to not include this action in the final resource management	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM's preferred alternative.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	plan.	
0086-1	I oppose the proposal to transfer 438,000 acres of federal pipeline corridor lands to the State of Alaska. I feel that the federal government is a better long term steward of this land & protector of the wide range of interests in the area.	Thank you for your comment. Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's preferred Alternative) propose the retention of all or most of the pipeline corridor in Federal ownership.
0097-8	AQRC [Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition] strongly opposes the Alternative B proposal to permit conveyance of the Pipeline Corridor to the State being included in the Preferred Alternative at the time of Plan approval. We oppose it not only for its substantial adverse impact on local subsistence hunting, but because we believe it would eliminate any areas closed to snowmachines in the Preferred Alternative, and substantially reduce the areas in Alternative C which are to be closed to snowmachines.	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0122-1	I think the proposal to transfer 438,000 acres of federal pipeline corridor land to the State of Alaska is ill-advised …because land for all of the American people should not be given to one state's people, particularly since that state would then have control.	Thank you for your comment. Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's preferred Alternative) propose the retention of most or all of the pipeline corridor in Federal ownership.
0159-4	I wish to strenuously object to the possibility that the Transportation and Utility Corridor could be acquired by the State of Alaska. The Plan makes clear how important the Corridor is for the federal subsistence user, in terms of hunting success as well as inexpensive access. There is no question in my mind that the urban hunting community would eagerly flock to the Corridor and vastly increase competition with all local hunters. It is my understanding that those who testified at the 810 hearings were overwhelmingly against such a transfer. In light of such solid	Please see response to comment 0379-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	opposition, BLM has a high standard to meet in order to justify honoring such a selection by the state. Moreover, a simple acre by acre relinquishment of state selected lands would not satisfy what I assume is a general trust responsibility owed by BLM to Native hunters who use the Corridor, beyond the procedural requirements of 810.	
0160-1	I am also concerned that in alternative B, a proposal to return the pipeline corridor to State administration has been identified. I do not believe that a adequate analysis of the impacts was completed in the draft. Many issues were not analyzed. I would not support this alternative for several reasons. 1. Reduction of the amount of land available for subsistence; 2.Loss of oversight authority by the joint pipeline office in the running and safety of the pipeline operations. I also believe that this proposal would be a precursor to turning over the entire pipeline to state management.	The effects of the revocation of PLO 5150 are analyzed on pp 383, 403, 415, 429, 442, 467, 481, 496, 518, 525-526 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Impacts to subsistence were analyzed consistent with ANILCA Section 810 in Appendix E of the Draft RMP/EIS. Some information has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (Chapter 3, pp. 326-327 and Chapter 4, pp. 549-550) regarding the effects on the Joint Pipeline Office and how this would impact pipeline administration and maintenance. BLM feels that the analysis presented in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS adequately portrays the impacts from the revocation of PLO 5150. Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's preferred alternative) propose BLM retention of most or all of the pipeline/utility corridor.
0164-51	We do not support Alternative B which allows for the revocation of PLO 5150 because of the significant impact that action would have on our subsistence lifestyle.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0164-65	We oppose Alternative B, which would "revoke ANCSA d(1) withdrawals and PLO 5150, which would open up 98 percent of the land base to mineral extraction, including oil and gas.	Thank you for your comment. Other levels of withdrawal revocation are considered in alternatives A, C, and D.
0164-66	We oppose Alternative B under Issue 4: Lands and Realty, which will revoke PLO 5150 and allows for conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor to the State of Alaska. … Units 11, 12 and 13 are Ahtna People's customary and traditional use areas since time immemorial. Most of the Ahtna People do not have the means to travel off the highway system to hunt for caribou and moose; the	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	pipeline utility corridor is accessible and is a prime hunting area for caribou and moose because of the migration route located in the pipeline utility corridor. … If PLO 5150, which makes up the transportation and utility corridor, was revoked, it would remove 63% of the land currently in the Federal Subsistence Hunting program in Unit 13. The State does not provide a rural priority; it provides for a seasonable opportunity for subsistence uses for all residents. The Ahtna People's subsistence needs will not be met if we have to hunt under State regulations. Tier II Subsistence Hunting Permit Point System is flawed, and many of the younger generations, those less than 50 years old, are not awarded a Tier II caribou and moose permits; thereby creating hardship to continue our subsistence lifestyle. All local residents will be forced to hunt in Unit 11 and 12, which is not accessible, unless a person has a boat or can pay airfare to hunt on NPS Federal lands. Revoking the transportation and utility corridor will "significantly restrict subsistence uses" and will have an "adverse impact" upon the federally qualified subsistence users.	
0164-68	Section 810 requires that an evaluation must be done to determine what "significant adverse impact has affected subsistence uses, when federal lands are removed or leased," etc. We know without a doubt that revoking PLO 5150 will bring about a "significant and adverse impact" to local residents who are federally qualified subsistence users.	Appendix V of the Draft RMP/EIS contains the required ANILCA Section 810 analysis for the Draft RMP. Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0164-69	The Secretary of the Interior and BLM must evaluate Section 810 carefully to "take reasonable steps to determine revoking the transportation and utility corridor, and	Appendix E of the Draft RMP/EIS contains the required ANILCA Section 810 analysis for the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	determine whether it will have significant adverse impacts on subsistence uses" in the Ahtna Region.	
0172-1	Whereas, the plan notes that the "conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor to the State as proposed under Alternative B, would constitute an irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under Federal subsistence regulations, and; Whereas, the Ahtna people have harvested and used subsistence resources in the lands under consideration since time immemorial, and; Whereas, under the Federal Subsistence Management Program over 3000 permits were issues to residents in the communities recognized as customary and traditional users, and; Whereas the transportation and utility corridor provides 80% of the caribou and moose harvested on Federal lands, and; Whereas, under the State of Alaska Tier II permit system for the same time period, only 243 hunters from these communities received a permit to harvest caribou and moose, and; Whereas the State of Alaska does not have the capability to provide a meaningful subsistence priority use from rural residents of the Ahtna villages, and; Whereas since 1991, the Federal Subsistence Management Program has managed these lands in order to meet the subsistence needs of the local and rural residents, and; Whereas the Bureau of Land Management through the Glennallen Field Office has been working with the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and local residents to address their subsistence concerns, and; Whereas the Southcentral Regional Council, after a preliminary review of the draft plan, spoke out strongly against the conveyance of these lands to the State of Alaska, among	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	other concerns. Now Therefore be it resolved, that Cheesh-na tribal Council strongly recommends that the transportation and utility corridor remain in Bureau of Land Management because of the irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under the Federal subsistence regulations that would result from the transfer of these lands to the State of Alaska. Be it further resolved, that the BLM carefully consider the recommendations from the Southcentral Regional Council and Ahtna villages about concerns raised about the draft resource management plan.	
0173-35	PLO 5150 (pipeline/utility corridor) should be modified to allow for mineral entry (leasing and locatable) in all but a 1/2 mile wide corridor for the pipeline ROW and to allow for existing State selections to fall into place.	Both these modifications are presented and evaluated under Alternative B throughout the Draft RMP/EIS document. See Map 19, pp. 107 and 126.
0173-37	Any designations within the pipeline corridor should not preclude the use of the corridor for its intended purpose as a transportation and utility corridor.	BLM agrees with this statement and the preferred alternative (D) does not change the purpose or the activities allowed in the transportation and utility corridor. Page 292 of the Draft states "Future pipeline needs … could be accommodated along this existing route."
0173-38	The PLOs along the inner and outer pipeline corridor must be investigated in detail to support removal of all but a 1/2 mile wide corridor for the pipeline ROW centered on TAPS.	This is considered in Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0174-1	I oppose the state assuming subsistence rights over unit 13 or parts thereof. If the state were as fair in their administration of subsistence as the feds, I would have no objection.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0175-2	[T]he State does not support BLM's proposed retention of PLO 5150, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Utility Corridor. The State believes that state ownership of the corridor is appropriate and we consider this to be a high selection priority. The land was withdrawn to enable	Revocation of PLO 5150 is proposed and evaluated throughout the Draft RMP/EIS under Alternative B. See pp. 107 and 387. This is not BLM's preferred alternative.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	construction of the Trans Alaska oil pipeline, which has now been in place for over 25 years. Rights-of-way for a future gas line are also already in place. Considering that the future use of the corridor for oil and gas transportation is assured, there is no need for federal retention of the corridor. In addition, portions of the PLO 5150 corridor within the planning area do not even include the existing or proposed oil or gas line. A good example of this is the portion of PLO 5150 within T 20 S, R 12 E and T 21 S, R12 E, where the pipeline routes are actually on adjacent state land located to the west of the PLO 5150 lands. In many cases the lands withdrawn by PLO 5150 are adjacent to and in some cases surrounded by state-owned land. Revoking PLO 5150 within this planning area would allow the state to own and manage larger contiguous blocks of land rather than continuing the present situation where BLM lands are essentially inholdings. Furthermore, allowing state selection and conveyance of PLO 5150, may in fact make state selected lands in other areas of the planning area available for long term BLM management, potentially creating a larger more manageable block of contiguous BLM land. This approach has the potential to facilitate more effective and efficient land management practices for both the State and BLM.	
0185-2	I am opposed to the pipeline corridor transfer as proposed in Alternative B. There will be no management tool in place under state management should this transfer occur. More important is the loss of 438,000 acres of Federal Subsistence lands, an “irretrievable loss” as noted in the BLM draft.	If the transfer were to occur, the State of Alaska's laws and regulations would apply to the land once they are conveyed. The lands would still be open to hunting under the State's sport hunting or subsistence regulations. Also please see response to comment 0010-3.
0306-4	I am opposed to the pipeline corridor transfer	Under State administration, the pipeline corridor would be managed under their laws and

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	as proposed in Alternative B. There will be no management tool in place under state management should this transfer occur. More important is the loss of 438,000 acres of Federal Subsistence lands, an “irretrievable loss” as noted in the BLM draft.	regulations. State management direction for most of the area can be seen in DNR's Copper Basin Area Plan (1985). The revocation of PLO 5150 is not proposed in Alternatives A, C, or D which is the BLM's Preferred Alternative.
0308-3	Maintaining the Trans-Alaska Pipeline utility corridor under BLM management for access to subsistence hunting.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0311-5	This transfer [revocation of PLO 5150] violates the intent of ANILCA to preserve the traditional subsistence rights so important to tribes and rural community residents.	Please see response 0010-3. The ANILCA 810 analysis that was done as part of the Draft RMP/EIS did find that revocation of PLO 5150 would result in a significant impact to subsistence uses and opportunities.
0312-91	We strongly oppose the BLM to even consider revoking PLO 5150. The potential impacts to subsistence hunting on federal lands would be dramatic.	NEPA requires BLM to consider a range of alternatives in an environmental impact statement. Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS contains revocation of PLO 5150 as requested by the State of Alaska. Presenting this action as an alternative allows the impacts of that revocation to be presented, analyzed, and commented on by the public. This analysis is outlined in Chapter IV of the Draft RMP/EIS on pages 525-529 as well as in the Section 810 Analysis on pages 651-652. The public comment on the issue is also presented in Appendix J of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Revocation of PLO 5150 is not the BLM's preferred alternative but is presented as a basis for comparison of impacts between proposed management actions.
0312-92	In addition to our support of the 28 residents that testified against the revocation of PLO 5150 on July 27, 2005 at the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council special session, we support the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission’s letter stating opposition to the recommendation of the revocation of the ANCSA d(1) and PLO 5150 withdrawals in Alternative B. Some of these comments that were raised that should be of particular concern when drafting the revised version of the draft or the Proposed RMP/Final EIS: A majority of the hunters use the highway to hunt and do not own ATVs The displacement of hunters would put pressure on other lands,	Please see response to comment 0010-3. Potential effects of this action to subsistence hunting in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve will be discussed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in Chapter 4 (page 568 and 575).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	such as National Park Lands off the Nabesna Road.	
0321-2	We are concerned about the pipeline corridor transfer, these 438,00 acres of land comprise the majority of federal subsistence lands in East Alaska. We cannot support this transfer with these impacts to rural subsistence.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0323-1	Although not currently included in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D), EPA is very concerned with Alternative B's proposal to revoke Public Land Order 5150 and allow conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor land to the State of Alaska. As stated in the Draft EIS, opportunities for subsistence hunting would be negatively impacted by conveyance of this corridor to the State of Alaska. We believe that the conveyance, with the resulting management of subsistence species and use and resource extraction and development that would likely occur, would cause significant adverse impacts to subsistence resources and subsistence users in several Environmental Justice communities…. EPA recommends that BLM's final Preferred Alternative not include conveyance of this portion of the planning area to the State of Alaska. We recommend that these lands remain in federal ownership and continue to be managed to maintain and enhance subsistence opportunities and resources.	Thanks for your comment. Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0328-1	Whereas, the Ahtna people have harvested and used subsistence resource in the lands under consideration since time immemorial, Whereas, other communities in the Copper River Basin and surrounding areas have been recognized as having customary and traditional uses along with the Ahtna villages, Whereas,	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	under the Federal Subsistence Management Program close to 3000 permits were issued to the 3300 households in the communities recognized as customary and traditional users, Whereas, the lands in the transportation and utility corridor provides 80% of the moose and caribou harvested by these communities, Whereas, under the State of Alaska Tier II permit system for the same time period, only 159 hunters from these communities received a permit to harvest caribou, Whereas, the State of Alaska does not have the capability to provide a meaningful subsistence priority use for rural residents of the Ahtna villages (in the planning area) Whereas, since 1991, the Federal Subsistence Management Program has managed these lands on [sic] order to meet the subsistence needs of the local rural residents, Whereas, the Bureau of Land Management through the Glennallen Field Office has been working with the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and local residents to address their subsistence concerns, Whereas, the Southcentral Regional Council, after a preliminary review of the draft plan, spoke out strongly against the conveyance of these lands to the State of Alaska, among other concerns, Now therefore be it resolved that Tazlina Village Council strongly recommend [sic] that the transportation and utility corridor remains in Bureau of Land Management, because of the irreversible and irretrievable loss of the area available for subsistence hunting under Federal Subsistence regulations that would result from the transfer of these lands to the State of Alaska, And be it further resolved that the BLM carefully consider the recommendations from the Southcentral Regional Council and Ahtna	

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	villages (local subsistence users) about other concerns raised about the draft resource management plan.	
0329-77	Why doesn't the Draft EIS mention anything about the TAPS Right-of Way? This is by far the most significant BLM thing here. Even the cumulative effects section ignores this ticking time bomb in our midst. Please consider the grave risks this awful pipe poses to the planning area.	The TAPS right-of-way is contained within the Transportation and Utility Corridor (PLO 5150). The current status of this corridor is outlined on page 292-295 of the Draft RMP/EIS including a map showing the location of pipeline in relation to the corridor. The effects of the TAPS was evaluated in 2002 through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Right-of-Way Renewal EIS which was written by BLM and the Joint Pipeline Office (Draft RMP/EIS, page 20). This Draft RMP/EIS is consistent with the Renewal EIS and does not reiterate what has already been evaluated through the NEPA process. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been edited to include a discussion of the effects of revocation of PLO 5150 on TAPS in Chapter 4 (pp. 568, 575) .
0329-131	We strongly oppose relinquishing PLO 5150, the transportation and utility corridor. This is a critical area for subsistence. The state does not guard subsistence, and would not be a competent land manager of this corridor.	Please see response to comment 0010-3
0331-12	We strongly urge that BLM not consent to the State of Alaska's request for transfer of the pipeline corridor to the State. Because few year-round jobs are available, residents of the Copper Basin rely heavily on subsistence hunting. Because of deficiencies in the State's Tier II hunting permit system, a small and declining number of Copper Basin residents qualify to hunt caribou on state lands. For the rest, the federal pipeline corridor provides the best opportunity for obtaining meat.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0331-13	Another reason for retaining the corridor in federal ownership is that it contains 14% of the Tiekel SRMA under Alternative C and 100% under alternative D's interim management. Under current state management practices, we cannot expect restrictions on motorized recreation. If the pipeline corridor were transferred, there would be no Tiekel SRMA under alternative D's interim management, and under alternative C, non-motorized users would	The effects on recreation that would result from revocation of PLO 5150 under Alternative B are displayed on pp. 384 – 388 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This analysis includes discussion of management without designation of the proposed SRMAs. There has been additional analysis added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS regarding this topic (page 426, Proposed RMP/Final EIS).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	have to pass through a motorized zone to reach the SRMA.	
0341-6	According to page 552 of the draft East Alaska RMP, conveyance of the transportation/utility corridor land to the State would "constitute an irreversible and irretrievable loss of area available for subsistence hunting under federal subsistence regulations." Economic impacts to rural families and communities dependant upon subsistence hunting in this area would be devastating. This transfer violates the intent of ANILCA to preserve the traditional subsistence rights so important to tribes and rural community residents. In addition, the transfer may affect the Joint Pipeline Office structure. At a time when we cannot access certain pipeline information because of national security, and when pipeline monitoring and protection has taken on new importance, it seems unreasonable to transfer these lands to state oversight. The BLM should retain the corridor lands.	Please see response to comment 0010-3. The ANILCA 810 analysis that was done as part of the Draft RMP/EIS did find that revocation of PLO 5150 would result in a significant impact to subsistence uses and opportunities. Also, please note that a section will be added to Chapter 4 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS describing the effects of the revocation of PLO 5150 on the Joint Pipeline Office and subsequent administration and maintenance of the pipeline (pp. 549, 550, Proposed RMP/Final EIS).
0342-1	The NPS is concerned that this action [revocation of PLO 5150 and conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor to the State of Alaska] will have a significant impact on subsistence activities for those communities having customary and traditional use determinations in Unit 13, many of which are resident zone communities for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. Removal of the pipeline and utility corridor from federal subsistence management jurisdiction through conveyance to the state would virtually eliminate local harvest of the Nelchina caribou herd and thereby significantly restrict local residents' access to this important subsistence resource.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0342-2	The removal of a substantive area of	Please see response to comment 0010-3. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS acknowledges

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	accessible federal land in Unit 13 could increase the hunting pressure on nearby lands managed by Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. Other than a small area of land along the Denali Highway, the only other road-accessible land under federal subsistence jurisdiction in Unit 13 is in Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve near Slana. This area would likely experience increased hunting pressure, especially by local subsistence hunters interested in harvesting caribou. Units 11 and 12 within the Park and Preserve could also see increased pressure from moose hunters (there are no open seasons for caribou in those portions of Units 11 and 12 that fall within the Park and Preserve.) These areas could see increased hunter competition as well as increased off-road vehicle traffic, both of which have the potential to negatively impact park resources. The consequences Public Land Order 5150 withdrawals on NPS administered lands needs to be evaluated in the EIS. For these reasons the NPS does not support that component of alternative B that would revoke PLO 5150 withdrawals and allow conveyance of the transportation and utility corridor lands to the State of Alaska.	that displacement of hunters would occur and place additional demands on other federal lands in the area (page 568).
0346-2	I oppose transferring the Fels Glacier and the lower Canwell to the State of Alaska due to the messy and poorly planned development currently occurring adjacently at Rainbow Mountain.	Please see response to comment 0160-1. This proposal (revocation of PLO 5150 to allow conveyance to the State of all of the pipeline/utility corridor) is not part of the BLM' preferred alternative.
0354-14	ALTERNATIVE B, with PLO 5150 completely revoked is completely unacceptable as we would lose 453,514 acres of federal subsistence hunt that provides 80% of federal subsistence caribou herds. … We prefer that PLO 5150 be maintained for use as a	Please see response to comment 0379-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	transportation/utility corridor, since a management action to revoke PLO 5150 has an EXTREME NEGATIVE IMPACT ON OUR SUBSISTENCE LIFESTYLE.	
0355-16	If PLO 5150 for the actual TAPS right of way is not removed, at a very minimum the right of way should be decreased from what is now many miles (over 10 miles in some locations) to a width of one mile. There is no question where a future gas line will go and a one mile width will accommodate a sufficient width for the new gas line.	Alternative B considers your suggestion. It is not the preferred alternative.
0357-1	Chitina Native Corporation does not offer any support to alternative B of the draft plan. This alternative would have to many sever impacts to subsistence in rural Alaska and change the way of life there to drastically. The possibility of revoking PLO 5150 more specifically is what raises great concern to us. There are so many rural residents that rely upon these Federally administered lands to take any action to remove them and change the hunting areas forever to offer any support for such an action.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0374-1	My dad's name is Mentasta Pete. He raised me subsistence style. He taught me that money is not important, that food is more important. You can't eat gold, you can eat food. That is the way I was brought up. I'm against 5150 because it further oppresses our people.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0375-1	Sections 801-816 [of ANILCA] declare as Congressional policy the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses by rural residents of Alaska, including both Natives and non-Natives, on the public land as essential to their physical, economic, traditional, and cultural and social existence. … In order to continue	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	this protection of subsistence priorities, the BLM should retain the lands in PLO 5150 in federal ownership and control and thus avoid greater development to the impairment of subsistence uses.	
0375-2	ANILCA, §§1101-1113, provides conditions for granting transportation and utility rights-of-way over many of the public lands in Alaska. Section 1107 requires the Secretary to include in any right-of-way issued a requirement to protect the interests of individuals living in the general area of the right-of-way for subsistence purposes. Unless the federal managers retain control over the TAPS right-of-way, this requirement will be lost and the subsistence rights will not enjoy the protections guaranteed the local residents when the PLO 5150 right-of-way was established under federal law years ago.	Please see response to comment 0010-3. Also, section 1107 of ANILCA describes conditions under which rights-of-way will be considered across Conservation System Units.
0375-3	[T]he State has never adopted an acceptable subsistence priority amendment to the Alaska Constitution. As a matter of law, rural residents are NOT granted any type of priority or subsistence rights under State law. See McDowell v. State, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989). And the subsistence regulations ("Tier II") that have been adopted have severely limited the rights of rural inhabitants to engage in a subsistence lifestyle. Conversely, ANILCA invokes the Constitutional authority of the United States over Native affairs and under the property and commerce Clauses to protect the continuation of subsistence uses on public lands by Native and non-Native residents. § 802. A transfer of public lands within the PLO 5150 withdrawal to the State will greatly imperil the subsistence rights that remain for the rural residents living in the Ahtna region.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0375-4	[T]he lands within the pipeline corridor, that is PLO 5150, were selected by Ahtna, Inc., under authority of ANCSA, 43 U.S.C. §§1601, et seq. That Act intended that the ANCSA corporations have priority over state selections of lands within the region. Section 11 declared that all lands within designated townships were withdrawn from all forms of appropriation including State selection rights under the Statehood Act. Section 12 authorized Native corporations to make land selections from these withdrawn lands. Ahtna, Inc. selected lands within PLO 5150 but was told by BLM that the lands were not available for Native selection. Now the BLM apparently has offered as an alternative in its RMP a right of the State to select these previously withdrawn public lands. Ahtna's statutory selection rights should protected and recognized and Ahtna, Inc. should be afforded the right to conveyance of these lands over the State as intended by ANCSA.	Please keep in mind that ANILCA allowed the State to top-file (which they did, including over the pipeline/utility corridor). This was NOT a BLM decision. This RMP will not change or amend ANCSA or ANILCA. As clearly stated in Chapter 1 of the Draft RMP/EIS, it will not effect conveyance of lands or meeting State or ANCSA entitlements.
0375-5	I'm here to urge you to retain jurisdiction over PLO 5150 for several reasons. I did submit written comments that outlined the responsibility that's been given to the Federal government to assure protection of certain rights, for instance, the rural preference to subsistence uses on Federal lands. 5150 is about the only conclave, if you want to call it that, of Federal land within the AHTNA region in which rural preference is actually protected. If you were to even consider transferring this parcel to the State, it seems like that would be irresponsible because you wouldn't be fulfilling your responsibility under ANILCA to assure protection of subsistence. And you'd also be ignoring like the history of the state. The State attempted to adopt a rural preference, it was	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	found to be unconstitutional. Since that time, that was 1989 I believe, since that time, the elected officials, namely the Governor, has been unable to convince the people of the state to vote an amendment that grants a rural preference to subsistence issues. This is the same Governor who is now asking you to transfer 5150 to the State, it's not only this Governor, it was the Governors before him as well. I don't think that you would see rural preference being protected by the State of Alaska and we would urge you to retain 5150.	
0376-2	We do not support Alternative B, which allows the revocation of Public Land Order 5150 because of the significant impact that action would have on our subsistence lifestyles.	Please see response to comment 0379-1.
0379-1	And I'd like to say this, before you think of--before they think of revoking all this BLM lands and having it over to the State I think that would be one of the biggest impacts on the Native people of the AHTNA area. This is our way of life since we're sovereign, we use subsistence, it's our lifestyle and we done this for years, immemorial. And if this [pipeline utility corridor, PLO 5150] goes to the State, I don't have no trust in the State, because they don't do rural priority.	The effects of revoking PLO 5150 on subsistence, proposed in Alternative B, are evaluated within the Section 810 Analysis and specifically on pp. 651-652. Alternatives A, C, and D (BLM's Preferred Alternative) do not propose this revocation.
0380-1	The Federal land that's selected here to the PLO 5150 I think violates a lot of the autonomy and the sovereignty and the human rights of the--the indigenous rights of our people to this land because when the pipeline went through this land, we didn't have a hearing on it or had a chance to select the sites that our traditional hunting and fishing grounds come from.	As stated in the Draft RMP/EIS (page 13), "decisions made in the RMP will not speed up or affect the land conveyance process."
0380-2	I don't think there was any Congressional hearings or any kind of hearings among the Federal and the State law and the tribal	The conveyance process is out of the scope of this planning document. Please see response to comments 0375-4 and 010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	governments. We were never given official time to claim, you know, what is our traditional hunting grounds and I think our land claims was settled in 1971 but none of the land was ever conveyed to us through BLM, so we have fiduciary trust responsibilities here. And also the Indian Trust Account goes with the pipeline and I believe that the State of Alaska, they want to tax--they want to get the taxes off that right-of-way and we can go all into other issues here but my concern is about the traditional, customary and religious uses for our potlatches and how its going to be effective on--how are we going to get food when it took the State of Alaska 50 years to destroy our habitat, our fishing and our wildlife, we have a big decline.	
0381-7	Briefly, another issue that we remain opposed to is the revocation of PLO 5150. Should this occur, it would mean loss of ability and overall access to lands that we have used for our subsistence activity.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0382-2	Also I want to speak on the Pipeline Corridor with the 5150. Like everybody stated earlier we've lived here all our lives and we've been compromising every year for our subsistence rights. And I don't think we need to compromise any more. That we're entitled to our subsistence rights and the Federal government needs to protect our rights under ANILCA.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0383-1	I do not support or endorse the State of Alaska assuming PLO 5150. They have put enough restrictions on the Alaska Native subsistence way of life.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0385-1	And, you know, I want to also speak for our people, a lot of our people don't have the employment in the local areas. We don't see employment with the State of Alaska or Bureau	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	of Land Management in high percentage. A lot of our people supplement their income with moose and we do -- as a people, we do share our moose and caribou and, you know, subsistence is not phasing out as some might think. … And this is why I oppose the revoking of 5150.	
0386-1	So having said that, you know, that 5150 is an area that is of great concern because that is practically the only area that the villages rely on, ones that didn't get Tier II, ones that don't have the means to go out in deep countries with vehicles, that they have an opportunity at the last 10 days there from the State hunt to get a caribou through that Pipeline Corridor area, which 5150 is going to be very detrimental to them.	Please see response to comment 0010-3.
0386-3	The watershed areas, you know, there's -- we've been in for talks with the Pipeline on the C-plans along the Pipeline, the environmental plans that they're implementing for reconfiguration for the Pipeline and the villages, one of their number 1 concerns of the villages is that the protecting of the fisheries along these river corridors, the crossing. They want to make sure that the Pipeline, the owners are held responsible for making sure that that -- you know, that accident recovery, that the C-plans really address those areas that the Pipeline crosses. And I believe that the Federal permit should really stress that and make these oil pipeline owners responsible for those river crossings.	The description of the Transportation and Utility Corridor in Chapter III has been modified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 326) to include a section that talks specifically about the TAPS and how it is administered and who is responsible for spill control and maintenance of river crossings. In addition, Chapter 4 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been edited to include a section about the effects of pipeline/utility corridor revocation and transfer to the State on administration and maintenance of the pipeline (pp. 549, 550, Proposed RMP/Final EIS).
0391-1	Yeah, definitely that's the only way that the locals -- the younger generation, and even the older ones, you know, that just moved in the Valley, to get their winter supply of meat is definitely the Federal hunting permits, and we	Please see response to comment 0010-3.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	definitely support the 5150, not to convey the land to the State. Because their restrictions for hunting is pretty substantial compared to, you know, just the local Federal permit.	
	SLANA	
0004-2	There's environmental concerns that we have before any more people move into [Slana]. There's garbage and junkyards all over the place up there and who knows what else is dumped into the ground. And so I have a problem with that, before, you know, selling the land or having home sites given out or whatever, I think, we need to -- it needs to be cleaned up before anything else happens up there.	BLM is committed to a strategy for disposal that would target unauthorized use and the messes associated with it. See response to comment 0065-1.
0004-3	And you have to think about everything else, you know, when the first wave came in there's like there's no jobs and, you know, the Troopers were running up there every day, I mean, you know, we watched that, we live here, we live 30 miles away from there. And it's like before anything like that happens again there needs to be a better plan than just giving the land to private homeowners, there needs to be something else set in place or looked at, some alternative.	BLM is committed to a strategy that would resolve unauthorized use in the area, clean up messes associated with unauthorized use, and facilitate future access. See response to comment 0065-1. This would be done in consultation and coordination with the Slana community as well as Ahtna, Inc.
0020-15	You opened up the Slana area without access. Now, where else in the world do you open an area and not provide access and not protect the adjacent landowners, only in Mentasta, Chistochina, Ahtna lands is how I feel it, nowhere else in the world.	Actually, at the same time Slana was first opened for settlement, BLM opened an area at Lake Menchumina where the only access was fly-in.
0020-29	I've testified a number of times before about the damage that we have sustained in that area due to the Slana home sites. Currently, after people deserted them there's unacceptable amounts of pollutants in the water, in the streams up there, car batteries	BLM is committed to working with the Slana community and Ahtna, Inc. in implementation of the strategy described in response to comment 0065-1. Dealing with unauthorized use through disposal or trespass will facilitate the clean-up of the area.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	leaking acid, you know, all the refuse dumping from vehicles are still there, that water still trickles into the Copper River. Some protections have to be provided for the headwaters up here because they are getting contaminated without regulation by any of the agencies.	
0023-2	In most of the people's opinion that I've talked to out there, they're in favor of your alternative D [in regards to Slana]. I've heard some very negative comments about Slana settlements, and I have to agree with some of the comments, in that, BLM, when they opened that did not have their poop in a pile, to say the least. Right-of-ways were not planned, access was not planned and, granted, we did get a whole lot of people originally settled out there that weren't respectful of anything. I would say that 95 percent of the people that are left are very respectful of the land and the animals and the way we operate in our community.	See response to comment 0065-1. Also, BLM is committed to working with the Slana community in implementation-level planning in carrying out priorities 1-3 as described in response to comment 0065-1.
0027-3	[T]he opening up of lands [in the Slana area], I think a plan needs to be put in place that addresses the environmental impacts to the surrounding communities, villages and people. The environment is affected when you open up large sections of land and there's no management and there's no infrastructure on how to build up that community to be a sustainable place.	Thanks for the comment. BLM is committed to working with the Slana community and Ahtna, Inc. in implementation of land disposal decisions made in this RMP. See response to comments 0004-3, 0080-2, and 0065-1. Read response to comment 0065-1 first.
0057-1	I'm interested in the lands and realty also that apply in Slana. Again, that area is accessible only by off-road vehicles at this time which is an issue for the subsistence lifestyle that is affected greatly in the fact that if they would just open that land indiscriminately, I would be against it. But under Alternative D, as explained to me, through my reading and	Thanks for the comment. See the BLM's revised strategy for disposal of lands in the Slana area (response to comment 0065-1).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	through representatives, I believe that Alternative D, a limited opening of that area would be okay, and that it would not adversely affect the subsistence lifestyle.	
0057-2	I do, at this point, agree with a limited opening to occupied sites of unsettled claims that I, personally, have a cabin on one such acreage and I would be willing to settle it that way as the other alternative is just to leave it closed and it's kind of historic that way, too, but a limited opening I would go with, otherwise I would rather have it closed and just remain as it is.	Thanks for the comment. See the BLM's revised strategy for disposal of lands in the Slana area (response to comment 0065-1).
0057-4	In regard to the Slana land settlement. That option of alternative D to sell those failed sites that are still occupied as stated by the BLM under this condition would be an acceptable preferred solution. A general opening of the settlement area I would not support as it would have a negative impact on the subsistence lifestyle of that area. In a well managed disposal of land realty a balance can be obtained.	Thanks for the comment. See response to comment 0065-1.
0057-5	If a sale is not possible [Slana], as in alternative A, then I would support the possible alternative as a leasing option.	Leasing of these lands is not considered under any alternative. Conditions for BLM leases (FLPMA and R&PP leases) are described in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 103.
0065-1	If they put the land up for any sale [any disposal], I would like to see it be offered to the people that have land adjacent to it if they want it or if there are any other circumstances where somebody happened to have a cabin on it or something, I'd like to have that checked out and let them have the opportunity to purchase that property before they put it up to the public.	The preferred alternative (D) in the Draft RMP/EIS identifies approximately 10,000 acres in the Slana settlement area that would be available for disposal. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will describe the same first two priorities for disposal, which are targeted at resolving unauthorized occupancy and give preference for disposal to failed claimants (see page 109, Draft RMP/EIS). However, the third priority (#3) has been changed to read: "The remaining lands may be disposed of at the discretion of the Glennallen Field Office, in close consultation with the community of Slana and Ahtna, Inc. Further disposals would be used to consolidate land patterns or provide lands for community infrastructure. Disposal to the general public at large by competitive or modified competitive bid will not be considered" (page 121, Proposed RMP/Final EIS).
0072-1	I think it's a bad decision to let people back in to recover property they never got. Because I	Thanks for the comment. Your suggestion is considered under Alternatives A and C of the Draft RMP/EIS. See also response to comment 0065-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	spent many years cleaning up the messes they left all over. I saw much waste of game when in the 80s. Many moose were wasted as well as small game. Many trees were cut down and left to waste.	
0076-1	I and other homesteaders I've talked to firmly believe that making North Slana available for other to occupy is a very bad idea. What concerns long-standing homesteaders is lack of available resources. All of us require and use firewood. Though there are millions of trees, there are few dead standing trees, the harvest of such is a necessity. We take that subject very seriously and guardedly, each using different areas so as not to infringe on each other's needs. Adding firewood collectors to the area would make survival much more difficult and cause conflicts. Another difficulty in adding more trail travelers--is the trail. The more traffic--the worse the trail conditions. This is most obvious during hunting season. Another problem is road vehicle parking, it is limited, and my space I rented. The trail turned into a road is unacceptable.	Thanks for the comment. Based on the strength of public comment, BLM has changed it's strategy for disposal of lands in the Slana area in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. See response to comment 0065-1.
0080-2	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council opposes the provisions of the plan providing for additional disposal of Federal land in the Slana area, based on serious concerns over past and present contamination by abandoned buildings, vehicles, trash from the initial period of homestead disposal. These problems must be cleaned up before any new disposals would be considered.	Thanks for the comment. Based on analysis presented in the Draft RMP/EIS and the strength of the public comment, BLM has decided to revise it's preferred alternative, as described in response to comment 0065-1.
0158-1	My opinion is that North Slana is already overpopulated and any addition to the area would strain the entire eco-system. [sic]	Effects of disposal are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS on pp.434 - 477. BLM's preferred strategy for disposal of lands in the area, based on public comment, is described in response to comment 0065-1.
0158-2	The number one problem being the BLM and its ability to follow through with the proper	BLM has shown a willingness to work with residents of the Slana area on processing applications for rights-of-way. The Slana area will be added (page 122, Proposed

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	access rights [in the Slana area].	RMP/Final EIS) as an area where rights-of-way will be considered for access to private lands.
0158-3	If by some chance that the land in North Slana is put up for sale, I would like the first opportunity to buy land adjacent to my property/	See response to comment 0065-1 for BLMs revised strategy for disposal of lands in the Slana area. Your comment would be considered in implementation-level planning for the area.
0164-49	The North and South Slana settlement area must have all the waste (cars, appliances, hazardous materials, abandoned buildings, and general trash) that is currently there cleaned up and the BLM needs to obtain special appropriations for the clean up. The waste is contaminating wetlands, waster sources, wildlife, and natural habitat.	See responses to comments 0004-3, 0080-2, and 0065-1.
0164-50	Ahtna Inc. adamantly opposes the disposal of the remaining North and South Slana settlement area outlined in Alternative D, but does support the BLM in addressing the trespass that is currently taking place there because of the land disposal. Slana is an important natural and cultural place for the Ahtna People, and we have a great interest in the area being actively managed and protected under Federal management.	See responses to comment 0065-1, 0080-2, and 0004-3.
0164-62	Page 549 - Under d) Wildlife, in the second paragraph an impact is notes related to the Slana disposal area that is not included on page 526 in the discussion of the FLPMA disposals, the only notes is for increased demand, wildlife displacement is not noted or referred to under this section and should be.	Thanks for the comment. Based on the changes discussed in response to comment 0065-1, portions of Chapter 4 that deal with the effects of disposal of 10,000 acres have been re-written in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to reflect the new strategy.
0329-76	We aren't convinced there is any benefit in, or need for, the proposed Slana settlement area. What community interest would it serve? Where is the demand? How much land development is reasonably foreseeable following disposal at Slana? The Slana disposal could have major impacts to water	See responses to comments 0080-2 and 0065-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	quality and fish. Population impacts of that many more residents could be major.	
0373-1	I'd also like to say that I'd like to keep the PLO 5150 as is because it's important to the elders and the young people, because if you take that away it will change their way of hunting.	Thanks for your comment. Maintenance of PLO 5150 and continuation of the federal administration of the subsistence hunt there is a part of the preferred alternative (D) and would also occur under alternatives A and C. Revocation of PLO 5150 is considered in alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0378-1	Because it's [Slana], you know, it's all our watershed up that way. If any--everything gets destroyed up there because of the disposals, it affects not only us, but all the way down to the Copper River, you know, we need to protect all those lands from things like that. Because it's not only going to affect us it's going to affect everyone down below us.	See response to comment 0020-29.
0381-5	A particular concern to me is BLM's position of disposing of additional land within the north and south Slana settlement area. History tells you that when after the lands became available for disposal in the middle '80s, BLM was in a lose/lose situation. There was no planning done. There was no EIS. There was nothing done. And every Tom, Dick and Harry came to the area to claim a chunk of that land. The land disposal created a welfare type of situation. There was no access in or out and pretty much people had to make do as is. Now, almost 30 years later, the two homestead areas are an accepted fact to the folks who live in this area, like Mentasta and Chistochina. However, this is only a one-sided view and one needs to see the entire picture. I urge you to fly over the area. And in so doing you will find junk and waste of all kinds. You will find abandoned buildings, you will find cars, you will find refrigerators, you find stove and just trash, trash, trash in general. In short it is disgusting and a disgrace. Besides the disgrace mentioned about BLM failed to acknowledge	Thanks for the comment. See responses to comments 0065-1and 0020-29.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	the people who use the land within that particular area prior to its disposal. They used the land for their subsistence needs. And by disposing that area they created a monopoly type of situation. They did not take into consideration other facts such as the caribou migration route that goes through the area. They did not take into the fact wet lands. They did not take into the fact of the impact that it might have in regards to cultural sites. When I talk about that, I refer to the Soslota area and that of the Batzulnetas area. I also refer to their disregard of migratory birds. But, yet, the BLM in the preferred alternative, wants to open up these lands, to rid themselves from the nightmare of management of the unoccupied areas.	
0381-6	But to me, by opening up these lands [lands in Slana for disposal], it's like saying, let's just sweep this management situation under the rug and hope no one notices. I say, I notice, we notice. And BLM is not only liable, but also responsible for its clean up, the environmental damage and condition that has been created by it and other consequences. We are extremely exposed to this BLM alternative of opening up these lands for settlement. Finally, if this alternative should become a reality, we request that there be extensive consultation between us, as tribes, specifically Mentasta and Chistochina and that of the affected residents within that area.	Thanks for the comment. See response to comment 0065-1 for the revised strategy for the area and response to comment 0020-29 on clean-up of the area.
0396-6	Lastly, the Slana area, under the plan, I believe that we're going to have to make these people responsible, Again, the land giveaway has created problems for AHTNA. There's cars trashed up there, there's -- and these are being left on all private lands of AHTNA, and without	See responses to comments 0080-2 and 0065-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	that land giveaway that would not be a problem. So I believe those areas have to be cleaned up and having these people made responsible for cleaning up that area before there's any more land giveaway in those areas.	
	WITHDRAWALS	
0017-3	And the last thing I'd like to talk about 1 is something I'm confused about so I'd like to make a request that it's in the final document; there's a separate process statewide that the BLM is going to initiate soon, I've heard, and that's to look at which withdrawals to remove from opening up more lands to mining. My organization is not opposed to oil and gas or mining, but we'd like a little clarification on how this document, this draft and this Final RMP relates to the bigger picture, look what the BLM will do, look at removing these withdrawals, making more lands available. I'm a little unclear on that, and I'd like to get it on the record to see that cleared up in the final.	Please see response to comment 0312-104.
0020-20	The withdraw, the ANCSA D1 withdrawals. That scares me too. We haven't had a chance to look at this, we don't even know what you're talking about when you--what lands besides PLO-5150 you're talking about withdrawing or, you know, revoking the withdrawal of. I have no idea what you're talking--I haven't heard even had a chance--that scares us.	Withdrawals are discussed on page 291 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative strategies for dealing with withdrawals are summarized on the table on pages 111 and 112. Effects of maintaining or revoking withdrawals are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. To gain a more complete understanding of the withdrawals and our decisions related to them, feel free to call and talk to any planning or lands and realty staff at 822-3217.
0060-8	All ANCSA d(1) withdrawals should remain firmly in place until comprehension of all their potential ramifications can be understood. Alternative C would thereby be acceptable as a management solution for Leasable Minerals, Oil, and Gas.	This planning process is where we consider the potential ramifications of revocation or maintenance of withdrawals. See the discussion of environmental consequences in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Our final recommendations will be based on this analysis as well as public comment.
0164-31	Support the BLM in withdrawing lands within the scenic portion of the Delta WSR and its viewshed from mineral entry to provide the	Thanks for the support. This action is considered in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) and in Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	maximum protection of cultural resources.	
0164-47	Ahtna Inc. proposes the maintenance of D(1) Withdrawals in areas where there are known and potential cultural sites.	The Draft RMP/EIS considers a range of options for retention of d(1) withdrawals. Alternative C considers retention of withdrawals to provide area-wide protection. Keep in mind that d(1) withdrawals on selected lands are only in place until conveyance occurs. Once Native-selected lands are conveyed to Ahtna or village corporations, the protections you provide are up to you. Until that time, no mineral entry or mineral leasing will occur on selected lands because of a segregation against these activities.
0164-48	Ahtna Inc. does not support the modification of Public Land Order 6329 that is included in Alternative D to allow for mineral entry in the Alphabet Hills area which has traditionally been used for hunting and is part of the migration corridor for the Nelchina Caribou Herd. Ahtna Inc. does not support the availability of the Alphabet Hills area to mineral leasing it should be closed to such developments.	The proposed revocation of this withdrawal will only have an effect if BLM retains lands in federal ownership in the area. Currently, the area is predominantly State, Native, or dual-selected lands. Revocation of this withdrawal would have no effect on selected lands because of the segregation against mineral leasing and mineral entry that applies to selected lands. Once conveyance occurs, it is up the selecting entity whether or not mineral development occurs.
0164-52	Ahtna Inc. supports retention of all D(1) withdrawals. This would provide the greatest protection for natural resources and wildlife habitat.	Please see response to comment 0376-3.
0173-34	All ANCSA d(1) withdrawals should be revoked.	See response to comment 0355-41.
0175-1	During scoping, the State of Alaska requested that existing withdrawals be reviewed and those that are no longer needed for the purpose for which they were withdrawn be revoked. Of particular concern to the State are the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) 17 (d)(1) withdrawals. These (d)(1) withdrawals are no longer appropriate for two reasons: 1) most were made to enable ANCSA selections that have long since been completed, and 2) they supported the study of federal lands for possible designation as conservation system units, which was resolved by Congress with the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). … Furthermore, the PLOs under review are a	The preferred alternative of the Draft RMP/EIS only recommends maintenance of such withdrawals in areas identified as needing the strongest resource protection (Bering RNA or Delta WSR) or in areas where the withdrawal purpose is still relevant (pipeline/utility corridor). The BLM stands by the recommendations in the preferred alternative.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	series of orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior in the 1970s under the authority of Section 17(d)(1) of ANCSA. Their purpose was to maintain the status quo of the lands in order to complete inventories and assess resources for consideration in land management objectives.1 The State asserts that the Resource Management Planning process provides the mechanism for developing land management objectives and strategies thus obviating the need for continued withdrawals. We therefore question the appropriateness and relevance of maintaining any withdrawals within the planning area.	
0175-30	The State also requests that obsolete power and/or reservoir withdrawals such as along the Nenana River, (ex. PS 450 and PS 403 within Section 10, 11, 14, and 15 T11S, R6W, F.M.) on lands not managed by BLM and PS 450, located just upstream of the Brushkana on BLM land, be revoked.	Under the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act, these withdrawals do not block conveyance or create an encumbrance on selected lands. They will remain in place until conveyance or relinquishment occurs.
0312-104	The analysis of Leasable and Locatable Minerals is also flawed in that it fails to provide any explanation of how this planning process – which will likely result in administrative orders opening to mineral entry lands that have been closed to such entry since before the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act – relates to BLM's review of all the d-1 withdrawals statewide, a process that is presently underway. Indeed, the EIS fails to even mention the d-1 review, even though it identifies other plans and planning processes that are relevant to the East Alaska RMP and describes the d-1 withdrawals. See, e.g., EIS at 291. … EIS must explain the relationship between the two processes in order to adequately inform the public about the issue on	There is no explanation of the relationship between the two because the state-wide review started while this Draft RMP/EIS was in print. The analysis and decisions related to withdrawal review in this Draft RMP/EIS and subsequent decisions made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are a subset of the information considered and recommendations put forth in the state-wide effort. Management options for withdrawals within this Draft RMP/EIS were subject to extensive public involvement and review. We disagree that our analysis of these withdrawals under the RMP planning process is flawed, simply because it happens concurrent with a state-wide effort. On the contrary, we are satisfied with our analysis because very specific recommendations are made, based on specialist concern and public input.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	which it is being asked to comment.	
0342-4	The NPS also supports maintaining the closure to mineral entry [PLO 5173] on unencumbered BLM lands east of Icy Bay that are adjacent to Wrangell St. Elias National Park and Preserve.	Thanks for the comment. Your suggestion is considered under alternative C. BLM's proposal to revoke the withdrawal in the eastern 1/3 of the Bering Glacier area is based on: 1) ability to replace the withdrawal with other protective measures as identified in the table on pp. 602 - 604 of the Draft RMP/EIS, and 2) low likelihood of mineral development in the area based on rough topography, limited access, and limited infrastructure in the area.
0355-4	All PLOs should be listed along with an indication whether the original purpose of each has expired. Such "lingering withdrawals" should be recommended to Congress for removal as part of this plan.	There are hundreds of PLOs in place on BLM-managed lands throughout this planning area. All were considered in the planning process, and the major decisions are summarized on pages 106 and 111-112 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0355-30	Alternative D (page 128) we do not follow the logic that there would be a withdrawal of an additional 16,000 acres for WSR. This is not consistent with the instructions given by the Secretary of the Interior found on page 15.	The discussion on page 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS is about consideration of wilderness inventory and designation in land use planning. The decision you describe would provide stronger protection within an existing Wild and Scenic River corridor. This decision would not add acreage to the existing Wild and Scenic River corridor, nor does it recommend it for wilderness consideration.
0355-41	We concur that Alternative A is not acceptable. This is due primarily to the numerous lingering withdrawals that need to be removed. These are land withdrawals and restrictions for which the original purpose has been satisfied or the need no longer exists. These lingering withdrawals should be removed, no matter which alternative or mix of alternatives is selected and becomes the final plan.	A range of alternative recommendations for withdrawal revocation or retention is considered in the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative B removes all d(1) withdrawals and Alternative D would recommend revocation of the majority of the withdrawals, with retention of withdrawals in areas the BLM feels warrant the greatest resource protection.
0376-3	Chitina supports the retention of all d(1) withdrawals, d(1) land withdrawals that would provide the greatest protection for natural resource of wildlife habitat.	The preferred alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS recommends revocation of most d(1) withdrawals, to be replaced with measures described in the tables in Appendix B of the Draft RMP/EIS as well as the Required Operating Procedures and stipulations described on pages 607-626. Alternative C considers retention of more withdrawals to provide area-wide protection.

5. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL VEGETATION MANAGEMENT		
0020-32	We don't want commercial logging and active burns, but, you know, we do need some work in the beetle kill area for fire. One of the things I'd like to caution BLM on is, you know, when you burn an area it takes seven years for the lichen to go grow back for the caribou, it's great for the moose but it's terrible for the caribou, and that's why we've seen such changes in the migratory patterns.	Alternatives B, C, and D of the Draft RMP/EIS provide for some fuels reduction to take place, targeted at reducing the beetle-kill in the Tiekel area. Page 118 of the Draft RMP/EIS describes the use of prescribed fire to enhance caribou habitat. The mosaic burn pattern (used in both caribou and moose habitat enhancement) would ensure the diversity of the habitat available. In addition, under Alternative D (page 118), it states "If large wildfires occur on or adjacent to winter range, changing the suppression class to full or modified would be considered."
0164-55	Ahtna Inc. supports the use of prescribed burning and best forestry management practices for the enhancements of fish and wildlife habitat.	Thank you for your comment. These actions are proposed in Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0354-34	With the exception of the beetle kill areas, leave Mother Nature alone and allow public use for firewood in small tracts with no permanent roads. …No commercial logging - no active burns.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS does not allow commercial timber or salvage sales (page 116). Alternative C and D emphasize temporary roads for personal firewood gathering (page 117).
0376-5	Chitina supports the use of prescribed burning and best forestry management practices for the enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat.	Thank you for your comment. These actions are proposed in the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) of the Draft RMP/EIS.
FIRE MANAGEMENT		
0020-8	I don't want any prescribed burns without respect to the adjacent land owners.	Page 298 of the Draft RMP/EIS states that "…fire management has been conducted by agreements executed on an interagency, landscape-scale basis since the early 1980s." This effort to coordinate with adjacent landholders would continue with future prescribed burns.
0175-31	Page 114, (2) Fire and Fuels Management. We question whether it is reasonable to expect that key ecosystem components of vegetation composition and structure can remain intact and functioning “within their historical range”	Fire management may have to change with climate variation in order to strive to meet this goal. This could be accomplished through adjusting suppression classes, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS on page 114.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	given that species' range varies in response to climate conditions. Is fire always a "natural change agent" of Alaskan ecosystems?	
0175-51	Page 515, Alternative C, Prescribed Fire. We oppose the Bureau's intent to preclude controlled burns. Small controlled burns are essential to effectively manage wildlife in the planning region, by restoring a natural fire mosaic after a century of fire suppression. In addition, prescribed fire benefits public safety by decreasing the amount of wildfire fuels, thus reducing disastrous wildfires.	This statement on page 515 of the Draft RMP/EIS is an error and it has been corrected. Chapter II, page 116 for Alternative C states that BLM will achieve habitat objectives through "wildland and prescribed fire." This is the correct information.
0175-61	Page 118, Vegetation Management, Caribou. We do not support stopping a large fire or changing suppression classification because of the potential for "overburning" the amount of caribou range. The fire history of the area is one with many years between fires, and the opportunity to "overburn" is extremely low because of the low annual occurrence of fire in important caribou range. Furthermore, based on our experience, it is very difficult to burn 10% of the range in a decade.	This statement is included in the Draft RMP/EIS to allow future flexibility to respond to potential large-scale burns. The Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges the area's lack of large fires. However, variations in climate could make the area ripe for a large fire.
0329-96	What is the feasibility of prescribed burning 1.5 million acres? (p.403) This strikes us as awfully ambitious, given past experience with prescribed burns in Alaska.	The 1.5 million acre figure came from page 121 of the Draft RMP/EIS and is based on crucial moose winter range. It states that this acreage is identified as "potential" for prescribed burning. This number is not necessarily a goal but will be used to prioritize future projects and focus them on improvement of critical moose range.
	FORESTRY	
0164-53	Ahtna Inc. supports controlled authorized timber sales on BLM unencumbered lands with minimum impact for the objectives outlines on page 117.	Thank you for your comment.
0164-54	Ahtna Inc. supports the use of a cooperative agreement to reduce hazardous fuels and improve wildlife habitat on Native-selected lands through the issuing of personal firewood gathering permits.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft RMP/EIS proposes this as a management option in alternative D (the preferred alternative). BLM is currently in the process of signing a cooperative agreement with Ahtna Corporation and this is an issue that can be worked on through that agreement.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0164-71	Ahtna Inc. supports development of temporary access, near to the Richardson Highway in the Tiekel area to utilize beetle-kill for person firewood gathering.	Thank you for your comment. This action is identified in Alternative D, page 117 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0175-32	Page 115, Forestry Products. We note that harvesting of timber, especially beetle kill, can benefit moose, but only if site treatment promotes willow, birch, or aspen regeneration. This type of treatment is contrary to current Bureau guidelines on timber salvage methods and means, which require that the soil not be scarified. We recommend the Bureau work with State biologists to develop specific site treatment to prevent logging areas from becoming seeded entirely to grass (such as occurred on the Kenai) or stagnant due to continuance of a deep moss layer.	Depending on the habitat enhancement objective for the forestry project, ROP-Soils-b-2 allows for the "Bulldozing of tundra mat and vegetation is prohibited unless project objectives call for scarification of the site to improve sprouting or seeding success." This allows for scarification to occur if it is consistent with meeting objectives for habitat improvement. BLM is committed to consulting with local ADF&G personnel on vegetation treatment projects.
0329-78	We absolutely support making a few acres here and there available to individual, small mills. If commercial timber sales are considered, in-state manufacture should be required, and local hire encouraged wherever possible.	Within the last 10 years, every BLM timber sale has been logged by a local (Copper basin) mill or operator. Interest outside the Copper Basin is low to non-existent because of the low value of timber here.
0329-79	We strongly oppose the proposed commercial forestry operation in the Tiekel subunit, due to the scale. The preferred alternative would target 144,000 acres for logging, and Alternative B proposes an alarming 360,000-acres of aggressive logging beetle kill. Particularly since Ahtna Inc. has offered up so much to NPI for chipping, and beetle kill has already killed so many green trees, what forest there is should be left standing. While maybe still a lot of forest is left by East Coast standards, there is no excess of mature forest in this area. Soil should not be further degraded, or watersheds further disturbed, by logging.	The 144,000 acres referred to in Alternative B is the area identified that is suitable for commercial logging. This does NOT mean that actual logging would take place on every acre. On the contrary, Alternative D anticipates an actual harvest level just slightly above what occurs now (about 40 acres/year). Chapters 2 and 4 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been edited to reflect actual anticipated harvest amounts under each alternative.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0329-80	Please remove "commercial wood products" from the issue statement. (p.113) This would be an appropriate secondary goal, but is clearly way down the list of highest or best uses of this land. This land is not particularly productive in terms of producing commercial wood fiber. What logging has occurred has required extraordinary steps to make economic.	The issue statement for Vegetation Management is meant to simply identify all aspects of vegetation management that will or could be covered within the Vegetation Management section. Goals for Vegetation Management are outlined on page 113 of the Draft RMP/EIS as well and clearly show that commercial harvests for the purposes of economic gain are not among BLM's top priorities for the planning area.
0329-81	Fuels reduction is not generally a suitable goal on this land. Defensible space around towns should be a high priority. What is typically meant by "fuels reduction" is just simple logging. Fuels reduction in the backcountry through mechanical treatment is inappropriate.	Fuels reduction as referred to in the Draft RMP/EIS is just that and it would be emphasized in urban-interface areas.
0329-82	Logging beetle-kill spruce does not "improve forest health." (p.117) There is no evidence to suggest that it does. To the contrary, there is quite a bit of evidence suggesting that land disturbance (e.g. from seismic lines, land clearing for settlement) is likely to cause beetle outbreaks. "Land clearing debris provides ideal material for brood development." (Crosby & Curtis 1969. See also Holsten 1994; Safranyik & Linton 1999) Please consider the role of land disturbance as a result of action alternatives—including housing, roads, trails, seismic line, etc.—in spreading the spruce bark beetle infestation.	How can you equate a vegetation treatment such as logging beetle-kill spruce, (which removes the majority of the dead tree), to land clearing or seismic line construction? In these practices (land clearing or seismic line construction), vegetation is often pushed into large berms, which of course provide ideal material for brood development.
0329-83	Where, exactly, would be made available for logging? The Draft EIS/RMP doesn't have maps so it is very difficult to evaluate the proposal.	Map 45 on page 311 of the Draft RMP/EIS shows the areas within the Tiekel Block that have productive commercial timber stands. Although no specific areas are identified for commercial harvest beyond the one small scale project outlined on page 312, it can be assumed that areas identified on Map 45 and the beetle-kill areas on Map 46 of the Draft RMP/EIS would be the areas targeted for forestry practices. Identification of specific areas will occur during project implementation, subject to site-specific NEPA analysis. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been edited in Chapters 2 and 4 to present an anticipated level of annual timber harvest per year by alternative.
0329-84	Current state forest practices regulations do not prevent logging of salmon streams on	Any permitted activity would be subject to the ROPs and Stips outlined in Appendix III of the Draft RMP/EIS. Specific to anadromous streams is ROP-F&W-a-2, ROP-F&W-a-6,

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	private land. Even if they did, most of them aren't catalogued. Therefore, it is inappropriate to rely on non-existent regulations protecting salmon in this region.	and ROP-F&W-a-10.
0329-85	Logging roads would not be a useful addition to SRMAs. The Tiekel area specifically would suffer a great deal if logging roads were constructed.	Alternative D emphasizes temporary roads and winter harvests, see page 117 of the Draft RMP/EIS. However, as stated, retention of some roads might be considered if compatible with managing for roaded natural experience.
0329-86	Roads should always be temporary, winter roads. Please include this as a binding stipulation in the RMP. It is not true that winter logging is typical here. The last two years NPI has been logging summers in the Copper valley, and moving to Mat-Su for winters. That operation is ongoing.	On page 117 of the Draft RMP/EIS it states that "Within all harvest areas, the use of temporary road or winter sales would be emphasized." Use of temporary winter roads is also emphasized in ROP-Veg-b-1. However, it is not always possible to conduct operations in the winter.
0329-87	Soil damage from logging is especially keen in this area. "Impacts to soils due to timber harvest at times other than winter and especially when soils are wet could be very disruptive to ecosystems." (p.400) Logging and logging roads have negative impacts to soils. It removes nutrients, causes compaction, rutting, and erosion, and covers native soils with gravel. Also, long-term effects through increased access.	Alternative C and D as described on pages 116-117 of the Draft RMP/EIS, emphasize winter harvests and temporary roads for forestry practices. ROP-soils-b-1 and ROP-Soils-b-2 also deal with soil disturbance and the vegetative mat.
0329-88	What is the impact of large-scale logging on watersheds in this area? We are concerned that logging on a large scale could have significant negative impacts to fish.	The impacts of forestry practices on fish are described on pages 465, 468, 473, and 476 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This is not large scale and BLM does not propose "large scale" logging in alternatives A, C, or D. Even under alternative B, large scale logging would probably not occur because the Copper Basin market does not support it. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been edited to include a more specific estimation of anticipated timber harvest by alternative. ROPs aimed at mitigating impact to Riparian Areas and Water Quality are on pages 616-619 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-89	The Draft EIS says: "As the forest canopy develops and the understory species disappear, a site becomes progressively less productive." (p.195) This is simplistic and misleading. The "productivity" of a forest depends what you are looking for. A clearcut is	The sentence following the one identified on page 195 of the Draft RMP/EIS, goes on to explain which animals or species benefit from the differing stages of forest maturity. Productivity in this case refers to quality of wildlife habitat.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	more productive in terms of volume of wood fiber grown each year, while an old-growth forest is more productive in terms of salmon spawning habitat, while early seral stages are most productive for moose.	
0329-90	What is the basis of your timber inventory? (p.310) When and how did the Forest Service estimate there were a billion board feet of commercial timber in this area? That figure strikes us as astoundingly high. It would be a very poor basis for a sustained yield figure. Surely, much less is actually commercially viable. Climate change is radically changing this area, with unknown impacts on timber volume. This survey was also likely done prior to extensive logging, and beetle kill.	This inventory was conducted by the USFS in the late 1960's. The data was published in 1975 as USDA Forest Service Resource Bulletin PNW-62. It is not used as the basis for a sustained yield figure.
0329-91	Please figure an Annual Allowable cut, before pursuing large-scale commercial forestry on this land.	BLM, under any alternative, will not pursue large-scale commercial forestry in the Copper Basin. There is simply not the market.
0329-94	What would be logged, if you offered all this land in the Tiekel block? What level of demand is there for commercial wood products?	We don't know what exact areas would be selected for logging out of the 144,000 acres identified as suitable under Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS. This RMP makes a decision that this (commercial harvest) is an allowable use for these 144,000 acres. Proposals for timber harvest within this area would be considered in site-specific NEPA analyses. Page 312 of the Draft RMP/EIS talks about the demand for forestry products within the planning area. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes, in Chapters 2 and 4, an estimate of anticipated actual harvest per year, by alternative.
0329-95	What do you mean that forestry impacts from 144,000 acres of logging would be "slight to insignificant?" (p.422) What do those words mean?	As stated, this assessment is based on measures identified in the ROPs as well as the fact that logging would NOT occur on all 144,000 acres. These are acres under alternative D that are identified as suitable for commercial timber sale. Under Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS, a slight increase of actual logging would be expected over current levels. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes, in Chapter 2 and 4, an estimate of anticipated actual harvest per year, by alternative.
0341-14	There is enough inventory on private lands to support the timber industry. Public lands should not be offered if there are sufficient resources available on private lands. This should not be construed as to prevent prescription use of beetle kill timber, or the use	Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS emphasize forestry objectives for enhancing wildlife habitat and fuels reduction as well as providing for public use firewood gathering. See pages 116-117 of the Draft.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	of controlled burns to maintain ecosystem function.	
0376-4	Chitina supports the use of cooperative agreements to reduce hazardous fuels and improve wildlife habitat on Native selected lands for the issue of personal firewood gathering permits.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft RMP/EIS proposes this as a management option in Alternative D (the preferred alternative). BLM is currently in the process of signing a cooperative agreement with Chitina Corporation and this is an issue that can be worked on through that agreement.

6. LEASABLE AND LOCATABLE MINERALS

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL MINERALS		
0044-21	No new open pit mines or other non-reversible development should be allowed until more data has been collected. Postponing that development will avoid conflicts with other human uses not yet inventoried completely.	Thank you for your comment. At the onset of any large scale mining operation, an Environmental Impact Statement would be prepared. This process would allow for the complete inventory of uses and impacts associated with the activity as well as identify and mitigate conflicts. This RMP will make decisions regarding what areas would be open for such activities and under what general conditions.
0044-25	Many critical elements of BLM's National Environmental Policy Act Handbook (p. 363-4) cannot be addressed because of lack of data regarding the planning area. In my opinion, no new development or exploration should be allowed until appropriate data is available.	Where critical elements occur on BLM-managed lands in the planning area, they are addressed in the Draft RMP/EIS. This includes air quality, cultural resources, floodplains, T & E species, hazardous wastes, water quality, wetlands/riparian zones, and wild and scenic rivers. For all of these topics, there are discussions on existing conditions in Chapter 3 and environmental effects in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. BLM feels that sufficient data is available on all these elements to proceed with analysis and decision making.
0084-3	I strongly oppose the proposal to increase the amount of public lands open to oil and gas leasing and mining by nearly 80%, as outlined in your preferred alternative. The BLM must take a more balanced approach to managing these lands for the multiple use enjoyment of the American public, and not just for the extractive industries.	As shown on Page 517 of the Draft RMP/EIS, Alternative A proposes 61% of the land closed to leasing and 70% closed to mineral entry. Alternative C proposes 41% closed to oil and gas with 53% closed to mineral entry. So, alternatives to the preferred alternative (D) ARE considered that would open less land to potential mineral development. In addition, please see response 0305-1 regarding mineral development on selected lands.
0305-1	I oppose as well the plan to increase the amount of public lands open to oil and gas leasing and mining by nearly 80%, as outlined in your preferred alternative. I find this shocking and disturbing -- I ask the BLM to PLEASE adopt a balanced approach in its land management , taking into consideration their recreational use and enjoyment by the American public, not just as a resource to be exploited by the oil and gas industries. In addition, as a	Please keep in mind that under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D), most of the lands identified as open to mineral development are either State or Native selected (only about 16% [937,000] of all identified lands available to leasing would actually be open due to segregation). This means, because of a segregation against mineral leasing or mineral entry, that no mineral development could take place on these selected lands until the lands are conveyed. At that time, it is up to the selecting entity to decide whether or not to allow mineral development. If any of these selections were relinquished and the lands retained in long term federal ownership, then decisions considered in this RMP regarding mineral development would become effective, including protective measures as well as Required Operating Procedures and stipulations identified in Appendix C.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	wildlife rehabilitator and an avid observer of nature, I despair for the loss of habitat and for the many other species that man is driving to extinction. … With natural resources diminishing all over the globe, each decision needs to be carefully weighed and considered.	
0312-99	The analysis of environmental impacts connected with Leasable and Locatable Minerals (Issue #6) in the four alternatives is patently inadequate. Most fundamentally, the Environmental Consequences chapter of the EIS fails to identify any environmental impacts whatsoever from the various levels of new leasing and mineral development that would occur under the four alternatives. See EIS pages 517-521. Instead, the analysis of Issue #6 under each alternative focuses entirely on the reduced access to mineral resources that would occur where lands remain closed to mineral entry.	We disagree. Environmental consequences of anticipated mineral exploration and development under each alternative are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS, specifically pp. 380, 383, 387, 388, 392, 396, 397, etc. This level of analysis is repeated for each resource potentially impacted by mineral development (soils, air quality, wildlife, fisheries, etc).
0331-22	We support strong protection of renewable resources and other values from oil and gas development impacts. There should be a thorough and meaningful public process regarding any proposed oil and gas development.	Any oil and gas development proposed on BLM lands will have to undergo NEPA analysis which involves public participation. In addition, measures for resource protection are summarized in the tables in Appendices I and II of the Draft RMP/EIS as well as the Required Operating Procedures described in Appendix III
0338-2	Where mining is permitted, BLM should have plenty of resources to monitor the mining to be sure the area is not polluted . The land should be reclaimed to the way it was found when mining is over.	Glennallen Field Office does have a Geologist who monitors all active mining claims and operations on BLM lands, see page 338 of the Draft RMP/EIS. See ROP-Soils-a, ROP-Water-b, and ROP-Veg-a for rehabilitation and reclamation requirements as well as those outlined in the Plan of Operations for each individual mineral project.
0354-16	To protect natural resources, there can be no development. The Native community historically does not promote development, so ALTERNATIVE A is preferred. We want all lands in the Mentasta area closed to mineral leasing (p. 137-147, maps 18-23), particularly if ANCSA (d)(1) withdrawals are revoked.	Minimal development is anticipated under Alternatives A and C of the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative A does not allow for any mineral leasing in the areas around Mentasta. See Map 17 of the Draft RMP/EIS. All BLM-managed lands in the Mentasta area are State or Native selected. This means, because of a segregation against mineral leasing or mineral entry, that no mineral development could take place until the lands are conveyed. At that time, it is up to the selecting entity to decide whether or not to allow mineral development. If any of these selections were relinquished and the lands

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
		retained in long term federal ownership, then decisions considered in this RMP regarding mineral development would become effective.
0355-8	The EARMP should include a bibliography of all known minerals and mining reports for the planning area. Such information is available in electronic form from USGS and the State DGGS.	Because of the easily accessible nature of the information and in an effort to keep the document as clean and concise as possible, that information is not included in the Draft or Final EIS. Many of those reports and biographical information are included in the Management Situation Analysis for minerals as well as the Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenario that are on file at the Glennallen Field Office.
0355-29	Under Alternative B (page 126) and Alternative D (page 128) for Leasable Minerals (oil and gas), a provision should be included to allow leasing of areas that are otherwise closed for directional drilling when the drill is adjacent to but not within the closed area.	Areas closed to mineral leasing include sub-surface minerals. So, directional drilling to extract sub-surface resources in a closed area would not be permitted.
0355-33	In the section on Locatable Minerals (page 335) a section should be added discussing the major exploration projects and associated potential that exists in the EARMP. In the Denali Block alone and area of 271 square miles is now covered by State and Federal mining claims. This is of huge importance to the EARMP and the future of the State of Alaska.	The existing Federal mining claims are described on page 338 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Mineral occurrence and potential for locatable minerals is discussed on pp. 335-337. The current major exploration projects within the planning area are on State or Native lands and are therefore not considered within BLM alternatives.
0355-35	The discussion of Resource Allocation (page 337) is not correct. The statement is made that the staking of new mining claims would cloud the title of State or Native selections. This is not correct. All State and Native selections are already withdrawan from mineral entry and new mining claims cannot be staked on such lands.	BLM stands by this statement. The first sentence of the paragraph states "Segregations occur on State and Native-selected lands." The paragraph then explains why.
0355-36	A statement on page 338 implies that BLM's management of mining claims is minimal. This should be changed to read that it is " … minimal until such time as the claimant wishes to do some activity that will disturb the surface, at which time various laws and regulations must be followed before such disturbance is allowed."	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	GEOLOGY	
0143-1	Given the high degree of geological activity in the region, it is reckless to open these areas for drilling and mining. There are substantial risks of fracturing earth and ice masses. They include, but are not limited to, increase in temperature and danger of earthquake and/or volcanic activity causing collapses of pipe lines.	It is precisely those geological activities that make areas productive for mineral exploration and development. It is the responsibility of the mining companies to ensure the safety of their workers and to adhere to the ROPs and Stips (see Appendix C) to protect environmental resources.
	MINERALS OCCURRENCE & POTENTIAL	
0312-101	BLM has foreclosed that argument by acknowledging its assumptions that oil and gas development will occur, see EIS at 372, that small placer mines will likely be developed within the planning area, see id., that development of nickel and platinum group elements (PGE) could occur, see id. at 372-373, and that demand for gravel will increase over the life of the plan to support road maintenance and construction, see id. at 373. Since the RMP/EIS assumes that these various forms of mineral development will, or will likely, occur within the planning area during the life of the plan, the EIS must analyze the potential environmental impacts of that projected mineral development.	We do. See all sub-headings "Impacts to…from Mineral Exploration and Development" for each resource (air quality, soils, vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, etc.) in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0312-103	The analysis of Leasable and Locatable Minerals is flawed in several other respects as well. The goal identified for Issue #6 is far too narrow and fails to give adequate weight to the protection of sensitive resources on BLM lands. The goal as articulated emphasizes the facilitation of increased resource development with a passing nod to protection of environmental values. See EIS at 122 (“Maintain or enhance opportunities for mineral exploration and development while maintaining other resource values”). BLM’s land management mandate, however, extends far	BLM recognizes it's duties to protect other resources, as stated in goals for other resource areas (recreation, soils, air, water, vegetation, wildlife, cultural resources, etc, pp. 55-86, Draft RMP/EIS). These goals are not mutually exclusive, BLM believes that resource development is possible while providing protection and maintenance of other resource values. The Draft RMP/EIS also considers potential impacts to resource values from mineral exploration and development and considers a range of different management alternatives with varying degrees of resource protection.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	beyond resource development. BLM has a duty to protect the sensitive biological resources on its lands and to safeguard the public trust in those resources. Thus, the goal for Issue #6 should be revised to place a greater emphasis on protecting sensitive resources such as water quality, air quality, wildlife habitat, subsistence resources, and wilderness values.	
0312-105	The EIS states that BLM will continue to "provide detailed mineral assessment of specific areas." See EIS at 122. BLM should provide a citation for the source of its authority to conduct this assessment.	Authority for these assessments is provided by Section 1010 of ANILCA. This information has been added on page 137 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0312-107	Revisions to the 1872 Mining Law are necessary before the BLM proceeds with opening up public lands to mineral entry. In the meantime, The BLM should identify area wide terms, conditions, or special considerations needed to protect resource values.8 Guidelines for rehabilitation and re-vegetation should be identified in open areas to minimize noxious weed or non-native plant introduction.	The Preferred Alternative of the Draft RMP/EIS does identify area-wide terms, conditions, or special considerations needed to protect resource values (see tables, Appendix I, Alternative D column). It also establishes Required Operating Procedures to minimize noxious weed introduction in reclamation efforts (see Appendix III).
0319-2	I am strongly opposed to mining and exploration, particularly in the Tangle Lakes area. This archeological area is highly used by Alaskans for recreation of many types. Mining destroys habitat and depletes fish, birds and game, leaves visual scars and pollution ... ruins existing roads while tearing up the land for more roads, is noisy and dusty while occurring , and has a history of minimal societal benefit while leaving permanent scars.	Thanks for your comment. Alternative C would maintain a closure on mineral entry in the Denali Highway area. Please keep in mind that management prescribed in this RMP only affects BLM-managed lands, not State lands, where the current focus on mining development is north of the Denali Highway on State land.
0321-8	The 78% increase in oil and gas leasing is too aggressive, we cannot support the opening of 79% of the entire management area for leasing.	Thanks for the comment. Alternatives A and C of the Draft RMP/EIS consider management scenarios under which less land would be open to leasing. The increase also includes acreage of selected lands, which are segregated to mineral entry. See response to comment 0305-1.
0329-98	Why leave coal leasing decisions off for a case-by-case decision? (p.123) Please don't	Because there has been little interest in coal and it is anticipated that this will continue, based on local geology, access, and marketability. Occurrence and potential for coal is

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	lease coal. Why is there no MSA for coal? What coal resources exist in the planning area? What is their potential for development?	discussed on p 325-329 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-99	How does the proposed action relate to possible development of the Bering River coalfield? The Draft EIS just says, "it is unlikely that these coal resources will be developed in the next 15-20 years." (p.325) What is the basis for that? At least in the case of the Bering river field, development in the next couple decades is reasonably foreseeable. What impact would proposed action have on that?	This assumption is based on past history of coal leasing in the planning area (one federal lease in 1984), interest from industry, and access. The preferred alternative of the Draft RMP/EIS would maintain a withdrawal on the western 2/3 of BLM-managed lands in the Bering Glacier area. This would make BLM managed lands in the vicinity of the Bering River Field closed to coal leasing.
0329-100	What is the impact of mineral exploration, as opposed to development? We are concerned that opening broad areas to mineral entry will result in a great deal of exploration, very very little of which will result in any actual economic return. This exploration will just be a cost to the land, with no economic return to society. Exploration would result in roads and trails, which can degrade habitat and have far-reaching impacts. It also can cause beetle kill when brush is not dealt with properly, disturbance to critters, and degrades wilderness values.	In most environmental effects discussions in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS, impacts from exploration are included with the discussion of impacts from development. See Chapter 4, under sub-headings "Impacts to…from Mineral Exploration and Development." Effects from roads and trails associated with exploration are discussed as part of these analyses.
0329-102	Many of the areas proposed to be opened to mining are unreachable mountain peaks, or are buried under miles of ice. What is the point of opening these areas?	The question could easily be asked, what is the point of keeping them closed, especially when ANCSA d(1) withdrawals can be replaced with much more site-specific protective measures, driven by resource-specific concerns. ANCSA d(1) withdrawals were never intended to be used as a long-term protective measure. The intent of the withdrawals was to limit appropriation of the lands in order to complete inventories of resources and assessment of values to allow for an orderly development of the BLM's management objectives (p. 291, Draft RMP/EIS). This planning process is the means by which that is accomplished.
0329-103	What is the basis for a 200-foot setback for oil & gas rigs from anadromous streams under alternative C? Why not 400 feet? Why not ten feet?	200 feet is the distance used by the State (DNR) in their Copper Basin Area Plan for closure to mineral entry around anadromous streams and rivers.
0329-105	We are concerned about the MAN project, by	The areas where the MAN claims are located and where the most intensive exploration

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Nevada Star and others. According to the Draft EIS, development of this mine would roughly follow the pattern of the Pogo mine near Delta. Such a venture, with on the order of 800-1,600 acres of surface disturbance (BLM 2004, Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential Report), could be disastrous to the wildland values of this area.	efforts have been focused have been conveyed to the State of Alaska. If development occurs on these lands, BLM is prepared to field requests for access across BLM-managed lands, based on decisions made in this planning effort.
0329-106	The Draft EIS fails to disclose any logic to why the minerals alternatives are written the way they are. Why are there no recommendations from the Minerals Potential report? Where did the positions come from?	The Mineral Occurrence Report is not intended to give recommendations for opening lands to mineral exploration and development. Its primary purpose is to identify areas of High, Moderate, Low and No Mineral Potential regardless of land ownership. The Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential Report (2004) was used extensively for much of the information presented in Chapter 3 of the Draft RMP/EIS. It was also used to help make decisions regarding alternative considerations for opening or closing specific areas to locatable mineral entry. Whether an area is considered as open or closed to mineral entry or mineral leasing in this process is not necessarily dependent on its' mineral potential. In other words, just because an area is open doesn't necessarily mean that it has high potential (geologically) for mineral development. More often, determinations were reached and alternatives developed based on what levels of resource protection were needed, given the resource values present in a particular area.
0329-110	Why aren't there any alternative ways to deal with Coalbed Methane? This type of drilling poses unique issues, that ought to be dealt with in the RMP. Current regulations are plainly not up the task. Current state policy is the adopt regulations for this area, only after development is under way. BLM should take the lead on this issue. It will be much easier to do this now, rather than later, under pressure from an application and upset interest groups. CBM would not be appropriate on most of the wetland country in the area. Those areas should be made off limits to CBM development. Please require specific operating plans, and protect surface owner interests from split estates.	The lack of alternatives for coalbed methane is based on the following statement (p. 330 Draft RMP/EIS): "However, we know of no companies testing lignite coal for gas, and with present technology it is unlikely that industry will produce commercial amounts of gas from lignite coal within Alaska for the reasonably foreseeable future." This assumption is carried through into Chapter 4 (p. 371). Additionally, coal on BLM lands is either too remote or doesn't meet the requirements to be a Coalbed Methane prospect.
0329-111	How can geophysical work be considered in sensitive wetlands during the summer?	Please see the Required Operating Procedures on page 619 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Summer geophysical work has huge environmental impacts.	
0329-115	Please consider the well currently drilled by Rutter & Wilbanks west of Glennallen, along the highway. Also, consider the gasline Right-of-Way application currently being reviewed by the state. These are critical considerations in regards to cumulative impacts.	Current findings from the Rutter and Wilbanks well are consistent with assumptions made in the RFD. Also, the RFD assumes 120 miles of pipeline construction necessary if oil and gas development occurred in the area. These factors are already considered in the analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-116	What level of confidence do you have in the RFD scenario? What is the margin of error?	The RFD was prepared using the best up-to-date information available. As stated in the RFD, "Estimating how much oil and gas activity will occur in the GFOA during the next 15 years is difficult at best. Timing and location of future commercial-sized discoveries cannot be predicted until exploration of those reserves occurs." Given the geology of the area, results of recent exploration, and the amount of selected land in the planning area, it is more likely that the RFD over-estimates development levels than underestimates them. However, analyzing impacts that could occur and measures to mitigate them, as is done in the Draft RMP/EIS, is better than not addressing the possibility of development.
0329-117	The Draft EIS is incorrect that if an exploratory well were plugged and abandoned, "drilling muds and cuttings would be re-injected into the bore hole." (p.469) Re-injection only works given larger fields of more than one well. Wildcat exploratory wells typically still use reserve pits—a technique that has been refined little in the last many decades. The current well near Glennallen, in fact, has a reserve pit.	The effects analysis was based on the following, from the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario prepared for this planning effort: "The BLM (as well as the State) discourages the use of reserve pits and most operators now store drilling solids and fluids in tanks, or in temporary on-pad storage areas until they can be hauled out or injected down the annulus of the well in accordance with State of Alaska statute. A permit is required by the State for onsite disposal or storage of drill cuttings." The current well you refer to near Glennallen is located on Ahtna land.
0329-121	The Draft EIS (p.448) ignores the fact that exploration wells are commonly abandoned, and are never reclaimed. For example, the old Katalla drillsite has been sitting there leaking oil into salmon streams for decades, without any cleanup.	The Draft EIS makes this assumption because, on BLM lands, abandoned exploration wells are reclaimed. The example you cite from Katalla which is not on BLM-managed lands.
0329-122	The Draft EIS does not appreciate that oil toxicity is persistent. (p.417) For example, the Draft EIS says: "The impacts of gravel pads are considered permanent, while those of oil spills, which are cleaned up immediately, allow recovery within a few years to two decades.	Persistence of oil in the environment might be debatable, depending on which research is cited. However, BLM does consider the effect of spills in the Draft RMP/EIS and applies Required Operating Procedures to minimize the potential for such spills. Analysis of environmental consequences has to take into account anticipated level of development as well as intensity. This is what the effects determinations in Chapter 4 are based on, as explained on p. 361 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Most oil spills occur on gravel or ice pads, and consequently, their effects do not reach the vegetation. Overall, past spills on Alaska's terrestrial habitats have caused minor ecological damage, and ecosystems have shown a good potential for recovery, with wetter areas recovering more quickly."(p.429) Newer and better evidence is clearly indicating that your sited studies are old and obsolete, and that toxic impacts of oil spills are very persistent. (Ott 2005, Peterson et al. 2003)	
0329-123	Drilling setbacks of 500 feet don't seem like they'll prevent impacts from thermokarsting. (p.416)	If soils in a particular area are particularly susceptible to thermokarsting, then the ROPs and stipulations allow for adjusting the buffer distance through a site-specific NEPA analysis. All proposed drilling locations are subject to approval by the BLM.
0329-124	We are concerned that "lakes and riverine pools could be subject to dewatering if consumptive use is high," especially during winter. (p.417) Oil & gas drilling, and mining both use huge amounts of water, and dewatering impacts are likely. How much water does each well use?	Drilling operations can use from 10,000 - 35,000 gallons of water per day. Effects of oil and gas development on water quality and fish and fish habitat is described in Chapter IV of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-125	Winter-only drilling is not an effective mitigation measure, especially with climate change. The current well is a winter-only one, and it is July. These sorts of seasonal restrictions are very difficult to work in an unpredictable, tight-lipped exploration industry like oil.	Winter only drilling is not proposed as a Required Operating Procedure or stipulation in the Draft RMP/EIS. Because of timing restrictions associated with trumpeter swan nesting or other stipulations, winter operations might be the only feasible option in some locations.
AREAS PROPOSED AS OPEN, LIMITED, OR CLOSED TO MINERALS		
0017-1	Alternative D is opening up millions of acres that have been closed, proposing to open those, and I think that would also cause significant impact -- it could cause significant impact to subsistence as well. Concerns that my organization has are impacts to the ecology of the area, which goes hand-in-hand with subsistence but damage to the Copper River watershed by increased mining, both oil and gas and hard rock mining. And if you take a	The environmental effects of implementing Alternative D, under an anticipated level of development, are described in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS, including potential impacts to fisheries and to subsistence. See pages 476, 471 for fisheries and pages 533 for subsistence.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	look at kind of the cumulative impacts of this area, there's already a platinum mine being proposed to go in up by Tangle Lakes.	
0034-4	[I]n the plan they're talking about opening up the Alphabet Hills for development and that's where our caribou migration path is. It is just too vital of an area to open up for development.	The preferred alternative (D) would recommend revocation of an existing withdrawal (PLO 6329). The revocation of this withdrawal would have no immediate effect on the Alphabet Hills, which is State or Native or dual selected. Selected lands have a segregation against mineral entry. Consequently, no mineral entry could occur on these lands until they are conveyed to the selecting entity, at which time it is their choice on whether or not mineral development occurs. The only way this decision (to remove the withdrawal) would have an effect would be if the selections were relinquished and the lands were retained in long term federal ownership.
0060-1	One is the issue of oil and gas and mineral openings. There has been, under the preferred Alternative D, a drastic increase in the percentage of the land that would be available for these openings. And while I realize that this is in part because so much of the land is slated to be withdrawn as Native selected or State selected land, I would stress the importance of BLM setting a precedent for land management and for approaching this management process as much as possible as if all of the lands were truly, you know, contiguous and going to be managed as a parcel long-term. Simply because, I think, part of the purpose of this planning process is to create patterns of use and set precedence for patterns of use, otherwise the planning process wouldn't be occurring at all, and to set an example for how the lands should be managed.	Please see response to comment 0060-10.
0060-6	We recommended that for the planning of Leasable Minerals, Oil, and Gas that the BLM follow Alternative C. Alterative C is the most restrictive to mineral development and may be presumed is the best alterative to ensuring the ecological balance of the Interior. As this is the first plan in twenty years, adhering to an approach that is both cautionary and	Thanks for the comment. Alternative D (the preferred) of the Draft RMP/EIS opens more lands to mineral entry or mineral leasing, through revocation of ANCSA d(1) withdrawals. This does not necessarily mean that development will occur on these lands.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	conservative is necessary. Under Alterative C, the highest percentage of acreage possible ...remains protected from entry through closures or No Surface Occupancy.	
0060-9	In the planning of Locatable Minerals it is recommend that the BLM proceed with Alternative A. In regards to the planning of Locatable Minerals, the BLM has not enacted a viable land management plan in east Alaska since the 1980's. Given the changing climate of development, politics, and the needs of Alaska it is recommended that the BLM proceed with great caution.	Thanks for the comment. We recognize that the Management Framework Plan adopted in 1980 is out-dated, driving the need for this planning effort.
0060-10	BLM's preferred option is unacceptable. The closing of only 15% [to mineral development] (1,068,000 acres) and ensuring accessibility to 85% (5,988,000 acres) would expose too much ecological diversity to the potential threat from a mining operation.	Opening 85% of the BLM-managed lands to mineral entry does not mean that development will occur on 85% of the land. Nor does it mean that accessibility is ensured. Assuming alternative D is adopted in the Final RMP, future development would be contingent on several factors: 1) If the land is State or Native selected, the land would either have to be conveyed (in which case the selecting entity chooses whether or not to allow mineral development) or the selection relinquished and the land retained in long-term federal ownership; 2) the area must have mineral potential enough to warrant development, which is an expensive proposition; 3) other factors such as access, topographic features, and existing infrastructure would need to be favorable. These factors were considered in anticipating levels of development for the analysis that was done in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0067-1	If we start closing things off so we cannot use them or we start closing mining it's going to hurt the people that live here.	Thanks for the comment. Economic impacts of implementing different management alternatives are discussed starting on page 522 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0097-10	Alternative C would open up 59% and 47%, respectively [to oil and gas leasing and mineral entry]. Since so many of these lands are selected, and will upon conveyance be opened for exploration and development, we believe there is no need for BLM to open up the lands it retains. We support Alternative C for this reason. In turn, retaining the d(1) withdrawals affords more opportunities for recreational access.	Thanks for the comment, although we don't agree with your conclusion that retaining the ANCSA d(1) withdrawals would afford more opportunities for recreational access.
0147-1	We support the proposal to increase the	Thanks for the comment.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	amount of public lands open to oil and gas leasing and mining by nearly 80%, as outlined in one of your alternatives. The BLM must take a more balanced approach to managing these lands for the multiple use enjoyment of the American public.	
0184-1	My biggest concern with the Plan is the the [sic] potential opening of lands to mineral exploration. It seems to me, opening lands to mineral exploration would be in direct conflict with every other recreational and subsistence use of the lands. Please keep mineral exploration restrictions in place.	See Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS for a detailed analysis of the environmental effects of anticipated mineral development, by alternative. In addition, see response 0060-10.
0312-98	Lands recognized for outstanding resource values should not be considered for leasable or locatable mineral entry: • All portions of Wild and Scenic River corridors should be closed to leasing, exploration, and development • All lands within proposed RNA, ACECs and SRMAs • Lands within 400 feet of anadromous rivers and streams • VRM classes I and II in the entire planning area • Primary trumpeter swan breeding habitat not included in an ACEC • Critical moose winter range • Areas within ¼ mile of historically active bald eagle and osprey nest sites • Lands adjacent to communities and residential areas As we have stated elsewhere in this document, the lands within the viewshed of the Glenn, Richardson, and Denali Highways should remain closed to mineral withdrawal on BLM administered lands.	All your suggestions are considered in Alternative C, some in Alternative D of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-97	We are adamantly opposed to the drastic increase in mining proposed in the Draft EIS/RMP. The Draft proposal is, basically, to lift as many restrictions to mining as possible, as soon as possible. This is an extremist vision that we find disturbing. Alternative C only maintains withdrawals on	Please see response to comment 0329-104.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	about 50% of BLM land, opening the rest to exploitation. It stretches good sense to propose OPENING millions of acres to development, and call it "conservation." Clearly there has been some misunderstanding about the meaning of "conservation." We would support the opposite approach—that is, maintain all mineral withdrawals, and maybe consider recommending some new ones. There is plenty of land available for mining already. What is left has little potential, and could only be developed at great expense to operators and the environment. At the same time, we also support limited grizzled prospector habitat. It is a way of life and we don't want to deny people that opportunity. It is reasonable for small businesses to work some of the gold placer deposits, for example, where that doesn't conflict with fish or wildlife.	
0329-101	The Draft EIS doesn't do a very good job explaining what impact these decisions regarding minerals will have, on the ground. For example, do the RMP decisions have any bearing on the amount of placer gold operations? If these lands are closed, will the same miners just go somewhere else? Or, if they are opened, will more mining take place in the state? Or, will existing miners move to BLM land, and off private or state land?	Assumptions for anticipated level of mineral development in the Draft RMP/EIS for each alternative are based on the Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential Report prepared as part of the planning process. Assumptions used in the analysis for locatable mineral development are explained on pp. 372 and 373 and under "Impacts by Alternative" starting on p. 375. See, for example, the discussion of impacts to recreation from locatable minerals (under "Locatable Minerals") on page 388.
0329-104	Why would maintaining withdrawals on 50% "severely limit development?" (p.406) Please describe the basis for this statement.	Sure. For example, under alternative C for leasable minerals, 41% of the area would be closed to leasing. In addition, 33% of the area would be open to leasing, but subject to No Surface Occupancy due to resource constraints (page 130, Draft RMP/EIS). This essentially severely limits 75% of the BLM-managed lands in the planning area to mineral leasing.
0329-107	How can increasing the amount of drilling and exploration be considered "conservation?" ...	Please see response to comment 0329-104. Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS places a strong emphasis on resource conservation by severely limiting 75% of the BLM-managed lands to mineral leasing.
0329-108	Exploration, drilling, transportation and	Thanks for the comment. Actually, alternatives B, C, and D establish a 500 foot buffer

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	consumption of fossil fuels hurt fish. That is reason enough to maintain these closures. Wetland areas, and salmon spawning habitat, should be strictly off limits to oil & gas.	(no oil and gas drilling or facilities) around all fish bearing streams, rivers, and lakes (see Required Operating Procedures, Appendix III of the Draft RMP/EIS).
0329-112	Why are 1,819,000 acres wide open to leasing even under the Conservation alternative? Another 2,322,000 would be open subject to some constraints. It would be a reasonable alternative to keep all the land closed to entry. Why not even consider it?	See response to comment 0329-104.
0329-113	It is hard to tell what areas are open and closed under the various alternatives in the Bering glacier area. The eastern two-thirds, and eastern third are proposed to be open in different alternatives, but that's not reflected on the map.	This will be shown on a map in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Thanks for the comment.
0329-114	It is impossible to tell which areas would be open under the different terms and conditions. It isn't shown on any map or described in the text. Please include this information in the Revised Draft EIS/RMP.	Maps 18-23 of the Draft RMP/EIS show areas open to mineral leasing and mineral entry by alternative. Short narrative in the tables on pp. 130-134 describe areas under the different terms and conditions of leasing. Because of the overlapping nature of some of the seasonal and minor leasing stipulations (moose winter range, trumpeter swan habitat, etc) portraying these together on a map is very hard and very confusing to the reviewer. Maps 19-26 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been modified to clarify presentation of this information.
0331-21	We support the strongest proposed closures and restrictions on locatable mineral entry. Lands that are being mined or have been mined too often lose their value for other uses. Mining laws, regulations and enforcement have thus far proven a failure in protecting air quality, water quality, wildlife habitats and visual resources. Until that changes, good stewardship requires that quality lands be off-limits to mining and mineral exploration.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS imposes the greatest restrictions on mineral development. We disagree with your assessment. We feel that mineral development can be conducted with protection provided for other resource values.
0335-1	I'm primarily a non-motorized user of the Tangle lakes, Gulkana, Delta River and Copper River (also Nizina and Chitina Rivers). I feel very strongly that these areas should be closed to mineral exploration and development. They	Thanks for the comment. Alternatives C and D of the Draft RMP/EIS would maintain closures against mineral entry and mineral leasing in the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridors (includes the Tangle Lakes area). Alternative C would maintain a closure against mineral entry and leasing along the Denali Highway.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	are our easily road accessible treasures, open to the common person w.o. having to fly in, to fish, hunt, hike, snowshoe and ski. Please protect these lands for future generations. The idea of some Fort Knox-sized open pit mine in the Delta R. area is a total nightmare. IT would completely destroy the wilderness values that make the land so important and valuable, now and forever.	
0346-1	Having said that, I oppose Alternative D for Eastern Alaska. I disagree that a nearly 80% increase in areas open to mineral, oil, and gas leasing is "balanced."	Please see response to comment 0060-10.
0355-1	New Approach Needed: It is not necessary to close lands to mineral entry in order to establish areas where there can be a focus on recreation. Trails and remote cabin sites can be established without closing huge areas to mineral entry. Rather than closing areas to establish SRMAs, [sic] we recommend that 5 or 10 acre sites be defined in areas that are not mineralized. These areas could be established for the cabin sites, with the requirement in the plan that, should the area be affected by mining in the future, the mining company would be responsible for relocating the cabins. The majority of the land can remain open and available. If a valuable mineral deposit is identified, that deposit can afford to pay for relocation of the cabin. Large areas of mineral closures do not just affect he immediate area but rather they will typically render the whole vicinity unattractive for mineral exploration. Mineral companies have been burned so badly and so often by closures, special use areas, etc. that they are not likely to ever consider an area with large closures.	The Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) would only close 15% of BLM-managed lands to locatable mineral entry. And, areas are not necessarily closed to mineral entry because SRMAs are established. In the preferred alternative, mineral entry would be permitted within portions of the Denali, Delta Range, and Tiekel SRMAs, unless prohibited by existing PLOs (such as the inner corridor of the pipeline/utility corridor). Your suggestion is considered under Alternative B, which opens all areas (except the wild portions of the Wild and Scenic River corridors) to mineral entry.

7. SUBSISTENCE/SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL SUBSISTENCE AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS		
0341-3	Salmon fishing is the keystone to the regional sustainable economy. Copper River Salmon are the measure of wealth and the key to survival for the indigenous people of the region. Although separated by mountains and glaciers, the Ahtna and Eyak have always shared the salmon of the river system. Subsistence is a major factor in the economy. Each year on the lower river Cordova/Eyak residents harvest about 175 pounds of subsistence food per person. In the upper basin, residents harvest about 340 lbs. Copper River salmon are the most important component in the subsistence economy. On the commercial fishing front, "Copper River Salmon" have become a recognized brand, commanding a premium price in the market. Annually, about 1.5 million salmon are harvested at the mouth of the Copper River by the commercial fishing fleet, with an ex-vessel value of $20 million. Cannery workers, plant operations, tenders, and product transportation contribute an additional $20 million. Upriver fishermen harvest on the order of 200,000 salmon. Various economic formulas place sport-fishing value between $2 and $5 million, and subsistence and personal use value in excess of $1.5 million. Conservative estimates place the economic value of fisheries related business in the region at between $ 40million and $45million annually, the largest economy and employer in the watershed. (Additional cited information on economics available by request)	Thank you for the comment. A short summary of this information has been added to Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 376).

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
SUBSISTENCE, ANILCA SECTION 810 ANALYSIS		
0033-4	Subsistence; I'll wrap it up in a few a sentences. Subsistence is not about killing game or hunting, it's about sharing of resources and it's about management of those resources in a way that constitutes the wellness of the community that the resources are located at. So we don't want to have a plan that promotes killing game, and basically that's what yours does, that's not acceptable. Let's not talk about shooting things. Let's talk about putting food on the table. That's what subsistence is all about and what it should remain to be.	Thank you for your comment. Additional language has been added to the description of subsistence user patterns in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 376) to emphasize sharing as a central cultural value in the subsistence way of life. The Section 810 analysis will focus, as provided in the statute, on the potential for land management decisions to significantly restrict subsistence uses, including subsistence harvests.
0044-17	Native traditional berry picking is practiced on the flats within two miles of either side of the Susitna River bridge. Development of that area should protect the quality of those subsistence areas.	Thanks for the comment. Information has been added to Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 373) that discusses subsistence use patterns in the planning area.
0080-6	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends that BLM encourage cooperative agreements (or memoranda or understanding) with local tribal entities and land owners to resolve land management issues, and to improve/protect habitat through actions such as prescribed burning.	Through this planning process, the BLM, Glennallen Field Office has entered into MOUs with Ahtna, Inc., Tazlina Village, Cheesh'Na, and Chitina. The purpose of these MOUs is to encourage and facilitate open communication in implementation of this RMP.
0080-9	Finally, be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends BLM carefully examine the requirements of ANILCA Section 810 to protect subsistence uses in developing the final plan, particularly the determinations required when an action has the potential to significantly restrict subsistence uses.	These required determinations have been fully examined in the final Section 810 analysis, Appendix E of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0164-56	Subsistence uses should have a higher priority than resource development.	The provisions of Title VIII of ANILCA ensure that subsistence uses receive a priority in allocations in comparison to other consumptive uses, such as commercial and recreational harvests. However, the statute does not provide a priority for subsistence resources and subsistence uses in relation to land use decisions concerning resource

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
		development. Section 810 requires a specific analysis of potential impacts to subsistence uses. If the proposed land use decision "may significantly restrict" subsistence uses, then the manager must provide notice and conduct a hearing in the affected region. Following the hearing, the manager may proceed with the proposed use, even if it might restrict subsistence uses, provided that the manager determines that the proposed activity is necessary under the agency mandate, will effect a minimum of public land, and is accompanied by appropriate mitigation measures.
0164-57	Page 150 - under D) Alternative B second paragraph, the percent of moose harvest provided by hunting in the transportation and utility corridor should be included.	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0164-58	Page 152 - At the conclusion of the description of the alternative for Subsistence Issue, there is no table presenting the "Alternative Summary" as was done for the other six issue. Ahtna Inc. requests that this table be created and included in the Final EARMP.	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 169).
0164-59	Page 341 - The first two paragraphs as a way of introducing the complex environment of Subsistence can be general to present an overview, but the third paragraph is unnecessarily vague. There is data for most of the communities in the planning area that would provide specifics to the Copper Basin household harvest and use of fish and wildlife and also sharing of subsistence resources. This information would seem more relevant to the description of the "Affected Environment" than most rural families in the Alaska. Ahtna Inc. requests that this information be researched and included in the Final EARMP	A more complete and specific description of subsistence use patterns in the planning area communities is required and has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (starting on page 373).
0164-60	Page 342 - Under b) Current Program Administration, since the concept of customary and traditional use determinations was defined in a) on page 341; it would be helpful to list the communities that have customary and traditional use determinations fort he species identified as important subsistence resources,	The change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS by referencing the Federal subsistence regulations.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	caribou (p206), moose (p208), and salmon (p248). Ahtna Inc. requests that this information be presented in the Final EARMP.	
0164-61	Page 526 - The first fill paragraph on this page contains an inaccuracy … Possibly the statement would be correct if it read: "State management on the non-Federal lands had reduced non-resident hunting . . ." This section would also be the appropriate place to discuss how the State Tier II system in place for the Nelchina Caribou Herd and Unit 13 does not address the subsistence needs of the residents of the Copper Basin since the State law allows priority for all residents of Alaska. Data is available to show the residency of the hunters who receive Tier II permits which would confirm the lack of priority for rural residents in the planning area. Ahtna Inc requests that this information be researched and included in the Final EARMP as it illustrates the subsistence issue more clearly.	The original sentence in the Draft RMP/EIS refers to reductions in non-local hunting under Tier II management, compared to previously, and is therefore accurate. Additional discussion of the State Tier II management systems in Unit 13, including discussion of relatively low local success in obtaining permits is warranted and included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0164-63	Page 652 - In the 5th paragraph on this page the word "may" should be "would" so that the sentence should read: "Revocation of the ANCSA d(1) withdrawals and PLO 5150 would significantly reduce the availability of game resources . . ."	We agree. The change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0164-64	Page 654 - Under B.2.4. Findings, the second sentence of the second paragraph is garbled. This sentence should be edited to state correct information.	The sentence has been revised in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page E-10) to more clearly point out that the key impact to subsistence uses under alternative B is in the likely displacement of current Federal subsistence users by competition from other users. A second sentence will point out that alternative B is not considered likely to directly reduce key subsistence populations.
0175-43	Page 292, Transportation and Utility Corridor, First paragraph final sentence. While this sentence is technically correct, it is important to clarify that the State regulates subsistence harvests throughout Alaska unless the state regulations are superseded by federal	Language will be clarified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to point out that the State previously managed subsistence hunting and fishing across Alaska in compliance with Title VIII of ANILCA. After 1990, the Federal government was obliged to directly manage the Title VIII rural subsistence priority on Federal public lands. The State continues to manage State-defined subsistence and other hunting and fishing activities, including on Federal public lands, except where these are closed to non-Federally qualified

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	subsistence regulations on federal public lands. In other words, both the state and federal regulations govern subsistence harvests on federal public lands.	subsistence uses.
0175-44	Pages 341-343, Subsistence. In this chapter, we expected a description of subsistence activities in the planning area, as is suggested in the first sentence of the "How to Read This Chapter" section on page 159. However, neither this section nor the ANILCA Section 810 Analysis in Appendix V provides this important information. If discussion of the potential effects of proposed management actions and measures on subsistence uses of the affected lands will be limited to this chapter and/or the ANILCA Section 810 evaluation, then we request the Bureau fully develop this discussion in the final plan. We urge that a revised discussion include the following: (1) a description of subsistence activities currently taking place in all areas of the planning region; (2) an evaluation of the potential impacts to these activities by the proposed actions; (3) an assessment of the potential cumulative effects to subsistence resources or opportunities referenced in the Review Summary; and (4) a discussion of measures that would be taken to avoid or mitigate negative impacts. This may entail preparing a much more detailed 810 evaluation than typically accompanies land use planning documents, but will be essential to fully address the issue and inform the affected public(s).	A fuller description of subsistence use patterns in the planning area has been added in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, starting on page 373. Concerning your remaining points, the Section 810 evaluation at this stage is only focused on the question of whether any of the proposed alternatives, including the cumulative case, "may significantly restrict subsistence uses." Having concluded in the affirmative, Section 810 requires hearings, and these were conducted in summer 2005. The final set of determinations including proposed mitigation measures, are developed following the public hearings, and appear in the complete Section 810 analysis which accompanies the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as Appendix E.
0175-45	Page 341, 2nd paragraph and page 203, 2nd paragraph. We request the discussion of "sport hunting" (second paragraph page 341 and second paragraph page 203) be corrected. The State subsistence law currently includes all	Language will be clarified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to point out that from 1980 – 1990 the State managed subsistence hunting and fishing across Alaska in compliance with Title VIII of ANILCA. During that era, hunting by non-rural residents was commonly referred to as "sport hunting." After 1990, the Federal government was obliged to directly manage the Title VIII rural subsistence priority on Federal public lands. The

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	residents as subsistence users in areas where subsistence uses are authorized in State regulation. Federal agencies frequently mischaracterize hunters who are not federally qualified subsistence users to be "sport hunters." Non-federally qualified subsistence users who are state residents often qualify as subsistence users under the State regulations. It is also important to clarify that State regulations classify hunters as being "resident" or "nonresident" hunters.	State continues to manage State-defined subsistence and other hunting and fishing activities, including on Federal public lands, except where these are closed to non-Federally qualified subsistence uses. Since 1990, the state no longer refers to "sport hunters", since hunting by all Alaskans is considered state-defined subsistence hunting. State regulations do distinguish between "resident" hunting for all Alaskans and "non-resident" hunting by persons from other states or nations.
0175-46	Page 342, 2nd and 3rd full paragraphs. We request that the second and third full paragraphs on page 342 indicate that State of Alaska regulations continue to apply on federal public lands, unless superseded (i.e., restricted) by federal subsistence regulations. State of Alaska regulation apply as well as on all State and private lands.	The language will be changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to specify that the State formerly implemented a subsistence management program that complied with Title VIII of ANILCA, until this was overturned by the Alaska Supreme Court. Since then, the Federal Subsistence Board has directly managed the title VIII rural subsistence priority on Federal Public lands. The State manages State-defined subsistence and other hunting and fishing activities, including on Federal lands, unless these have been closed to non-Federally qualified subsistence uses.
0175-47	Page 343. Two of the bullets at the top of page 343 may overstate the Bureau's role in subsistence management. We request revising the second bullet to read, "Manage BLM land and habitat . . . ". We question whether Bureau staff actually "develops interagency subsistence management regulations and policies," as asserted in the fourth bullet, or if they instead make recommendations regarding regulations and policies for decision makers.	Language will be clarified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to more clearly state that the BLM participates in the inter-agency Federal subsistence program, with BLM staff advising the BLM State Director (or his delegated representative) who serves as a voting member of the rule-making Federal Subsistence Board.
0175-49	Page 373, Resource Assumptions: Subsistence. We question that the Bureau would continue to have a "major role in the management of subsistence resources on public lands" if as many as 5.5 million acres of the 7.1 million acres currently managed by the Bureau in the planning area are conveyed to the State and Native interests. Such a	We stand by our assumption. Local rural communities rely heavily on the unencumbered Federal lands, managed by the BLM for a significant portion of their overall subsistence harvests.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	conveyance would substantially reduce the amount of Bureau lands in the planning area and would require fewer Bureau resources. We acknowledge the continuing role the Bureau will play in federal subsistence management activities generally in Alaska, whether or not a substantial portion of the Bureau lands in the planning area are conveyed to the State	
0175-60	Appendix V: ANILCA Section 810 Analysis of Subsistence Impacts. As noted above (comments from pages 341-343), neither the main text nor this appendix presents a description of subsistence uses of the planning area, which we consider an important deficiency in the plan. Enough information about subsistence uses is presented, however, to enable the Bureau to conclude " . . . at Alternative B and the cumulative case considered in this Draft RMP/EIS are likely to significantly restrict subsistence uses." To comply with required procedures in this situation, the Bureau has initiated public hearings to solicit public comment from local communities and subsistence users. We recommend that the Bureau use testimonies at these hearings to supplement what already had been documented about subsistence uses in the planning area.	We agree that a fuller description of subsistence use patterns is needed in Chapter 3. See the revised version provided in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, starting on page 373.
0312-78	Pursuant to ANILCA 810, BLM is required to evaluate whether its land-use decisions in Alaska will significantly restrict subsistence uses and resource, to consider alternatives, and to minimize impacts on subsistence. BLM, however, failed to provide adequate foundation for this "tier-I" subsistence analyses, which requires the agency, in determining whether to withdraw, reserve, lease, or otherwise permit the use, occupancy, or disposition of public	We agree that a fuller description of subsistence use patterns is needed in Chapter 3. See the revised version provided in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, starting on page 373. We disagree with the view that the first tier Section 810 analysis in the Draft Plan was inadequate in identifying potential impacts. We believe that the impact analysis properly focused on the unencumbered lands on which the Federal subsistence priority applies, properly documented the intense use of these lands for subsistence uses, and properly concluded that lifting PLO 5150 would result in significant restrictions. The required public hearings have been held, as reported in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	lands, to evaluate the effect of such use, occupancy, or disposition on subsistence uses and needs. The Draft RMP/EIS failed to provide meaningful analysis of the subsistence activities in the planning area, i.e., the Draft RMP/EIS failed to specify where these activities take place, what access would be required, and the nature of the subsistence uses and resources. BLM's internal guidance requires the agency to "include such things as: information on subsistence uses, subsistence resources in the affected area; current levels of use including commercial, sport, and subsistence within the affected area; and current hunting and fishing regulations." IM at 1-2. Despite its relevance, BLM failed to include any of this information in the Draft RMP/EIS.	
0312-79	As for its second obligation under tier-I, which requires the agency to assess whether other lands are available for the purposes it seeks to achieve in each of the alternatives, BLM summarily found that no other lands within the Glennallen Field Office boundaries are available for meeting the agency's multiple use mandate. Such a conclusion, without illuminating how the agency reached its decision, is inadequate and an end-run around the requirement that BLM seriously consider other lands for the purposes it seeks to achieve in the Draft RMP. See IM at 1-2. Without further information, and a detailed discussion of the activities planned under each alternative, it is not possible for BLM or the public to evaluate the adequacy of the foundation for this determination. BLM should provide the analysis underpinning its decision in adequate detail.	By its nature a Resource Management Plan operates at a regional level, and assesses resource values and potential uses for all BLM managed lands in the planning area. From this standpoint, there are no other BLM lands in the planning area, not already considered in the planning process. In the alternatives, specific management actions are considered on a more site-specific basis. In this context, BLM contends that the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMP/EIS effectively cover the spectrum of feasible and appropriate actions. More specifically concerning the Section 810 analysis, BLM has identified the key components of alternatives that "may significantly restrict" subsistence uses, and has proceeded with additional compliance with the requirements of Section 810. The Section 810 analysis concluded that Alternative B, while not the preferred alternative, would clearly result in restrictions on subsistence uses, and the required Section 810 hearings were conducted. The final Section 810 analysis, included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as Appendix E, provides the full analytic justification for the adopted alternative.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0312-80	Finally, in discussing the third prong of the tier-I analysis, the alternatives that could reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes, the Draft RMP/EIS simply stated that the only way to eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes would be to prohibit any activity that conflicted with subsistence use or subsistence users. BLM then cited its multiple-use mandate as preventing it from managing resources based on single resources, such as subsistence. BLM should not cast the third prong as a paradox: that to eliminate threats to the use, occupancy or disposal of land needed for subsistence, the agency would have to prohibit all other use of the land. BLM provided no foundation for or analysis of its decision to solely examine alternatives that would eliminate the use, occupancy or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes and to ignore the other criteria: that it examine alternatives that reduce the use, occupancy or disposition of those lands. Although its internal guidance instructs BLM to evaluate alternatives that "are other ways to accommodate the proposed action or other actions," the agency failed to perform this analysis.	The Section 810 analysis contained in the Draft RMP/EIS considers the set of alternatives developed in the planning exercise. Clearly one, Alternative B, would significantly restrict subsistence uses. Other alternatives, including the preferred alternative D, were found not to significantly restrict subsistence uses. It is not reasonable, as the comment appears to suggest, that for an Alternative B which would restrict subsistence, there should be sub-sets (sub-alternatives) with reduced effects, when other formal alternatives already provide this contrast.
0312-81	Moreover, BLM failed to account for, or fully explore, mitigation measures, as it was required to do pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality guidance governing environmental impact statements, 40 C.F.R. 1502.14 (EIS must include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in proposed action or alternatives). BLM should re-evaluate and provide analysis of alternatives that would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands	Mitigation measures are identified and applied (for the purposes of analysis) to all action alternatives (Draft EIS, p. 607) in Appendix III. In addition, an Environmental Impact Statement is being done for this proposed Resource Management Plan in part because BLM acknowledges that there would be significant impacts associated with some management actions considered in the range of alternatives. The 810 analysis acknowledges this for Alternative B for subsistence.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	needed for subsistence purposes, and provide adequate foundation for its analysis.	
0312-82	Alternative B is the only alternative for which BLM provided any foundation for its finding regarding the impacts of the proposed land-use plans on subsistence resources, although its discussion was limited to broad generalizations. BLM should provide further information about the subsistence uses and resources throughout the planning area, as well as access to those resources, and should provide details about the potential impacts on those uses, resources, and access. BLM should also clarify why impacts to subsistence resources and access would be only "localized and minimal" under Alternative B.	BLM contends that the analysis of restrictions to subsistence under Alternative B is concrete and specific, amply warranted by the quantitative analysis of Federal subsistence harvests and by the public testimony. Additional description of subsistence patterns will be provided in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, but the key facts for the assessment of Alternative B were included in the Draft. The determination in the 810 analysis that impacts from leasable and locatable mineral development on subsistence would be localized and minimal is based on assumptions for potential development as outlined in “Resource Assumptions” in Chapter 4. These assumptions include the fact that approximately 90% of the lands “opened” to mineral development by withdrawal revocation under Alternative B are currently ANCSA or State selected and therefore have a segregation against mineral leasing or location. These important assumptions have been emphasized in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0312-83	The Draft RMP/EIS also stated that the cumulative impacts of Alternative B could result in significant restriction of subsistence resources. BLM made the same finding for Alternative A. The Draft RMP/EIS stated that BLM would follow the tier-II notice and hearing procedures required by ANILCA 810 to determine the cumulative impacts of alternatives A and B, and would include its findings in the Final ANILCA 810 evaluation. BLM should have conducted the tier-II hearings and should have included a full discussion of its findings and analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS to allow for public participation and informed decision-making.	The 810 Analysis concluded that significant restrictions to subsistence harvest and access would occur under Alternative B. Consequently, seven public hearings were conducted. Testimony at the hearings was not limited to Alternative B or the revocation of PLO 5150 considered in that alternative. In fact, BLM received testimony on several other issues, including OHV management, 17(b) easements, and the Slana settlement area. Clearly, the analysis presented in the Draft RMP/EIS did not limit the scope of the testimony presented at the hearings and did not preclude meaningful public review.
0312-84	The Draft RMP/EIS provided an inadequate foundation for BLM's FONSR for alternatives A, C, and D. The absence of proper analysis to support BLM's FONSR for Alternative D is especially problematic considering that this alternative proposes opening to potential minerals exploration 83 percent of the planning	Please refer to the second part of the response to comment 0312-82. In general, low resource potential and low level of foreseeable development resulted in a finding of no significant restriction.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	area within the Glennallen District, of which 17 percent is withdrawn d(1) lands.	
0312-85	Because BLM's analysis of subsistence impacts for alternatives A, C and D was broad and lacked specific information on subsistence resources, uses and potential impacts, it failed to provide adequate support for BLM's conclusions. The Draft RMP/EIS failed to describe the subsistence uses that occur in particular regions of the vast planning area. It also failed to identify with any specificity any of the proposed actions that could impact those subsistence uses, or the precise geographic locations of any of the actions proposed under each alternative. Without more specificity regarding subsistence needs, uses and users, and the actions that could restrict those uses, it hardly seems possible that BLM or the public could properly evaluate whether an alternative might significantly restrict subsistence uses. To foster informed decision-making, BLM must provide sufficient detail on subsistence needs, uses, users, and the actions that could restrict those uses before the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.	Additional information about subsistence use patterns, including traditional use areas, has been provided in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, starting on page 373. However, it is important to keep in mind that the Section 810 analysis focuses on those unencumbered BLM managed lands on which the Federal subsistence priority applies. These lands include the pipeline utility corridor and the adjacent Gulkana and Delta Wild and Scenic Rivers. The significant State-selected parcels on the Denali Highway are not subject to the Federal subsistence priority, and are outside the scope of the Section 810 analysis. The uses of those unencumbered BLM managed lands for subsistence, particularly for moose and caribou harvest, were fully analyzed, resulting in the finding that Alternative B would significantly restrict subsistence users.
0312-86	Without much explanation or support, the Draft RMP/EIS highlighted alternatives C and D as reducing the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes. Draft RMP/EIS at 524, 527. BLM provided no support for this blanket generalization that anything short of full-bore resource extraction, proposed in Alternative B, would reduce competing uses, occupancy or disposition of public lands. BLM must provide specific data on subsistence resources, uses and users, and describe the geographic areas in which these subsistence activities take place or that are	Additional information has been provided in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, but BLM remains convinced that Section 810 analysis has already demonstrated the major subsistence uses of the area subject to revocation of PLO 5150 and the resulting potential for significant restriction to those uses.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	needed for access to subsistence resources.	
0312-87	BLM must also discuss in detail its plan for activities that could potentially impact subsistence uses and resources, as well as access, including the potential effects of those activities on the subsistence resources. Because BLM failed to provide this data, the Draft RMP/EIS failed to provide a meaningful tier-1 analysis to support BLM's FONSR for Alternatives A, C, and D. Because the FONSR for Alternatives A, C, and D lacks support, BLM should proceed to conduct tier-II analyses for these alternatives.	We disagree. Analysis of impacts to subsistence from alternatives A – D are displayed on pp. 522 – 535 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This includes discussions on Travel Management and Recreation, Lands and Realty, Natural and Cultural Resources, and Minerals Development. Some reference is made to more detailed discussions under fisheries or wildlife.
0312-88	Although the Draft RMP/EIS provided some discussion of subsistence fisheries in the planning area, primarily the Copper River fisheries, BLM failed to articulate in sufficient detail its plans to "withdraw, reserve, lease, or otherwise permit the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands" in those areas. BLM also failed to articulate whether there would be any restriction on these subsistence fisheries, or any other specific subsistence resources.	More information has been provided in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (starting on page 373) to clarify that the significant subsistence salmon fisheries occur on the main stem of the Copper River, in waters under National Park Service subsistence management. While BLM would potentially manage non-salmon subsistence fishing on the Gulkana and Delta Wild and Scenic Rivers, there have been less than 5 permits requested for this activity since Federal subsistence fisheries management took hold in the summer of 2000. The Draft RMP/EIS did analyze the potential for land use and development activities to directly impact fish habitat or populations. See pp. 461 – 477 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0312-183	ANILCA 810 analysis: BLM's internal guidance states that, although NEPA alternatives are a mixture of alternative lands and uses and ANILCA 810 requires a distinct separation, if the agency carefully constructs its NEPA alternatives to embrace 810 objectives, it could combine the two objectives. Instruction Memorandum No. AK 86-350, 8-1 (August 26, 1996). Here, not only did BLM fail to provide adequate analysis of the four alternatives to satisfy the NEPA standard, the draft RMP/EIS failed to adequately elucidate BLM's plans to "withdraw, reserve, lease, or otherwise permit the use, occupancy, or disposition of public	The alternatives described in the Draft RMP/EIS meet appropriate standards for alternatives under NEPA. These alternatives are sufficiently clear about the resulting land use actions to provide for careful analysis of impacts to subsistence uses in Section 810.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	lands" in the planning area.	
0318-1	The moose population and division of state and federal control of it in regard to subsistence is a problem. I believe that the state should have more control in game management.	Congress has directed the Department of the Interior and Agriculture to ensure a rural subsistence priority is provided on the Federal Public lands. The Secretaries have, since 1990, encouraged the State of Alaska to find a solution to complying with Title VIII so that subsistence management can be reunified under State auspices. Until that is accomplished, the BLM is obliged to implement the standards established in Title VIII of ANILCA.
0326-2	Review of the Evaluation and Findings section for Alternative C make unsubstantiated negative claims regarding the effects of motorized transportation on subsistence uses and needs, as required by The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) Section 810(a). Specifically, the following comment is not supported by the facts: "Travel and recreation management under the status quo would result in the continued unmanaged and unplanned proliferation of OHV use. Additional and poorly planned OHV trails would continue to compromise the effectiveness of habitat refugia for fish and wildlife by allowing easier and increased access to those areas." (Page 649) It is relevant and important to note that the Alaska Department of Fish & Game area biologists has no documentation that OHV trails have significantly restricted subsistence uses or needs.	BLM stands by the statement made on page 649 of the Draft RMP/EIS. ADF&G, in a series of reports to the Board of Game between 1985 and 1996, clearly recognized existing and potential effects from steadily increasing OHV use, particularly in unit 13. The quote from the 1996 report cited on page 9 of the Draft RMP/EIS clearly states the agency's concerns at that time. While the current State administration and ADF&G personnel are dedicated to providing unlimited access to public lands, it doesn't change the impacts on the ground. They were occurring in 1996 (enough for the local biologist to recommend a Controlled Use area for the Alphabet Hills at that time) and OHV user trends have continued to increase since that time. Specific to subsistence, extensive public testimony during this planning process indicated displacement of Federal qualified subsistence users by growing OHV use by non-local hunters.
0329-126	Conservation would have dramatic benefits for subsistence, that aren't disclosed in the Draft EIS/RMP. Please give full credit to the value of conservation in the revised EIS.	The analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS, starting on page 529, clearly shows that alternative C would provide the most long term benefits to subsistence resources. For example, "Management under Alternative C is the most aggressive in halting the unmanaged proliferation of OHV trails and establishing visitor use limits. Although these measures do not apply to users engaged in traditional subsistence activities, they would benefit the subsistence resources by limiting the recreational pursuit of these resources."
0329-127	Why the scarcity of alternative approaches to subsistence? Reasonable alternatives might include proactive measures to support subsistence, or additional habitat conservation measures, or additional access restrictions to	Please see reply to response to comment 0312-183.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	decrease competition.	
0329-128	The MSA says, "The majority of river use is focused on or around the Gulkana and Delta Rivers. These two rivers serve as important subsistence hunting corridors." (BLM 2004, MSA Rivers, p.6) While the Gulkana is important, that statement is not true. A great deal of subsistence fishing occurs on the main stem of the Copper other rivers and creeks. Certainly at least as much as on the Gulkana. In fact, we've heard from area elders that fishing the Gulkana didn't used to be done, because that is where the Kings are spawning.	Federal subsistence permit harvest reports are the basis for the BLM statement that the Wild and Scenic River corridors serve as important areas for subsistence hunting. The comment offers the contrasting point that subsistence fishing is less focused on the Gulkana river and more common on the main stem of the Copper River. Particularly since fishing regulations prohibit subsistence salmon fishing in the tributaries, the distribution of subsistence salmon fishing is, indeed, concentrated on the main stem of the Copper River.
0329-129	The Draft EIS/RMP understates the potential negative impacts on subsistence, from action alternatives. Access management, mining, oil drilling, and the rest pose a grave threat to continued rural subsistence opportunities.	BLM stands by its' analysis, given the assumptions used. Please refer to the second part of the response to comment 0312-82. In general, low resource potential and low level of foreseeable development resulted in a finding of no significant restriction.
0329-130	Given the information in the EIS, especially cumulative effects of increased use, decreased habitat, rural subsistence does not appear sustainable. Please consider a real conservation alternative that would achieve long-term sustainability.	We disagree. While the definitions and administration of subsistence may change over time, there will continue to be a dependence on these resources as there has been for thousands of years. BLM is committed to providing habitat to support sustainable populations for subsistence resources. We believe that at least two of the four alternatives considered in the analysis would achieve that goal.
0331-15	The discussion of subsistence was not only brief but also incomplete. We found no mention of subsistence berry-picking, an important activity for most of our members and for many Copper Basin residents. Nor could we find mention of impacts of various activities on the quality of fish, game and berries. Air and water pollution created by mining, mineral exploration, and motorized vehicle use certainly would impact the quality of these resources.	Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (starting on page 373) has been revised to include more information on subsistence user patterns and traditional use areas. Pages 522- 535 of the Draft RMP/EIS display anticipated effects to subsistence resources, based on assumed levels of resource development by alternative.
0331-16	We support the greater protections that alternative C provides to subsistence. By creating ACECs and SRMAs, and by placing	Thank you for the comment.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	stronger controls on mining, logging and road-building, limiting motorized use, Alternative C protects habitats, the quality of the resource taken, and the ability of people who do not have or do not wish to use OHVs to take subsistence resources.	
0354-15	ALTERNATIVE D negatively impacts subsistence by enhanced resource development/extraction, but has a portion for correcting adverse resource impacts from OHV use and halting proliferation of trails that can be combined with ALTERNATIVE C, our preferred alternative.	The assumption used in the analysis, based on low potential, segregation of selected lands, and poor accessibility, was that mineral development, even with opening of 85% of the land base, would be limited to that described under the "Resource Assumptions" section of Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. This is the level of development upon which the analysis was based. At this level of development and given the application of area-wide protective measures and Required Operating Procedures and stipulations, we stand by our analysis.
0354-17	ALTERNATIVE D revokes most ANSCA (d)(1) withdrawals, opening 85% of the land base to mineral extraction, which has an extremely negative impact on subsistence.	Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS and the ANILCA 810 analysis in Appendix V analyze the effect of implementation of Alternative D on subsistence. Because of the anticipated level of mineral development, application of area-wide protective measures, and application of Required Operating Procedures and stipulations identified in Appendix III of the Draft RMP/EIS, these analyses found that the impacts to subsistence would not be significant.
0355-43	Regarding subsistence - there is no justification to keep lands closed or PLOS in place due to subsistence. The lands were not closed for subsistence purposes and must not remain closed based on any subsistence purpose. Where the reasons for withdrawing or closing lands has been satisfied, removal of the closures should not be contingent on any other factor.	BLM's decisions in this planning process must be consistent with ANILCA. As such, we are mandated under Section 810 to consider the impacts of our actions on subsistence uses and resources. While you are correct that the original purpose of PLO 5150 was not to provide a federal subsistence hunting area, this is what the area currently provides. Please read the comments concerning this proposed action under alternative B and contemplate what would happen if we ignored them in our decision making process. Please recognize that all lands within the pipeline/utility corridor are not closed to mineral entry--only the inner corridor. Nor are they closed to other uses such as recreation or timber management.
0386-2	There's some Federal responsibility in regards to that.[management of the pipeline corridor] ANILCA has the -- the Katie John issue was all about protecting subsistence, protecting subsistence along the river corridors and that's what the Supreme Court and United States Government said, that they need that -- the Federal people have to step in and protect the subsistence rights of the people and this is no different than that type of case. Because the	BLM is committed to continuing to provide a manageable federal subsistence hunting area as well as protection of subsistence resources. That is why retention of most of the pipeline/utility corridor is described in the Proposed Action of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	Federal has a responsibility under ANILCA to protect the subsistence use of the people that are using it in these areas.	
0390-1	And here the trespassing in the state of Alaska including the AHTNA region has a great impact on our subsistence lifestyle for both Federal and State, there is no rural priority with BLM. BLM needs to enforce ANILCA and protect all of our lands and water resources. As we AHTNA people rely on our culture and our customary and traditional use for that fish and game resources as this is our land, the way we live for years, you know, for many years, that we always rely on the moose and fish that's been going through here.	The State formerly implemented a subsistence management program that complied with Title VIII of ANILCA, until this was overturned by the Alaska Supreme Court. Since then, the Federal Subsistence Board has directly managed the title VIII rural subsistence priority on Federal Public lands. BLM does provide a rural priority and is committed to continue doing so.
	SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	
0173-1	Alternative C would chase the Mineral Exploration industry out of Alaska, costing the local and State of Alaska economy hundreds of millions of lost revenue.	The Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges (p. 531) in it's analysis of effects of implementation of alternative C, that "no new jobs would be created from resource development."
0311-1	The BLM “Draft Plan” does not adequately evaluate potential impacts to salmon habitat and salmon fisheries from proposed development and land use options. The plan makes no attempt to quantify potential impacts to the economy, or lost value and revenue to the region from various development scenarios offered within the alternatives. … Although the plan addresses sport and subsistence, it fails to mention commercial fisheries, the largest economic contributor to the Copper River watershed. Although commercial harvest does not occur on BLM land, the salmon and much of the habitat they depend on are managed and administered by the BLM. Each decision made related to alternatives in some way affects salmon, people and economies that depend on them. With economic indicators and	Economic effects are considered in Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. See response 0355-34. However, you are correct in your assertion that there is no analysis of the effects to the commercial salmon fisheries and the economics associated with it. This analysis is not included for the following reasons: 1) BLM manages only 15% of the lands within the Copper River watershed; 2) Management decisions along the Gulkana River, the most important salmon fisheries on which BLM manages the uplands, are common to all alternatives (see page 76). This management will continue to provide strong protection along the Gulkana, which provides critical spawning habitat for Chinook and sockeye salmon; 3) ADF&G manages populations, BLM manages habitat; 4) Current State and Native selections prevent mineral development until either conveyance occurs (in which case development is up to the selecting entity) or selections are relinquished and the lands are retained in long-term federal ownership; and 5) On most unencumbered BLM within the watershed (Wild and Scenic Rivers, pipeline/utility corridor) withdrawals prohibiting mineral entry or leasing will be retained. Given these factors, even under the most aggressive development scenario (Alternative B) the BLM anticipates minimal impact to salmon habitat and particularly salmon populations within the watershed. An analysis trying to display differences between the alternatives in impacts to commercial fisheries would not display significant differences.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	analysis absent from the plan, it is impossible to make informed decisions on the alternatives. ...The plan should be modified to include a comprehensive fisheries and economics section, and management options should be evaluated as to how they will impact the sustainability of salmon populations and the value of the salmon economy.	
0311-2	I offer the following information on salmon values: EX VESSEL VALUES In Thousands of Dollars YEAR CHINOOK SOCKEYE COHO Total Value 1994 1,630 10,960 7,550 20,140 1995 3,750 13,570 4,520 21,840 1996 2,320 24,720 1,720 28,760 1997 2,450 25,290 370 28,110 1998 3,990 15,560 950 20,500 1999 5,700 20,710 790 27,200 2000 2,710 14,660 3,460 20,830 2001 3,220 15,420 1,320 19,960 2002 2,391 16,332 2,195 20,918 2003 3,872 18,326 2,058 24,256 2004 3,757 14,881 3,418 22,056 10 year average 3,253.64 17,311.73 2,577.36 23,142.73 I have attached a spreadsheet that includes additional information on the financial aspects of the commercial fishery, but the quick take is that the fishery averages about $22million a year directly to fishermen, and another $18million to cannery workers, tender men, and shore side support. Estimates of value for the commercial sport guide industry, sport and subsistence is placed at about $5million, making the fishery a $45million a year	See response to comment 0311-1.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	economic driver.	
0311-3	We oppose any increases in these activities [mining, oil and gas leasing, logging] until an analysis is completed that includes potential economic impacts to fisheries.	See response to comment 0311-1.
0311-6	The BLM should reject the current draft as it has been presented and institute a planning process that includes an economic assessment of the impacts of various land use options.	The Draft RMP/EIS analyzes effects of the implementation of the four alternatives on social and economic conditions. Please refer to pp. 522, 528, 529, 531, 534, and 535 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0330-4	Overall, smaller scale resource extractive activities can be beneficial to the local economy on a seasonal basis, such as log ship stevedoring. However, the most sustainable resource Yakutat has is its fishery resource, which has supported the town for over 100 years commercially. This resource is readily renewable and should take precedence over shorter term projects.	Thanks for the comment. BLM's preferred alternative (D) would designate BLM-managed lands in the vicinity of the Bering Glacier as a Research Natural Area. This designation will provide measures to protect the area's unique ecological features associated with the glacier (see table, page 602, Draft RMP/EIS). Despite lifting existing ANCSA withdrawals on the eastern 1/3 of the area, very little mineral exploration or development is anticipated, due to rough topography and poor access. BLM feels that it's preferred management strategy for the area would provide protection to the area's anadromous rivers and streams.
0355-34	For nearly a decade, the Valdez Creek Mine was the largest private employer in the entire Mat-Su Borough. The economic impact of VCMC was tremendous and there are numerous mineral exploration projects that, if they become miners, would be much larger than VCMC. The economic benefits of such projects must be considered. Even though most of the claims are on State land, the plan should recognize this, especially where such claims will require access over BLM lands.	The effects of potential mineral development and jobs created by such development are considered in the Draft RMP/EIS. Please refer to pp. 528, 529, 531, 534, and 535. Information has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to include the economic benefits to local service businesses from mineral development.
0355-39	There is no effective analysis showing the benefits of mineral development. Just the opposite, the EARMP talks only about the supposed negative (page 482) impacts and goes so far as to say that Alternative B that may see the most mining would have the greatest negative impacts. What about t he personal satisfaction and self esteem that results when a person has a good quality job	Please see response to comment 0355-34.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	near where they live that can provide for their family? These benefits are totally disregarded in the EARMP. We have excellent examples of the benefits derived from mining and exploration from the Red Dog Mine and the Donlin Creek Project.	
0369-2	It [the plan] also overlooks the economic impact that would be caused by the loss of area available for subsistence hunting.	Actually, the Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges the economic importance of subsistence (see pp. 341, 343). It also discusses the economic impacts of revoking PLO 5150 on pp. 527 and 528.
	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	
0198-1	I am 63 years old and the game I hunt in this area are not of the suit-case size. This plan strikes me as a ban or at the least discrimination against us old folks.	Please see response to comment 0199-1.
0199-1	I am 68 years old, and hunting in this area. The plan seems to discriminate against use old folks.	BLM does not agree with you that the plan discriminates against the elderly. Your comment refers to OHV management considered within the Draft RMP/EIS. Even under the most restrictive Alternative C, only 4% of BLM-managed lands in the area would be managed as non-motorized. No matter which alternative you look at, there will still be ample opportunities for motorized access to recreation, hunting, fishing, and subsistence uses in the area.
0354-37	Plans, though cannot benefit one group of people, must also not harm one group of people. Some actions proposed in the RMP negatively impact the Ahtna people, our lands and landowners rights, and our subsistence lifestyle and socio-economic well-being.	The Draft RMP/EIS acknowledges this effect on page 529 of the Draft RMP/EIS under "Environmental Justice." This effect is described as a result of revoking PLO 5150 under Alternative B.

8. RMP/EIS PROCESS

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	GENERAL PROCESS	
0020-3	There's no enforcement of all these regulations being placed on those of us in the Native community, be it non-Native subsistence users, or even Native land managers. Unfortunately, it's placed us in a hostile environment many times, especially with the state of Alaska.	BLM is committed to providing enforcement of its regulations on BLM-managed lands. The Glennallen Field Office recently hired a second law enforcement ranger. However, regulations dictate our ability to enforce on some areas, such as 17(b) easements. Please see response to comment 0379-3 under Access.
0020-5	Other parts of ANILCA need to be brought into this plan that you're not bringing in. ANILCA, Section 811 deals with access. I see we've got 810 in there, but 811 is access. ANILCA 1107, dealing with right-of-ways; 1110 dealing with more access; 1316, allowable uses; Section 1318, the list goes on. Section 1107 of ANILCA has requirements for restoration, revegetation and containment of erosion, 1107(a) talks about the damage to the environment including the damage to fish and wildlife habitat. There's a number of protections that were provided in ANILCA, however, form on the ground they're not being adhered to.	Section 811 of ANILCA is specifically addressed on page 34 of the Draft RMP/EIS: "All proposals for OHV management considered below would be consistent with section 811 of ANILCA…" Title 11 of ANILCA and specifically section 1107 deal with rights-of-way across public lands that access or cross Conservation System Units. BLM will comply with 1107 in consideration of right-of-way applications or right-of-way management within CSUs (the Delta and Gulkana wild and scenic rivers are the only BLM-managed CSUs in this planning area).
0020-6	There needs to be an increase, really, for the cabins, public cabins up there. You want to do inventory and monitoring of visitor use, those are lofty goals but where's the money. Please, you need to apply to Congress for money on these. You can't be giving more regulations without enforcement money.	Inventory and monitoring are part of our annual budget proposals and operations. BLM is committed to continuation of inventory and monitoring, as described for each resource in Chapter 2 of the Draft RMP/EIS. It will continue to be an element in the activities of the Glennallen Field Office, contingent on annual budget.
0023-1	I'm wondering, under ANCSA and ANILCA when all of the land claims are going to be settled? Putting hundreds of thousands of dollars into this [plan] and whatever else you	The Lands Transfer Act was recently signed by Congress and will speed up the conveyance process of all land entitlements. It is scheduled to be completed in 2009. This process, and the speed of this process, is outside the scope of this planning document. See Draft RMP/EIS page 13.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	folks do before you've settled something that was passed years and years and years ago seems to me to be putting the cart before the horse. Settle the laws that were on the books in the '70s before we start making new ones.	
0033-1	The first general comments I have is in regards to the consultation process. If you'll note on Page 21, there's reference to consultation with village corporation and the same reference is made on Page 563, I believe, there are no village corporations in the AHTNA region. The villages merged in 1980, and have been merged with AHTNA since. There are, however, tribal councils, in the area which function both as local governments. And I'll note in another section of the report there's a reference to there being no local governments, which is clearly wrong. So there's several corrections that need to be made to the initial Draft here in terms of, not only the types of entities that are representing constituents in the region but also to the fact that tribal councils, which predate the United States government by some several thousands of years have been inadvertently left out and need to be put in the proper context.	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0033-2	[U]nless you have a detailed background on some of the issues that are alluded to in the study it's very difficult to draw conclusions. For instance, when you use the term development, there's no standards of reference within the study itself and there's no agreed upon use of the term that you can find in the study. So you either hint it or refer it and that's not a good way to produce a conclusion.	The issues presented within this document are very complex. In Chapter 2 of the Draft RMP/EIS, BLM has produced a summary of each issue as a means of comparing management strategies. An alternative comparison table will be provided in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 171).
0033-3	Native allotments have predated both the state of Alaska and a number of agencies up here by quite a period of time. And the study itself	The Draft RMP/EIS does not mix Native allotments and 17(b) easements. They are presented and discussed under different Issues: 17(b) easements are discussed under Travel Management and Native allotments are discussed under Lands and Realty

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	mixed Native allotments access questions with 17(b) which shouldn't be done. 17(b) easements were clearly a function of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in 1971 and just as clearly Native allotments were a separate legal issue. And when you mix all of them up together you create a compressed version of what the public might consider access issues. Native allotments has no access issues, they never will. They stand alone. And you need to look at those kinds of information if you're going to deal with the Native contingency.	throughout the document. Some comments we have replied to referred to 17(b) easements crossing Native allotments.
0034-2	I think that more money should be appropriated for proper management and for the monitoring of the impacts that these ORV's have on our land.	Through the identification of the issue of OHV use and management within this planning document, the first steps for justifying the need for increased funding have been initiated. However, as stated on page 365 of the Draft RMP/EIS, under General Assumptions "Actions outlined in this plan are contingent on appropriate funding and personnel."
0044-28	The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act provisions should not be revoked or changed without consent of all Alaska Natives.	This planning document does not change any provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.
0050-1	I open up this packet given out by BLM I keep coming up with what is called the BLM Preferred Alternative. See, when we have hearings we try to gather up all the issues and we don't have a preferred alternative before we start. This has bothered me from the very first meeting that I've attended, and it continues to bother me that the deciding organization has a preferred alternative already; you haven't got all the testimony, you haven't gone to all the communities, you haven't gotten all the pertinent information but you have a preferred alternative.	See response to comment 0093-1.
0060-18	[W]e urge BLM to begin implementation level planning within one year of the Final RMP, in order to adequately address the management of areas that are already becoming degraded.	Thank you for your comment. The implementation level plan for the Delta Wild and Scenic River Corridor is scheduled to begin in 2006.
0066-1	Put some language in there where it takes	The 90 day public comment period on the East Alaska Draft RMP/EIS was the

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	public comment before decisions are made to do anything other than alternative A.	opportunity for the public to comment on actions that would be different from current management (Alternative A). All implementation level decisions will also include an avenue for public involvement.
0069-2	Of particular concern in C and D. We would find that there is a lot of verbiage that would leave the potential for future restrictions to be put in place without a lot of public process. If you could, perhaps, amend that language, and incorporate into D a very open and public process then I think we would find it much more palatable.	The Draft RMP/EIS states "These planning processes would include public, State, and Native coordination." (p. 33, under Implementation level planning).
0080-8	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends that BLM seek adequate funding from Congress to fully implement the provisions of the East Alaska RMP.	Through the identification of the issues and management strategies within this planning document, the first steps for justifying the need for increased funding have been initiated. However, as stated on page 365 of the Draft RMP/EIS, under General Assumptions "Actions outlined in this plan are contingent on appropriate funding and personnel."
0093-1	I feel that you ask for our input after you have already made your decision. You already had problems and answers you wanted. You stated that the problems came from other sources but were these sources Alaska residents?	All of the scoping comments received that were used to develop the alternatives, came from Alaska residents, not from organizations or individuals from the Lower 48. Appendix VI of the Draft RMP/EIS outlines all of the public involvement opportunities that were used to identify the issues evaluated within the plan. In the Draft Alternative stage of the planning process no preferred alternative was identified. Public comments were solicited on the draft alternatives and used to determine a preferred alternative. The identification of a preferred alternative is consistent with the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook and NEPA and allows the public to have an idea of what the BLM is thinking or leaning towards. The BLM preferred alternative is NOT the final decision and may be modified to include components of all alternatives as a result of public input on the Draft RMP/EIS.
0093-3	More information also needs to be given about Anilca [sic] and how it REALLY affects Alaska. Since lawyers drew it up only lawyers will be able to interpret it, not the regular citizen.	Consistency with ANILCA is clearly explained in the text of the Draft RMP/EIS where necessary (see for example page 34 of the Draft RMP/EIS under Travel Management). This planning process or RMP will not amend ANILCA.
0097-5	[W]e see a number of issues arising, between Plan approval and the conclusion of implementation planning, which can and will affect both the interim and final management of OHVs despite what is proposed in the Preferred Alternative. These issues include: implementation planning may take up to five	Thank you for your comment. Implementation Level considerations were outlined within this planning document under Travel Management to give managers a place to start when undertaking implementation level plans, consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the Draft RMP/EIS. Some implementation-level considerations could change based on public input and State and Native coordination during implementation-level planning. Land conveyances are out of the scope of this plan, as stated on page 13. However, this Draft RMP/EIS provides interim management direction for selected lands.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	years after the Plan is approved; the final results may not match the "Implementation-level Considerations" proposed and it is not clear which of the acres currently selected by the state and native corporations will revert to BLM and be subject to the protections or restraints proposed to be adopted through implementation planning.	
0097-9	Should this proposal be inserted [to revoke PLO 5150] into the Final Plan, we firmly believe the public must be given another opportunity to comment on the revised proposed Plan, since we believe it would substantially change any number of elements and therefore would not be the Plan which had been submitted to the public.	Revocation of PLO 5150 is not considered as part of the preferred alternative (D) in the Draft RMP/EIS. However, it is considered and it's effects analyzed under alternative B. The public has had ample opportunity to express opinions about this proposal during 90 days of comment period.
0159-5	Such a transfer [revocation of PLO 5150] would significantly change the Preferred Alternative due to the impacts to recreation, SRMAs and travel management. I believe a new Preferred Alternative would have to be presented for public review prior to any final decisions or final Plan.	Please see response to comment 0097-9. Effects of this proposal on recreation management are considered in the Draft RMP/EIS. However, Chapter 4 has been edited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 426) to clearly state that effects to recreation with revocation of PLO 5150.
0160-2	BLM should prepare a separate EIS, should this proposal [revocation of PLO 5150] be adopted. It should completely analyze these impacts, including the loss of oversight of the joint pipeline office.	Please see response to comment 0097-9. However, Chapter 4 has been edited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to include potential effects to pipeline administration resulting from revocation of PLO 5150 (page 549).
0164-1	Congress must appropriate money for the implementation and enforcement of the EARMP specifically the active management and maintenance of 17b easements, enforcement of trespass, and repatriation of damages to Ahtna lands caused by 17b easements. Money is also needed for the research of 17b easement use that can be used in a relinquishment determination.	Please see responses to comments 0080-8 (on funding) and 0020-3 (on enforcement).
0164-2	Congress must appropriate money for the BLM	Please see response to comment 0080-8. Also, Glennallen Field Office has recently

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	to comply with and enforce all ANILCA mandates and other statutes affecting easement management.	hired a second law enforcement ranger. The position is expected to receive continued funding.
0164-13	BLM needs to enforce ANILCA Section 1107 for protection of land and water resources.	Title 11 of ANILCA and specifically section 1107 deal with rights-of-way across public lands that access or cross Conservation System Units. BLM will comply with 1107 in consideration of right-of-way applications or right-of-way management within CSUs (the Delta and Gulkana wild and scenic rivers are the only BLM-managed CSUs in this planning area).
0173-39	No areas should be studied for further land management restrictions, including wilderness designations, wild and scenic rivers, ACEC, etc. The ANILCA "no more" clause does not allow such studies. A secretary's decision prohibits such studies unless the Alaska Congressional Delegation and the governor agree and so request.	The ANILCA "no more" clause does not apply to ACEC designations, which are administrative and not congressional. BLM Manual 8351 and the Land Use Planning Handbook require us to "assess all eligible river segments and determine which are suitable or non-suitable per Section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act…" We did not conduct wilderness inventory as part of this planning process, nor are wilderness designations considered. See page 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0173-43	We further suggest that the mineral and access data be incorporated as the first phase in the Plan development. Then this will provide a base map for all other work and will greatly assist in the minimization of future conflicts - both in the planning process and in the actual use of the Plan once it is completed.	Mineral data (Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential Report) and access data were both included as part of Management Situation Analyses prepared during the planning process. This data was utilized in development of management alternatives that are presented in the Draft RMP/EIS.
0175-4	Limits on general public use and access in ANILCA CSU's (Wild and Scenic River corridors) require additional procedural steps under 1110(a). We recommend following this ANILCA process (articulated in 43 CFR Part 36) on non-CSU lands such as the Denali SRMA, the Bering Glacier RNA, the Tiekel SRMA and the West Fork ACEC. Such a public process will allow BLM to better address many of the concerns raised by the public and the State regarding limits on use and access. The State in its review of the East Alaska DEIS/RMP is interested in documentation that management actions on non-CSU lands in Alaska are justified, reasonable, and evaluated	BLM will adhere to ANILCA's intent when considering limitations or closures that would effect access, even on non-CSU lands. BLM shows commitment to this statement in the Draft RMP/EIS (page 33), where we commit to public involvement during implementation level planning in travel management areas where we have identified the need for OHV limitations. During implementation level planning, BLM will demonstrate why limitations are necessary, based on objectives for a given area. Note that these objectives may be socially driven (such as management to maintain an experience) as well as resource-driven.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	through a public process involving appropriate stakeholders, conducted through an implementation level planning process with more specific focus than the RMP process can provide.	
0175-5	As previously stated, the State does not support limitations to manage general use of public lands without further justification and a more focused public process. The State is pleased to see that many of the Alternative Tables do speak to the identification of appropriate objectives for specific management purposes to be accomplished through implementation level planning. We encourage BLM to continue to utilize this approach throughout the planning document.	Thanks for the comment. See response to comment 0175-4.
0175-8	While there is no requirement to address coastal zone management issues in an EIS, such a discussion will help identify potential issues that could arise during state reviews of activities proposed in the future. It would be helpful to explain, perhaps within the Background section in Chapter I, when Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP) reviews will be required for federal activities proposed in this planning area. Because the RMP/EIS focuses on general land use management strategies, it is unrealistic for BLM to develop a meaningful consistency evaluation upon which the State could initiate a consistency determination. The State prefers to consult with BLM and provide its coastal zone consistency determination on specific implementation activities as they are proposed.	BLM will utilize coordination on coastal zone management issues at the specific implementation level (on projects that might have an effect on Coastal Zones) rather than the Land Use Planning level.
0175-10	We suggest that BLM consider including an introductory section at the beginning of Chapter II entitled “How to Read this Chapter” (similar to that included in Chapters III and IV) that	The change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 35).

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	describes the organization of each issue and clearly describes the difference between an "RMP Decision" and "Implementation-level Considerations" and where and when one might expect to find implementation level considerations described in the alternatives. We request this text include the important clarification that the decision-making process is flexible and will be based on a subsequent management planning process. This subsequent decision-making process is likely to consider the "Implementation-level Considerations," presented in the action alternatives, particularly Alternatives C and D but this RMP/EIS does not prejudge the results of the subsequent planning process. These alternatives should clarify that future decisions will be based on the information, discussions, and outcomes of the implementation level planning process. Several of the following comments provide additional information on several of the implementation-level considerations. We request that those comments be considered for discussion as part of the future implementation level planning process.	
0175-15	The State requests that Implementation-level Considerations described in Alternatives C and D be modified to acknowledge that decisions on any further limitations will be based on information, discussions, and outcomes of the implementation level planning process.	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0175-22	We request that the discussion in (8) Tiekel Area (including Tonsina Sub-units) section (a) RMP Decisions regarding potential area closures for snowmachines be moved to section (b) Implementation-level Considerations. We recommend that further	The level of decision making described is consistent with direction outlined in the Land Use Planning Handbook Appendix C which states that "All public lands are required to have off-highway vehicle area designations (43 CFR 8342.1). Areas must be classified as open, limited, or closed to motorized travel activities". Identification of the Tonsina Subunit and the non-motorized management goals for the area is consistent with this direction. There has been extensive public participation in the development of the

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	restrictions such as closures be developed in consultation with the user community through development of an implementation-level plan that includes a public process.	alternatives that identify this sub-unit. This sub-unit is considered as a direct result of public involvement. Also please see response to comment 0175-10.
0185-3	I am disappointed that the Alaska BLM website is not in operation during this comment period. This limits access to the complete draft plan/EIS in a timely fashion.	Please see the response to comment 0323-8.
0208-1	I have reviewed and am current on the issues surrounding the Knik River Public Use Area. … These lands should not be locked away from motorized use.	The Knik River Public Use Area is not within the East Alaska Planning Area and motorized use in that area is not covered in this planning document.
0306-6	I am disappointed that the Alaska BLM website is not in operation during this comment period. This limits access to the complete draft plan/EIS in a timely fashion. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the management of our public lands.	See response to comment 0323-8.
0310-2	Since 5.5 million acres of the planning area is to conveyed to the State of Alaska, these lands should be conveyed before this plan is completed. It is a waste of resources to go through the planning process for lands that are to be conveyed in the near future.	The new Resource Management Plan is necessary for several reasons, including: •Glennallen Field Office currently operates under a Management Framework Plan that was done in 1980. It is outdated. Since 1980, the area has seen dramatic increases in recreation use and Off Highway Vehicle use for recreation and hunting. Withdrawals that were placed on the land as a result of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act need to be assessed and determinations made whether or not to retain them. With renewed interest in mineral development in the area, BLM needs to determine which areas would be available for exploration and development. The RMP will address these issues. The State of Alaska is over-selected, so potentially as much as 25% of the 5.5 million acres of selected lands in the area could be retained by BLM.
0312-108	We request that the Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential Report for the Glennallen Field Office Planning Area, completed in 2004 by the Branch of Solid Minerals, be included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as an appendix.	The information presented in that report is used summarized in Chapter III, pages 325-340 and is considered in the effect analysis on pages 517-521 of the Draft RMP/EIS. In an effort to keep the Final as concise and clear as possible, it is not included as a separate appendix. This entire Mineral Occurrence and Development Potential Report is available for the public to review upon request from the Glennallen Field Office.
0313-1	State selected lands should not be considered in this plan.	State selected lands are BLM-managed until conveyance, consistent with ANILCA section 906(k). That is why they are included in this planning effort. As noted in the Draft RMP/EIS (page 564) there was a high level of involvement and cooperation/coordination with the State of Alaska in this planning process to ensure that

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
		management direction for State selected lands is consistent with State management direction.
0313-4	With more time we could provide more comments, but a 90 day comment period for a 700 page document is insufficient especially with the difficulty of downloading the plan as originally planned due to BLM's website trouble.	See response to comment 0323-8. We have received approximately 4,500 comments on the Draft RMP/EIS and only two of them (including yours) requested more time. We feel that a 90-day review period is sufficient.
0315-1	The plan should ensure that future long-term use is considered. Whether it be trails or other development, the resources of the land should be available for generations to come.	We agree. BLM is mandated to provide for multiple use management. This is clearly stated in the planning criteria on page 16 of the Draft RMP/EIS and is reflected throughout the Draft RMP/EIS.
0323-8	In general, EPA is concerned that information related to development of this EIS, available primarily through the BLM's web site, is not adequately accessible to the public, especially in light of the long period of time the BLM Alaska web site has been shut down for security upgrades. Efforts by the BLM to successfully distribute information regarding this EIS in a timely manner to the public should consider implications of current and future shut downs of the agency's web sites.	All public information distributed during the period of time that BLM websites were down contained alternative formats to obtain and review the Draft RMP/EIS. A special mailing was also sent to all those on an extensive mailing list highlighting the fact that the website was down and describing alternate means to obtain a copy of the Draft. Although it was unfortunate that the websites could not to utilized, CD and hard copies of the Draft were distributed upon request. BLM feels that the websites being down did not cause excessive hardship for obtaining a copy of the draft for review purposes.
0323-17	EPA recommends that BLM provide opportunities for the public to provide input on future resource development proposals and review future draft decision documents. EPA also recommends that additional detail regarding how BLM may tier off this RMP and EIS in order to evaluate and approve future proposed actions in accordance with NEPA be added to the Final EIS. EPA requests the opportunity to review future decision documents, including Environmental Assessments, for resource development proposals and other proposed activities that may cause adverse impacts to environmental, cultural, and subsistence resources in the	Implementation level planning is subject to NEPA analysis, which provides further opportunity for public review and comment. We will add EPA to our mailing list for all projects.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	planning area.	
0326-4	The AOC recommends that the lands within the EARMP area that are to be conveyed to the state and native landowners should be conveyed prior to adopting this plan. The planning process for lands that will change ownership in the near future is not a productive use of resources or time.	See responses to comments 0310-2 and 0313-1.
0329-1	Why doesn't the Draft EIS/RMP explain or even disclose the issue of the disappearing Draft Alternatives for review? All it says is "500 draft alternative packets were distributed." (p.21) We remain concerned, and repeat our previous comments and questions (July 2, 2004) about this debacle: Why were the blue versions disappeared? We are dismayed by the re-write of alternatives done between April 13 and 29 (hereafter “original” and “modified” versions). Many good and reasonable management alternatives were removed entirely, without explanation. This is a misuse of power that circumvents the proper public process, and is in violation of federal law (see specifically 43 USC 1712, 43 CFR 1610.4-5, NEPA, and its implementing regulations). Most importantly, these changes largely nullify the good work the Glennallen Field Office did to solicit public comments, and to sincerely incorporate them into draft alternatives." NEPA requires that scoping be an open process or meaningful agency and public involvement becomes impossible. FLPMA also requires that land use planners " shall…use a systematic interdisciplinary approach to achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences." 43 USC 1712(c)(2)	The "blue versions" were draft alternative packets that were mistakenly distributed prior to State Office review. Because this planning area deals with a large amount of State and Native-selected lands, BLM-Alaska wanted to be sure that BLM management of these lands was consistent with BLM policy and direction as well as ANILCA and ANCSA. State Office review resulted in changes to the "blue version" that more accurately reflected this policy and direction. As noted in the Draft RMP/EIS, the Draft Alternative packet was then distributed widely for public comment, and changes were made based on comments received. NEPA certainly does not prevent or discourage internal review, as a matter of fact it emphasizes an interdisciplinary process. The "blue version" was simply a draft of a draft that was distributed prematurely.
0329-9	It is unclear why the unique Bering Glacier region is being lumped together with the lands	The land managed by the BLM in the Bering Glacier area is within the administrative boundaries of the Glennallen Field Office which also happens to manage the lands along

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	at the Denali, Susitna and Copper River headwaters. Why are they being managed together? Please be very cautious to recognize the unique values of this place. Don't rely on one-size-fits-all mitigation measures.	the Susitna and Copper Rivers and the Denali Highway. The designation of a Research Natural Area proposed in Alternatives C and D consider and give protection to the unique values of the region.
0329-53	Inventory and Monitoring is a central mission of BLM, and should be a high priority. Between the blue and green copies of the draft alternatives, inventory and monitoring goals and objectives were disappeared. Why? Please re-instate the goals and objectives in the original draft alternatives for review.	Inventory and monitoring actions are outlined for each issue in Chapter II under Management Common to All Alternatives. See pages 33, 55-56, 73-74,113-114 and 122 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0329-66	Fisheries should have been a key issue in the Draft EIS/RMP. Copper River Salmon in particular are of immense value. Why was the fisheries section removed, after the original version of the draft alternatives?	Fisheries within the planning area are described on pages 244-250 of the Draft RMP/EIS. The effects of proposed alternatives on fisheries and fish resources is discussed on pages 461-477 of the Draft RMP/EIS
0329-189	Management is greatly complicated by the fact that "almost every trail within the planning area crosses multiple jurisdictions." (p.161). Integrated management is critical. The watershed is interconnected.	We agree. That is why the BLM has coordinated with the State, Ahtna Inc., Chugach Alaska Inc., National Park Service, and the Forest Service during this planning effort. We are committed to continuing this level of coordination during implementation level planning.
0330-3	For Yakutat lands, alternative D is too broad in scope. In addition, it does not reflect the CBY Assembly ratified Coastal Management Plan for Icy Bay to Cape Suckling. In this plan, chapter 7 page 58 the Multiple Use Intensive Land Use Designation is restricted to non-BLM lands from Icy Bay to Cape Yakataga. The BLM lands slated for Oil and Gas Leasing and Mineral Entry in Alternative D occur to the North and West of the CBY holdings and are designated Natural Areas and Multiple-use Recreation, Research, Residential Emphasis. Therefore the land designation change proposed for alternative D is inconsistent with the borough plan. The borough plan mandates that we must support alternative A as most	The preferred alternative (D) of the Draft RMP/EIS would designate BLM-managed lands in this area as a Research Natural Area and prescribes measures to protect the unique ecological values associated with the glacier. The withdrawal that currently exists on the eastern 1/3 of the area would be recommended for revocation. However, this does not mean that mineral development would take place. Based on topography, limited access, limited infrastructure, and low mineral potential in the area, likelihood of development is considered low. BLM feels that it's management direction under the preferred alternative is consistent with the borough's goals for the area.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	compatible with our plan.	
0341-2	The original Draft Plan [preliminary draft alternatives, April 2004] focused on reducing ATV impacts to salmon, reducing trespass, protecting subsistence and addressed other issues of local concern. For some reason left currently unexplained, the original draft plan, developed through a consultive process that included local input, was substantively altered prior to its release for public comment. The elimination of the entire sections is an indication that politics, not land use planning, was a major influence on internal plan edits that limited the options for meaningful public dialogue and comment. In addition, specific alternative management options were eliminated from the original draft prior to release to the public for comment, including an option to consider the Copper River watershed an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).	Please see response to comment 0329-1.
0341-5	The current draft BLM plan fails to serve the best interests of the public because it fails to present relevant information and options. The plan should be substantively modified to include a comprehensive fisheries section, and management options should be evaluated as to how they will impact the sustainability of salmon populations. In addition, management prescriptions that were administratively removed from the “local workshop draft” document should be reinserted in the amended draft, and the plan should again be offered to the public for comment.	Fisheries within the planning area are described on pages 244-250 of the Draft RMP/EIS. The effects of proposed alternatives on fisheries and fish resources are discussed on pages 461-477 of the Draft. The Draft RMP/EIS focuses on impacts to fisheries habitat because that is what BLM manages, not populations. Reasons for not including an analysis of impacts to salmon populations, and in particular impacts to commercial fisheries, are described in response to comment 0311-1 (under social/economics). For an explanation of the "local workshop draft" see response to comment 0329-1.
0341-15	The BLM should reject the current draft as it has been presented and institute a planning process that includes options and information critical to informed decision-making. The BLM	The public involvement efforts untaken for this planning process have exceeded the requirements of NEPA. This planning process has been shaped by public comment and involvement. Appendix F lists all public involvement opportunities to date including 30 scoping meetings, 14 draft alternatives meetings, and 7 public hearings on the Draft.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	is statutorily required to fulfill its obligations for meaningful participation by the public. The public deserves no less.	This does not include government to government meetings held with Native, State, and local governments or briefings to interested organizations.
0354-20	Some assumption in the RMP are incorrect and unrealistic, and a plan based on inaccurate assumptions is doomed to failure, such as: "3) Sufficient funding and personnel will be available for implementation." With only budget cuts on the horizon, this is not only improbable, but impossible.	Please see response to comment 0080-8.
0354-21	Some assumptions in the RMP are incorrect and unrealistic, and a plan based on inaccurate assumptions is doomed to failure, such as: "4) Implementation will be in accordance with all valid, existing rights, federal regulations, bureau policies and other regulations." This does not occur now, and chances look grim for future adherence to regulations.	This is tough to respond to without knowing what specific regulations, bureau policies, and other regulations BLM is not adhering to. We suggest you look at our responses to your comments regarding ANILCA regulations and 17(b) easements for a response to this specific comment.
0354-28	Actions for BLM-managed lands must include: 1) Budget line-items for enforcement of regulations, reparation, and education	A land use plan is an overarching plan that includes decisions on goals, objectives, and allowable uses. It does not contain such detailed information as budget line items.
0354-31	Actions for BLM-managed lands must include: 4) Prioritization of site-specific projects with public input.	Prioritization for implementation level planning will be included in the Final RMP, not the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This prioritization will be conducted by BLM but will be based in part on the issues identified in the planning process, which were driven by public involvement.
0354-32	Actions for BLM-managed lands must include: 5) Research Agency adherence to applicable laws and regulations (ANCSA, ANILCA, NEPA, Bureau regulations, etc.)	I don't know what "Research Agency" refers to in your comment.
NEPA ADEQUACY		
0084-1	I am very concerned that your plan falls short of giving adequate consideration to alternatives for environmentally responsible federal resource management and fails to take action to provide long-term protection for the remarkable values of these 7.1 million acres of public wild lands.	Alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS considers designation of three ACECs, one RNA, and five SRMAs for protection of resources associated with these specific areas. Alternative D proposes one RNA, four SRMAs, and takes area wide measures in other areas for resource protection (see tables in Appendix I and II, Draft RMP/EIS). It also identifies Required Operating Procedures and stipulations for resource protection, to be applied to permitted activities.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	The headwaters of the Copper River watershed, one of the world's richest salmon fisheries, the calving grounds of the Nelchina Caribou Herd, and the pristine Bering Glacier are lands that are important to all Americans.	
0312-35	We are concerned that the Draft RMP/EIS fails to analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of recommending rivers as suitable or un-suitable for designation, as required by NEPA. We request that BLM amend the Draft Plan to include an analysis of the specific impacts of designation or non-designation of each eligible river segment upon recreation opportunities, fisheries, wildlife, historic and cultural values, local economies, subsistence, scientific and educational opportunities, and all other significant impacts.	NEPA does not require BLM to consider alternatives in considering WSR suitability. Nor does the Land Use Planning Handbook, which states "Assess all eligible river segments and determine which are suitable or non-suitable per section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, as amended." Based on public scoping conducted during this planning process and based on input from the State, BLM did not feel that it was necessary to generate alternatives around the suitability determination. We received one comment in support of Wild and Scenic River designation during scoping (see Scoping Report).
0312-100	NEPA requires an analysis of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed activity on the human environment. … [A]t the beginning of the Environmental Consequences chapter, BLM identifies the “critical elements” of the human environment that must be addressed during environmental analysis. See EIS at 364. In its subsequent discussion of the environmental consequences of each alternative treatment of Issue #6, however, BLM utterly abdicates this responsibility, not even identifying a single impact to the human environment as a result of opening up new lands to mineral entry. See EIS at 517-521.	Pages 517 - 521 of the Draft RMP/EIS analyze effects of the different alternatives on oil and gas and mineral exploration and development. The rest of Chapter 4, under sub-headings "Impacts to…from Mineral Exploration and Development" examine environmental effects to other resources, including the critical elements.
0312-102	The cumulative impacts analysis of Issue #6 is similarly flawed. The 2-page analysis of the cumulative impacts of mineral development under the four alternatives contains exactly zero identification and analysis of the impacts to the environment of the increased mineral	Please see response 0312-100. The same applies to the cumulative effects portion of Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Your citation (page 545) refers to the portion of cumulative effects that discusses effects on oil and gas and mineral exploration and development. There is also discussion about cumulative impacts to other resources throughout this section (see for example cumulative effects of mineral exploration and development on wildlife, p. 540, Draft RMP/EIS).

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	entry and subsequent mineral exploration and development that would flow from the alternatives. See EIS at 545-546. Instead, the analysis focuses on the "cumulative impacts to oil and gas resources" rather than on the cumulative impacts to the environment of the proposal to open more lands to mineral entry and the mineral development that would result. This blatantly inadequate analysis is a perversion of NEPA's requirement and must be repaired.	
0323-2	The Draft EIS does not present compelling justification for the conveyance [revocation of PLO 5150] and does not describe effective mitigation of the adverse impacts to subsistence resources and subsistence users in Environmental Justice communities.	Justification will be provided in Chapter 2 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 119). Mitigation measures would be dependent on negotiations with the State of Alaska and would by highly speculative. Therefore, analysis was conducted based on no mitigation measures for this particular action (which is not a part of the preferred alternative).
0329-2	The Draft EIS/RMP does not evaluate a full range of alternatives. Conservation is not fairly represented, even as an alternative. Alternative C is not proportionally advocating Conservation as Alternative B is to resource extraction. Not even close. Millions of acres would be open to oil & gas drilling and mining, with lax restrictions to boot, under the alternative supposedly slanted to represent conservation. Even if the decision were to open everything to exploitation, still, closing it all to drilling and mining would be a reasonable alternative. If you took a poll of Americans, a good portion of them would no doubt consider closing as much as possible to exploitation. A good portion would do otherwise. They are both reasonable, and the law requires their view to be at least considered.	Under alternative C for leasable minerals, 41% of the area would be closed to leasing. In addition, 33% of the area would be open to leasing, but subject to No Surface Occupancy due to resource constraints (page 130, Draft RMP/EIS). This severely limits 75% of the BLM-managed lands in the planning area to mineral leasing. We feel this is a fair representation of a "conservation" alternative.
0329-3	On many issues, there are no alternatives presented. For example, there are no alternatives for: ROPs, or lease stipulations;	ROPs and stips: One set of Required Operating procedures and stipulations was developed and applied to all action alternatives in order for specialists to write their environmental effects analyses. Wild and Scenic Rivers designation: See response to

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	Wild & Scenic Rivers designation; Conservation of oil & gas, and minerals; A Copper River Watershed ACEC; Bering Glacier Wilderness. The list of "Alternatives Analyzed but Not Considered in Detail," is incomplete. Why isn't there a wilderness alternative in there? Why isn't a Copper River watershed ACEC in there? Our two primary objectives for this RMP are being rejected, without even the courtesy of a formal dismissal.	comment 0312-35. Conservation of oil and gas, and minerals: The draft RMP/EIS does consider alternatives for this; in addition, see response to comment 0329-2. A Copper River Watershed ACEC will be added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS under Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail (page 39). Bering Glacier Wilderness: See Draft RMP/EIS, pp. 14 and 15.
0329-4	We are concerned that the Draft EIS/RMP relies on adjectives to qualify impacts, rather than numbers to quantify them. Impacts are commonly described simply as "minor" or "moderate" or "localized," or sometimes "extreme" or "major" or "severe" or "significant," without reference to objective data or analysis. "Conclusory statements which do not refer to scientific or objective data supporting them do not satisfy NEPA's requirement for a 'detailed statement.'" Citizens Against Toxic Sprays v. Bergland, 428 F.Supp. 908 (D.Or. 1977). In several important cases, our judgment of the same impacts would be very different. For example, where the Draft calls restrictions on oil, gas & mining development "severe," (p.406) under Alternative C, we'd judge them dangerously inadequate. Another example: where the Draft calls cumulative damage of ATVs on the watershed "minor to insignificant," (p.539), we'd rather agree with the Management Situation Analysis that it is an "extreme concern." Bias in the impact statement, of course, renders impossible the fair and careful evaluation of a project's environmental effects demanded by NEPA." NRDC v. Callaway 389 F.Supp. 1263, 1273 (D.Conn. 1974) citing Calvert Cliff's Coordinating Comm., Inc. v. US Atomic Energy	BLM's land use planning handbook (H-1601-1) states that "land use plans must identify uses, or allocations, that are allowable, restricted, or prohibited on the public lands. The land use plan must set the stage for identifying site-specific resource use levels. Site-specific use levels are normally identified during subsequent implementation planning." Land use plans are broad decisions that are used to set the stage for implementation level decisions that involve site-specific analysis. Consequently, environmental effects analysis tends to be general and sometimes comparisons are made from a relative standpoint. BLM's NEPA handbook (H-1790-1) states that "the analysis should lead to a pointed conclusion about the amount and degree of change (impact) caused by the proposed action and alternatives." This is done in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	Commission. 449 F.2d 1109, 1115 (D.C. Cir. 1971	
0329-5	The Draft EIS does an inadequate job of considering the cumulative impacts of proposed alternatives. After reading and struggling with this complex plan, we fully understand this is a difficult task. Ironically, however, this is probably the single most important aspect of this EIS/RMP. Because the planning area is a discontinuous smattering of land ownerships in various stages of conveyance or retention, spread over several major watersheds, the most important impacts can only be seen by taking a broader view. The isolated section on cumulative impacts at the end of the document is confusing. (p.536-547) We recommend cumulative impacts be integrated into your consideration of the key issues. Most of our comments regarding cumulative impacts are made that way, but we'd like to point out here that many critical cumulative effects are being ignored. Most important are the Trans-Alaska pipeline system, OHV use on other land ownerships, the devastating logging on the Lost Coast, current exploration for oil and natural gas on Ahtna and state lands, the state gasline spur line Right-of-Way, logging on other land ownerships, the Nevada Star mine, the existence of the World Heritage Site Wilderness and the park, global climate change, and increased industrial tourism. Please consider the interaction of these factors, and the proposed action, in a Revised Draft EIS/RMP. ... The cumulative effects section suffers from the same lack of quantification and analysis as the rest of the document. Impacts are just stated in a vague and general way that does little to inform a	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will include some of your suggested cumulative impacts discussions, as pointed out in responses to other comments.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	decision. Please carefully consider cumulative effects in the Revised Draft EIS/RMP.	
0329-6	We strongly recommend taking a watershed approach as the most informative and useful way of considering cumulative impacts. Watersheds are the underlying interconnection of this place, and are in the end of far more significance than artificial political and land-ownership boundaries. You might think you are managing "East Alaska," but you really are managing major parts of the Copper, Susitna, Delta and Bering Glacier watersheds.	Thank you for your comment.
0329-15	The Draft EIS/RMP fails to consider cumulative effects. Critically, the logging on the Lost Coast continues to be ignored. The Draft EIS misleadingly says, "forestry activities are constrained by the Yakataga Game Refuge…" (p.542) Please consider that the state, Mental Health Trust and native corporations have decimated their land on the Lost Coast. This logging covers tens of thousands of acres, and is some of the most damaging in the country. (see exhibit A) ADF&G populations counts show mountain goat populations are down 80% between White River and Icy Bay, as a result of lost winter habitat. We have alerted you to this situation repeatedly, and are puzzled why it is being ignored. Information should be easily available. In fact, BLM may know more about deforestation here than the state does, because of your satellite imagery work.	Vegetation management (including logging) on other lands is considered in the cumulative impacts analysis: "Maximum forest management activities outlined in Alternative B, combined with increased forestry practices and associated road construction in State and Native lands, could lead to short-term reduction in big game security areas, fragmentation of specific habitats, increase in road density, and short-term loss of late-seral habitat in specific areas." (Wildlife, p. 539, Draft RMP/EIS). See also under Fish on page 540, Draft RMP/EIS. Alternatives C and D propose the Bering Glacier area as a Research Natural Area, which would prohibit road construction or timber harvest, unless compatible with protection of the identified resource values.
0329-44	The Draft EIS fails to consider the cumulative impacts of the Copper River Princess Wilderness Lodge, and the introduction of industrial tourism to the Copper basin and Denali highway.	This will be added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (page 580).
0329-45	The EIS should consider that the Wrangell St. Elias wilderness is the biggest one in the world.	This is taken into consideration in the Draft RMP/EIS (see cumulative effects analysis (specifically p. 539) and resource assumptions on pp. 362, 363. However, BLM is

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	The attraction here is that big wild, along with the salmon, living native cultures and history. That is what visitors come for. Understanding that context is essential to figuring out how to manage adjacent BLM lands and waters.	mandated to manage for multiple use which is a different mandate than the National Park Service.
0329-190	What are the cumulative impacts of OHVs? Since trails cross multiple jurisdictions, the cumulative impacts are highly relevant. How many mile of OHV trail are there in the Copper River Watershed? In the Gulkana? How many salmon stream crossings are there?	Cumulative effects of OHV management are described on pp. 536 - 547 of the Draft RMP/EIS and particularly under Issue 3, Natural and Cultural Resources, starting on page 538. It is clearly stated in the Draft RMP/EIS that we do not have a complete assessment/inventory every one of the estimated 1,300 miles of trails on BLM-managed lands within the planning area (page 160, Draft RMP/EIS). The Draft EIS/RMP, however, recognizes the need for more intensive OHV management, based on issues and impacts presented in Chapter 3.
0331-1	A full range of alternatives is not offered. For instance, the most land closed to motorized recreation under any alternatives is 4%. Both alternatives C and D close very small percentages of land to summer OHV use. We prefer Alternative C, but 4% is a very modest amount and is not a fair allocation to non-motorized users. OHV riders also have the use of the region's considerable state lands, none of which are closed to summer ATVs, as far as we know. There are no closed areas along the Glenn Highway or Tok Cutoff under any alternative.	BLM feels that a full range of alternatives is considered. While you are correct that only 4% of BLM-managed lands are closed under alternative C, this equates to 281,000 acres. In addition, management intent described in both alternatives C and D clearly show that BLM's intent in most areas is to manage to maintain existing primitive recreation experiences. These are areas where very little motorized use occurs. Currently, 63% of the BLM-managed lands in the area are classified as a primitive recreation experience.
	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	
0020-11	This [the plan] says that you worked with the Mentasta Tribal Government. I've spoken to our tribal members, none of us recall. I'm on the AHTNA Board, I would have recalled. The only time I recall is when I and Brenda Rebne went and testified before the committee and if that's considered working with you then we need a little bit more involvement in that.	Mentasta Village received a letter (mailed in March, 2003) at the outset of this planning process, describing the process and inviting participation as a government-to-government relationship. Mentasta never replied. Nevertheless, several public meetings were held in the area during the process which could have been attended by people from Mentasta (Slana and Chistochina).
0020-31	We need some cooperative agreements with the village councils and AHTNA, AHTNA is the major land owner in this area. The regulations proposed by both the Federal and the State	The BLM currently has Memorandum of Understandings with Tazlina, Cheesh-na and Chickaloon. We are developing MOUs with Ahtna and several other tribes. Any government entity that would like a more formal, collaborative relationship with BLM is welcome and encouraged to approach us on the subject and work with us to create one.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	impact our people greatly.	
0026-2	[W]e'd like to see more involvement from the local community in planning of these alternative because we didn't see that we were very involved.	Appendix VI of the Draft RMP/EIS has a complete list of opportunities for public involvement throughout the planning process. The scoping process emphasized local involvement, with two scoping meetings conducted in each local community or village. We also held public meetings at the Draft Alternative stage of the planning process.
0027-2	[T]here is a governing entity in here, it is the village and we do have an MOU with the BLM and I think that should be noted in your overall management plan.	Chapter V has been modified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to include a list of government entities that the BLM currently has a Memorandum of Understanding with.
0028-1	First of all I wanted to state that I'm concerned that these hearings are held so soon after the Alaska Resource Management Plan and the Environmental Impact Statement has been given to the public. I did not have time to thoroughly review the report to make comments on it because the report is over one inch thick. So I would have liked more time to read through that and comment on all the seven issues.	The public hearings on the Draft were scheduled to allow as much time after the release of the Draft as possible before the summer subsistence season began. As there were several other ways to comment on the Draft and all were given the same weight, everyone had the same 90 days to review and formulate comments.
0047-1	We felt that not enough information was sent out to the public concerning this plan. We are members of the Alaska Outdoor Access Alliance and were in attendance at the meetings held in Anchorage and Palmer this past week to generate letters in support of Alternative A. There were several people in attendance that still had never heard of this plan and were outraged that more information by your agency was not released in the past.	See response to comment 0026-2. Several meetings were held in Anchorage and Palmer. In particular, one meeting was held during the draft Alternative stage of planning in which approximately 230 people attended, many of whom were members of the Alaska Outdoor Access Alliance.
0069-1	We'd like to encourage your organization to be a little more public in the advertising process. The want ads generally are not read, are not the more favorite parts of the publication that's here locally. Also the timing is not good. I'd like to state that if you were to have held this hearing during the wintertime you would have had a much larger participation and you would have heard a lot more comments on the plan	See response to comment 0026-2. The timing of public meetings is greatly dependent on the planning schedule and timeline. BLM has tried to schedule public meetings at the best possible time of the year within the constraints of the planning process timeline.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	from those in the industry that I represent.	
0080-5	Further be it resolved, the Southcentral Regional Council recommends that BLM encourage cooperative agreements (or memoranda or understanding) with local tribal entities and land owners to resolve land management issues, and to improve/protect habitat through actions such as prescribed burning.	See response to comment 0020-31.
0164-3	Native Villages are recognized as sovereign entities by Federal law. The Final RMP needs to refer to all Native Villages as tribes and consider them to be a government to government relationship with BLM.	Changes have been made so that the proper reference is made throughout the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0164-6	The Final RMP must list specifically which entities the BLM consulted with during the development of this planning document.	Appendix F of the Draft EIS/RMP contains such a list.
0164-19	Ahtna Inc. requires a cooperative agreement to manage ATV use on all lands within the planning area.	A cooperative agreement in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding is currently being developed between BLM, Glennallen Field Office and Ahtna Inc. Cooperation and consultation with Ahtna, Inc. relative to ATV management will be addressed through this agreement.
0164-70	Ahtna. Inc is in support of a cooperative agreement with the BLM to facilitate cooperative management, data sharing, and open communication about issues on Native-selected lands and those BLM lands have had an impact on Ahtna Inc. lands. We support cooperative agreements between BLM and Tribal governments in the Ahtna region.	See response to comment 0020-31.
0323-5	EPA recommends that the Final EIS include additional description of not only the outreach efforts that BLM conducted during the planning process, but also how the information and comments that were submitted to the BLM were received, evaluated and used to develop the final Preferred Alternative. This additional information will inform the public about the	Public Participation opportunities are described in Chapter V of the Draft RMP/EIS. In addition, a specific list of public meetings is shown in Appendix F. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will contain an Appendix J that shows the public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS and how BLM responded to them; it will also highlight changes between the Draft and Final as a result of public comment.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	process the BLM undertook to evaluate and respond to concerns and recommendations that were submitted to the BLM during the Draft EIS comment period and government-to-government consultation. As an example, BLM could highlight or footnote in the Final EIS those major components of the final Preferred Alternative that directly respond to comments, issues and concerns expressed by tribes during consultation.	
0323-6	The Final EIS should include a section or appendix that contains comments received during the Draft EIS public comment period and BLM's responses to those comments, with user-friendly cross references to locations within the final document where additional information was inserted or changes were completed in response to comments.	This is included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as Appendix J.
0323-7	In addition, EPA recommends that the Final EIS also include the East Alaska Resource Management Plan Scoping Report as an appendix for easier reference by the reader.	The scoping report is available upon request from the BLM office as well as on the Plan website. Pages 7-8 of the Draft RMP/EIS outline how the input received during scoping was used to generate the issues and alternatives that have shaped this planning process. In an effort to keep the Final as concise as possible we did not include this as an Appendix.
0354-27	BLM's management policies must reflect more oversight on: 5) Work with Village Councils / Native Corporations for management strategies on 17(b) easements that reduce negative impacts.	As noted on page 563 of the Draft RMP/EIS, scoping meetings were held with all villages within the planning area as well as Ahtna Native Corporation. From those meetings, Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with several villages were established. More MOUs are currently in the development stages. Meetings were also held with villages of the planning area at the Pre-Draft Alternative stage and the Draft Stage. Appendix F of the Draft RMP/EIS has a complete list of opportunities for public involvement throughout the planning process.
0397-2	And the final RMP, that needs to be--needs to refer to all Natives as tribes and consider it to be a government to government relationship.	Refer to response to comment 0164-3.
0380-4	And so from there I think that we need to do a government to government with the tribes, with the corporation and with the Feds and the State, we need to work out some kind of protection for the hunting and fishing.	See response to comment 0020-31.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
0381-1	Anyhow, as a representative of Cheesh'na, I urge BLM to reflect in the plan, let's just say plan, that we, the Native villages within the AHTNA region, for instance, must be referenced as tribes. Federal law recognizes us as such and it serves as a basis for a government to government relationship. Given this, we urge BLM to actively seek cooperative agreements with the tribes because it not only serves to benefit both parties but also could be used as a management tool in getting Congress to appropriate funds or otherwise implement and enforce the RMP, the plan.	Refer to responses to comments 0164-3 and 0020-31.
NEW ALTERNATIVES PRESENTED		
0006-14	I have only recently learned of a proposal for a Copper River Valley ACEC; I hope BLM will give this proposal serious consideration.	See response to comment 0186-1.
0035-2	[I] proposed special recreation management area southeast of Valdez. ... I would like to see that special management area managed for non-motorized use, especially with reference to helicopters and snowmachines. And I was just skiing through that area about three weeks ago and it was my understanding that the Chugach Forest Plan had designated the country south of Solomon Gulch as non-motorized and we came across snowmachine tracks throughout the Jack River, or the Neamhoff River drainage and that was a real disappointment.	This area would be considered for designation as part of the Tiekel SRMA under Alternatives C and D (under long term management in D). Because of the small parcel size of BLM lands in your specific area, it is not considered for exclusion from heli-ski activities in decisions made as part of this RMP.
0038-1	And so the designation now of having trails and only staying on the trails, I am totally against. What I would rather see is corridors. I think Alaska is big enough to have motorized vehicles, for having non-motorized vehicles, for having wilderness, it's a big enough state to satisfy everybody. When there is core areas for motorized vehicles, we need to have more area, we need to have not a designated trail,	Your suggestion will be considered in implementation level planning, in consideration of such things as game retrieval using OHVs off of existing or designated trails. Thanks for the suggestion.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	but designated corridors, one mile or two miles each side of the corridor, then you're basically able to go wherever you want.	
0041-1	I support expanding the areas for non-motorized users. There should be plenty of places where OHVs and snowmachines are not allowed. One good place to consider making "quiet recreation" would be the McCallum Creek drainage.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0042-1	I like to think that there is room in our big state for all kinds of recreational users, and it would be nice to have some of the beautiful Delta Range left undisturbed for skiers and climbers without having to run into snow machines. I do a lot of skiing, and I find it peaceful and refreshing, and there is nothing more wonderful than being able to go out in the wild and break trail. But it is difficult to enjoy it when I am constantly either going by snowmachine trails or hearing the mosquito-buzz of the machines in the distance, or even dealing with the fumes of machines that have just gone past. This is a very large area, and a very large area is open to the machines. It seems to me we could share the area a little more effectively. For example, I would support adding the McCallum Creek drainage to the areas designated for quiet recreation.	Based on public comment, the Draft RMP/EIS has been revised to include the McCallum Creek drainage in the Canwell sub-unit of the Delta Range SRMA (pp. 52 and 73, Proposed RMP/Final EIS). This area would be managed for non-motorized winter recreation, with allowances for snowmachine use to access subsistence hunting.
0045-3	These two areas, among others in the area, have seemed to be receiving less and less snowpack over the years, from my observations, therefore I recommend you add McCallum Creek drainage to the list as a third as a third area designated for quiet recreation.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0047-2	We support alternative A to be compatible with the states generally allowed uses and feel that it would be the least restrictive of all the alternatives listed.	Thanks for the comment. BLM will not amend alternative A in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as you suggest because NEPA requires analysis of a "No Action" alternative. However, your amendment suggestion is considered and analyzed in other alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS, specifically Alternatives C and D consider adoption of policy

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
		consistent with the State's Generally allowed uses for State-selected lands.
0049-1	[W]e would like to see from a practical perspective, an Alternative E, if you will, in which 100 percent of the lands would be managed to match the State's generally accepted used as defined in Alaska Administrative Code 96.025. And what this would do for us is give us an option that we feel would have a chance of being blessed by the State. would feel much like we're already used to in terms of the way we currently use the lands. The way that works is that -- well, again, probably a clarification, where in Alternative C and D it says that it would be limited to existing trails, and that would be the equivalent of the generally accepted uses, we would like that language to emphasize that those users of those lands could get off trail as long as they don't destroy the vegetation which, again, is consistent with the State designation for State lands. In particular, lands that are already conveyed to the State.	Please see response to comment 0047-2. In addition, please note that policy adopted by BLM for State-selected lands under Alternatives C and D would allow for travel off existing trials, if that travel did not result in resource damages as described on page 36 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0050-1	I support adding the McCallum Creek drainage to the non-motorized areas because it is road accessible to skiers yet not in a snow shadow on the north side of the Alaska Range.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0060-7	Alternative C provides the BLM with the opportunity to plan the remaining 2,915,000 acres to the best possible ecological advantage. While Alternative C provides for the protection of the Nelchina ACEC, all segments of the WSR including the sections of the Delta, the Western two thirds of the Bering RNA, lands within the transportation and utility corridor (PLO 5150), the Tiekel SRMA, and the lands within the West Fork ACEC, it is suggested that the remaining concentration of land be put towards ensuring wildlife corridors,	Your considerations are taken into account in management actions described in the Preferred Alternative (for wildlife corridors, riparian and woodland health, and ecological diversity). See specifically the proposals under vegetation management (pp. 113 - 121, Draft RMP/EIS) and the Required Operating Procedures and stipulations that will adopted under all action alternatives (Appendix III).

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	riparian and woodland health, and ecological diversity.	
0060-19	While we appreciate and support the Canwell and Augustana subunit closures to motorized use in the preferred alternative, we are disappointed to note that all areas in the range that receive heavy snowfall are currently open to snowmachine use, while the areas proposed for closure are in the snow shadow of the Delta Range and commonly get little snow. … The McCallum Creek area on the south side of the Delta Range should be added to the non-motorized category, because is located in a particularly snowy side of the Delta Range, ideal for back country skiing and non-motorized recreation, and would correct the imbalance.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0060-23	Several other areas should be considered for seasonal closures [to off-highway vehicle use]. Specifically, closures should be instituted during nesting season in the West Fork Gulkana ACEC and other areas of primary Trumpeter Swan habitat. Seasonal closures should also be instituted in important calving areas for bison, caribou, and moose, sheep, and mountain goats. Since spring travel tends to be most destructive in terms of erosion and bogging, spring closures would also help protect ecosystems as a whole.	Seasonal closures or limiting OHV use to designated trails are considered for these areas in alternatives C and D. See pages 34-50 of the Draft RMP/EIS and also the tables in Appendices A and B.
0062-1	As I have pointed out in the past there is a snow shadow effect in the Delta Mountain with significantly more snow on the south side of the Alaska Range. The Augustana, Castner, and Canwell glaciers commonly have significantly less snow. Adding the McCallum drainage to the non-motorized zone appears desirable due to the following reasons: 1. the drainage is almost entirely BLM; 2. the area is close to the road so non-motorized users have easy	Please see response to comment 0042-1.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	access; 3. It is an area traditionally used by skiers and mountaineers. (In fact it was the area we retreated to when we were driven out of the West Gulkana, Gulkana, and College Glaciers by the snowmachine invasion); 4. It is on the south side of the range so it gets good snowfall; and 5. motorized users have access to many square miles of similar terrain with their ability to travel further. Please close the McCallum drainage to motorized use.	
0077-1	The McCallum Creek drainage should be added as another quiet recreation area.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0078-2	[I]n addition the McCallum Creek drainage would be a place that would also be good because unlike the other places mentioned [Castner, Fels & Augustana glaciers] that get much smaller amounts of snow. The McCallum gets decent snow falls.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0079-4	[A]t a minimum, [we] urge BLM to include the McCallum Creek drainage as part of the Cantwell subunit in its Final Plan. This area is proposed by longtime skiers with great familiarity with the entire area, for the reason that its location on the south side of the Delta Range makes for a reliable snowfall. It is their experience that the areas proposed for closure are in a snow shadow of the Delta Range and commonly lack adequate snowfall.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0097-7	To alleviate the very real probability of continued trail and environmental damage to the East Alaska lands, we urge BLM to adopt a policy as part of its final decision that Limited means limited to existing trails. (This designation is already in place in the Preferred Alternative for the Delta and Gulkana WSR Corridors.) This standard would serve a number of purposes: put everyone on notice that upon Plan approval, OHV use is being	We agree and the intent of the preferred alternative (D) is to limit OHV users to existing or designated trails. However, in order to designate trails in any given area and enforce no OHV travel off of designated trails, the following must occur: a) complete inventory of all existing trails in the area; b) determination of which trails are necessary based on public input, providing for subsistence, recreation, resource development, etc; c) publishing the designated trails in the Federal Register; and d) enforcement. BLM recognizes that it is not ready for that level of detail in this RMP decision. Therefore, it must set the stage in this RMP and prioritize areas for implementation-level planning. Logically, the first priority is for areas that we know we will manage long-term. In the meantime, BLM will increase it's OHV management on other lands (such as State-

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	managed throughout the East Alaska area: stop some of the trail proliferation and resource damage; provide an unambiguous basis for enforcement; permit enforcement to be initiated since we understand a substantial amount of the trail mapping will have been completed by time of Plan approval, and, of course, provide some protection for the land until implementation planning is completed.	selected lands) through education and enforcement.
0159-3	It is strongly recommended that an additional area on the south side of the Delta Range, the McCallum Creek drainage, be closed to snowmachines. That is the snowy side of the range and, prior to being displaced over the years by the increasing snowmachine traffic, this area was extensively used by backcountry skiers.	Please see response to comment 0042-1.
0164-41	The Nelchina Caribou Herd migrates through the Eureka Area in the spring. Ahtna Inc. would like to see protection of this resource from oil and gas leasing, mineral entry, and snowmachine and ATV recreational use.	The four townships of land in this area are selected by the State of Alaska and by Ahtna, Inc. Consequently, no mineral development would occur on these lands until they are conveyed to the selecting entity, at which time it is their decision whether or not to allow mineral development; or 2) the selections are relinquished and the lands are retained in long term federal ownership. The State of Alaska has indicated these lands are a high priority for conveyance, so relinquishment is doubtful.
0164-45	The Clearwater Mountain are a traditional hunting area of the Ahtna People and should be protected for fish and wildlife resources and subsistence uses.	The Clearwater Mountains, north of the Denali Highway, have been conveyed to the State of Alaska. They are now State lands. This RMP will not prescribe management for those lands.
0186-1	"…the waters contained on public lands provide a tremendous service in that they are the spawning and rearing areas for these fish stocks." "There is a direct correlation between the amount of quality habitat and fish populations."- I quote from the BLM Draft EIS. ...I wish to see the alternative to consider the Copper River watershed an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) reinstated.	A Copper River Watershed ACEC was considered during the planning process, but was eliminated from detailed analysis for the following reasons: a) BLM currently manages only approximately 15% of the lands within the watershed, 50% of which are selected lands that will probably not be retained under federal management; b) strong protective measures will be continued along the Gulkana River, BLM's largest piece of unencumbered land in the watershed, through the proposed SRMA designation and continued management as a Wild and Scenic River; c) protective measures will be put into place through measures identified for the West Fork area and the Tiekel SRMA (see tables pp. 598 and 583); and d) application of ROPs and stips for permitted activities apply strong protective measures for anadromous streams. This information will be added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS under "Alternatives Analyzed but not Considered

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
		in Detail (page 39)."
0312-8	The three conservation proposals for lands within the Delta Range are specifically the Delta Bison ACEC, the Delta Wild and Scenic River corridor SRMA, and the Delta Range SRMA. It is not a coincidence that the values of these lands continue to emerge throughout the draft plan. Obviously BLM Resource Specialists have both independently and collectively identified outstanding resource values and illustrated their willingness to commit protective management strategies toward long-term conservation. We recommend that the preferred alternative of the Final East Alaska RMP include a single proposal to recognize and protect the wildlife values and non-motorized recreation opportunities available in the Delta Range region.	Good idea. The areas are proposed as is because of different mandates and policy (for example, one area was withdrawn as a pipeline/utility corridor, one area is a Wild and Scenic River). However, they may be combined in implementation-level planning.
0312-16	We support Cascadia Wildlands' nomination to designate the BLM-managed lands and tributary streams within the Copper River Valley as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). The world renowned salmon fishery of the Copper River Valley is currently experiencing increasing impacts from human encroachment, unmanaged use of recreational off-highway vehicles (OHVs), and the potential for increased mineral development activities and infrastructure on adjacent BLM lands. The salmon spawning streams on BLM-managed lands should be avoidance areas for mining activities and OHV use should be limited to existing or designated trails and stream crossing points. We support an ACEC designation for the Copper River watershed that will not necessarily prohibit mining activities or OHV use, yet serve as a reminder	Please see response to comment 0186-1.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	in BLM permitting and management decisions of the sensitive fisheries habitat and BLM's responsibility to mitigate any impacts that could diminish water quality or downstream resource condition, increase erosion, or threaten the economic viability of the commercial salmon industry.	
0312-52	We support a combination of the allocations within Alternatives C and D regarding VRM classifications. The designated corridors of the Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic Rivers must be assigned VRM Class I to protect the outstandingly remarkable scenic values for which these rivers were designated. The landscapes adjacent to the designated corridors, especially the uplands visible from the rivers, should be assigned VRM Class II in order to minimize visual impacts and ensure a naturally harmonious scenic viewshed for users.	Thank you. Your recommendations are considered as part of the preferred alternative (D). See page 99, Draft RMP/EIS. There is limited Class II along the southern portion and the west fork of the Gulkana because the viewshed from the river in these areas is limited.
0312-93	Maintaining the ANCSA d(1) withdrawals within areas that should be recognized for special resources will afford the maximum protection for resource vales. The following d(1) withdrawals should be maintained against mineral leasing and locatable mineral entry: 1. PLO 5179 on the unencumbered BLM lands within the Bering RNA 2. PLO 5179 which provides the “outer corridor” on the Gulkana Wild and Scenic River. 3. ANCSA d(1) withdrawal within the Nelchina ACEC. 4. Modify PLO 6329 to exclude leasable minerals from West Fork ACEC 5. Modify PLO 5180 to exclude leasable minerals and mineral entry within the proposed Denali Highway SRMA. Generally, maintain ANCSA d(1) withdrawals in the following areas within the planning area: • Areas containing identified sites of subsistence,	Your suggestions are considered in alternative C of the Draft RMP/EIS, with the exception of Wild and Scenic Rivers. Please see responses to comments regarding Wild and Scenic Rivers in this Appendix.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	cultural or historical importance. • Designated, suitable, and interim protected Wild & Scenic Rivers. • Lands classified as VRM class I and II.	
0321-1	We would like the fisheries section of the plan reinstated, including an alternative to consider the Copper River watershed an Area of Critical Environmental Concern. Commercial fishing of Copper River seafood is an important economic, environmental and cultural resource which relies on the health of these lands.	Fisheries are addressed in the Draft RMP/EIS, on pp. 244 - 251 in Chapter 3 and pp. 461 - 477 in Chapter 4. For the Copper River ACEC proposal, see response to comment 0186 - 1.
0326-3	The Implementations-Level Planning section for both Alternative C and D will require the significant expenditure of time and funds in the attempt to designate areas and trails as "limited" or "closed. In contrast, Alternative A, based on the Southcentral Management Framework Plan (MFP), is the only alternative plan that would not require an inventory of all trails within the planning area. For these reasons, plus the fact that after land conveyances the majority of the EARMP area will be under state management, AOC supports Alternative A with the following amendments: 1.Revising Alternative A to match the State of Alaska's "Generally Allowed Uses on State Land" policy. This policy has a long record of adequately protecting state lands and will allow consistent enforcement between state and federal lands; 2.Revoking all ANCSA d(1) withdrawals, except within the already designated Delta and Gulkana Wild and Scenic River corridors and PLO 5150 (page 107 Alternative B, withdrawals.)Dual management of subsistence hunts in GMU 13 has been a continuous issue since federal managers developed subsistence regulations of their own. Conservation goals and law enforcement	Thanks for the comment. BLM will not amend alternative A in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS as you suggest because NEPA requires analysis of a "No Action" alternative. However, your amendment suggestions are considered and analyzed in other alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS, specifically: 1) Alternatives C and D consider adoption of policy consistent with the State's Generally allowed uses for State-selected lands; 2) Alternative B considers revocation of all ANCSA d(1) withdrawals; and 3) Alternative B considers revocation of PLO 5150, which would allow State conveyance to take place, therefore eliminating the federal subsistence hunt in the pipeline/utility corridor. It is possible to combine elements from each alternative in the final decision presented in the Record of Decision.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	of state hunting regulations would be much easier to achieve without federal hunting regulations applying to 1.5 million acres out of the 7 million in the planning area; 3. The construction of recreational facilities (under Alternative B, page 57) for the Denali Highway Area would be highly favored by the AOC. The AOC believes the vast majority of outdoor recreational users are law-biding citizens who are cognizant of environmental issues and they would appreciate outhouse facilities, garbage receptacles, and campground/boat-launches.	
MAPS		
0173-2	The Management Alternatives maps still do not have any references to allow the reader to determine exact locations of the proposed areas of management. They are missing: Township, Range, and Section lines; the Yost Trail is not identified on the maps. This is one example of a well establish [sic] trail that has been missed in the inventory. Are they others like this?	All maps within the document contain longitude and latitude lines, key location towns, larger river systems and lakes, as well as the main highways as reference points. The maps are not meant to portray exact locations and cannot because of the scale required to show the entire planning area on one page. Township and section lines are too detailed and would clutter the maps. We have included the main meridian lines, glaciers, and more towns, rivers, and roads as reference points.
0173-3	All active State and federal mining claims should be shown on at he maps. This will allow the reader to understand the impact on existing mineral exploration programs for the Alternatives. This would also allow local communities and businesses to assess the financial impact the Alternatives might have on their businesses. This data is readily available in electronic geospatial form for both State and BLM claims.	See response to comment 0355-7.
0173-40	All 17(b) access routes should be shown on the Plan with their identifying name and number.	See response to comment 0355-11.
0173-41	All roads, trails and historic access routes should be shown on all maps and identified with their BLM and/or State of Alaska identification numbers. These should include	See response to comment 0355-11.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	all trails, whether they qualify as RS-2477s or not. Those that do qualify as RS-2477s should be so identified. An appendix should be included to provide a comprehensive list of all trails of every type.	
0354-6	On (p. 163, map 24) the maps require more detail as no one can determine which 17(b) easement, in an area full of illegal trails, is being referred to. This only increases conflicts.	See response to comment 0355-11.
0354-7	The printing of the "alleged" RS 2477's is offensive to those of us (native Corporations and Tribal Councils) who DO NOT recognize them. BLM needs to refuse to acknowledge their existence and REMOVE THEM FROM THE MAPS, as printing them only increases conflicts and trespass issues, along with the associated costs, liabilities and litigation.	The R.S. 2477s have been removed from Maps 3 and 4 but not from Map 27 in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The following disclaimer has been added to Map 27: "RS-2477 routes portrayed on this map are for informational purposes only. These routes have not been adjudicated or asserted. The routes shown are based on historical or traditional trails, but because of lack of regular maintenance or use, many routes may no longer exist on the ground. These mapped routes DO NOT imply that a trail actually exists or that access is currently available. Consult with local land owners and managers before attempting to use the RS-2477 routes shown. "
0355-2	References are needed to assist the reader to better determine exact locations. Longitude and latitude are often the only reverence on many of the maps. We suggest that more reference information be added to include: township lines, place names for roads, towns, sites, lakes, etc. milepost references.	See response to comment 0173-2.
0355-3	All federal withdrawals including PLOs, secretarial orders, congressional acts, etc should be identified on maps.	Accurately portraying all PLOs, secretarial orders, and congressional acts on maps would result in a map that would be very complex and difficult to interpret. The effect of all PLOs, secretarial orders, and congressional acts is portrayed on the mineral alternatives maps 19-26 in the Draft RMP/EIS by showing which areas are open or closed to mineral development.
0355-5	State and Native selections should be identified in the EARMP and shown on the maps. These lands will likely be taken out of BLM management and it is important that everyone using the EAMP [sic] know that these selected lands will in all likelihood become State and Native owned lands at some point in the future.	Land status information is portrayed on all maps where it does not impede the understanding of the other information presented on the map. Acreages and explanations of land status within the planning area are described within Table 1 and in the narrative on pages 4 and 5 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Because of the large amount of selected lands within the planning area, for many alternatives interim and long-term management objectives are outlined. The role selected lands play within this planning area is clearly shown and considered throughout the document.
0355-7	Active State and Federal mining claims should be shown on the maps.	Federal mining claims have been added to the maps in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS dealing with mineral potential and the minerals alternatives. See maps 20, 21, 23, 25,

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
		and 51. This information will not be included on all maps because it does not pertain to the subject portrayed on all maps and would confuse the reader. State mining claims are not under BLM jurisdiction and are therefore not shown.
0355-9	A mineral occurrence map should be developed for the area and included in the Plan. This map should show all locations where mining has occurred in the past. This information is available through the USGS and the BLM minerals office.	A discussion of mineral occurrence and past mineral development is included in Chapter III on pages 325-337 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Maps 48, 49 and 50 of the Draft RMP/EIS display the mineral occurrence for coal, oil and gas, and minerals. A more specific description of the location of sites developed in the past is included in the discussion.
0355-10	All sedimentary basins should be shown and identified for their petroleum potential.	A description of sedimentary basins in the area is included on pp. 330-331 of the Draft RMP/EIS. These basins are shown on Map 50, page 333.
0355-11	All roads, trails and historic access routes should be shown an all maps and identified with their BLM and/or State of Alaska identification numbers. These should include all trails, whether they qualify as RS-2477s or they are currently recognized by the State. An appendix should be included giving a comprehensive list of all trails of every type. … Map 24 showing trails should identify each trail and include a table with names and number of each trail.	Because of the map scale required to show the entire planning area, the level of detail needed to identify specific trails or 17(b) easements on the ground is not possible. A detailed list of all trails and 17(b) easements is available from the Glennallen Field Office. A disclaimer has been added to Map 27 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS: "RS-2477 routes portrayed on this map are for informational purposes only. These routes have not been adjudicated or asserted. The routes shown are based on historical or traditional trails, but because of lack of regular maintenance or use, many routes may no longer exist on the ground. These mapped routes DO NOT imply that a trail actually exists or that access is currently available. Consult with local land owners and managers before attempting to use the RS-2477 routes shown. "
0355-13	All PLOs, including those along the inner and outer pipeline corridor, should be shown on the maps and identified by number and acreage.	A Table with the PLOs identified by number with their acreages has been included in the Final in Chapter III under Lands and Realty. The effect of these PLOs is displayed by alternative in Maps 17-23 of the Draft RMP/EIS. PLO 5150, which makes up the transportation and utility corridor, is identified on Map 41 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Acreages have been added to that map for both the inner and outer corridors.
0355-15	Map 1 and several other maps incorrectly identify BLM "unencumbered" lands when much of these lands are adversely encumbered by lingering withdrawals, PLOs, etc.	The Glossary, on page 696 of the Draft RMP/EIS, defines the term unencumbered as: "Public lands that have not been selected by the State or Native organizations. These are the lands that will be retained in long-term Federal ownership." The term is not used to describe specific limitations on a use of the land, only general land status.
0355-31	The red line boxes on Maps 19,21,and 23 that are meant to indicate areas open to mineral entry are not clear in some areas. It appears that these boxes may be areas that are NOT open to mineral entry. For example, WSR areas and Native-selected lands have red	These maps have been revised in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for clarification. See maps 19-26 in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	boxes around them. It is crucial that such issues be corrected or clearly explained in the EARMP to minimize the future confusion and lessen the opportunity for legal challenge.	
0355-32	Map 48 regarding Mineral Terranes and Producing Placer Districts is a valuable addition to the EARMP. However, this base information and the active mining claims should be included with the discussion of each Alternative to show the impacts of mineral closures and restrictions to access associated with each Alternative. Furthermore, this Map 48 should be placed at the beginning of the discussion to ensure that it is included in the minds of the reviewers from the start.	Map 48, which depicts Mineral Terranes in the Draft RMP/EIS, is located directly after the narrative discussion of mineral terranes. We feel this placement is consistent with how maps have been located throughout the document and is an effective way to portray the information.
	EDITORIAL CHANGES	
0164-4	The Final RMP should refer to Mt. McKinley as Mt. Denali.	The McKinley reference is consistent with the portrayal on USGS maps. For consistencies sake, BLM will use names accepted by the USGS for location names.
0164-40	Page 249 - Table 22 - The title of this table is misleading … It should be "Subsistence and Personal Use Fisheries Permits Issued and Harvested".	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0175-9	The definition of public lands in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) contrasts with the definition of public lands in ANILCA. Except for Titles IX and XIV of ANILCA that amend the Alaska Claims Settlement Act and the Alaska Statehood Act, ANILCA uses a definition of federal public lands that applies to many management directions regarding public uses of federal land. For purposes of the ANILCA provisions, the FLPMA definition must be replaced by the ANILCA definition in Section 102, which states: (2) The term “Federal land” means lands the title to which is in the United States after the date of enactment of this Act. (3) The term “public lands” means land situated in Alaska,	BLM will continue to use the FLPMA definition of public lands.

Letter-Comment	Comment	Response
	which, after the date of enactment of this Act (December 2, 1980), are Federal lands, except – A) land selections of the State of Alaska which have been tentatively approved or validly selected under the Alaska Statehood Act and lands which have been confirmed to, validly selected by, or granted to the Territory of Alaska or the State under any other provision of federal law; . . . Because the definition of public lands is important to determine where provisions of ANILCA versus FLPMA apply to federal lands in Alaska, we request the Bureau incorporate the ANILCA definition of public lands in the plan and carefully distinguish where the plan uses the FLPMA definition.	
0175-34	Page 149, b). Please correct item three to read: "Monitor Resource Populations Use(d) for Subsistence Purposes."	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0175-40	Page 249, Second full paragraph, line 3. Please change "residence" to "residents."	This change has been made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
0355-27	It appears that on page 61 regarding the Management Comment to all Alternatives should reference page 73 not page 56.	The reference to page 56 of the Draft RMP/EIS is correct as it is referring to Management Common to All Alternatives for Issue 2: Recreation (containing management for the Gulkana WSR Corridor Area) and not Issue 3: Natural and Cultural Resources.

9. GENERAL/OTHER

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
GENERAL (CROSSING MULTIPLE CATEGORIES)		
0010-4	We believe under ANILCA the Federal government is obligated to protect the state of Alaska's Native's fishing and hunting. We strongly believe that and I believe it's pretty well outlined in ANILCA.	Page 149 of the Draft RMP/EIS describes BLM's administrative functions in regard to subsistence management, including compliance with ANILCA Section 810. This is also clearly explained on pp. 342 and 343. Chapter 4 (pp. 522 - 535) displays the effects of implementation of the different management alternatives on subsistence (and socio/economics) and Appendix V is the ANILCA 810 analysis, considering impacts of the different management alternatives on subsistence.
0010-9	Some of the other concerns we have is on navigable waters, that these navigable waters are used to access lands that are private. We have concerns about--AHTNA, Inc., has a lot of lands out in the middle of nowhere here up rivers and we can't watch all of them, so I mean those thing ought to be considered before access is allowed.	See response to comment 0312-97.
0020-1	What needs to be added in your vision is the protection of neighboring lands and shared resources. We, as AHTNA and Mentasta people, I have testified before, you've heard, we are a good neighbor to BLM. We are a good neighbor to the Park Service and the State of Alaska. We don't let people, you know, cross through land with off-road vehicles, we don't encourage trashing. What we are asking is for your to be a good neighbor back, especially on these trails issues. So if you can add part of your vision to protect, or at least the shared resources need to be protected, something has to go in there.	Alternatives C and D define the Cantwell-Chistochina Travel Management Area (Draft RMP/EIS, pp. 40, 47) which outlines more active cooperation with Native entities regarding OHV use on Native-selected lands. A Goal of Travel Management is to: "Manage trails to minimize resource impacts and reduce user conflicts."
0020-9	There is not much management put into the protection of Native allotments. We have easements crossing Native allotments, which is forbidden. We need to get those dealt with.	This RMP will not affect disposition of Native allotments. Native allotments are described in pages 289 and 290 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0020-13	There's no justice here. And I think it all starts with policy. If your policy included that, somehow there would be--you can't teach respect but maybe you can establish a guideline where the respect is built in.	No, we can't establish a guideline, law, or regulation that requires respect. We can, however, educate the public about specific issues (17(b) easements in particular).
0020-19	The land--back to the Native lands, sorry. BLM's policy is to retain them in long-term Federal ownership, that scares me. That lets me know you have no incentive at all to transfer those lands to Natives. And you're not managing them or protecting them so what's going to happen? They must be transferred either to the State or Natives sooner if you're not going to protect them, they're just increasing in the contamination up there.	The land conveyance process is an issue out of the scope of this plan. See the Draft RMP/EIS, page 13. All land entitlements will be fulfilled as outlined in the Land Transfer Act which is an independent process from this plan.
0034-3	People having access to other lands via the rivers because they're navigable or getting to the lakes because they say the lakes are navigable and then they demand rights to get to that lake because they -- it's State owned, you know, it's State navigability. It's not addressed in the plan adequately.	See response to comment 0312-97.
0073-1	I would like to go on record as supporting the BLM preferred alternative D. I think it is always important to try to find a balance between development and conservation, particularly in a large area with multiple users and uses.	Thank you for your comment.
0075-1	The Council recommends selection of either alternative C or Alternative D of the East Alaska Resource Management Plan. These two alternatives strike an appropriate balance between protection of important common property resources and allowing use of renewable resources to take place.	Thank you for your comment. The final Record of Decision can incorporate elements of both Alternative C and D.
0164-22	The navigable waters issue as a method of accessing public lands is not adequately addressed in this Draft Plan and BLM needs to do so.	See response to comment 0312-97.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0164-67	We oppose Alyeska issuing permits within the pipeline utility corridor which allow access to Ahtna lands without management of trespass from State and Federal governments or Alyeska.	Decisions made in this planning process will not affect Alyeska's enforcement on the pipeline. Such issues should be worked out cooperatively between Ahtna, Alyeska, and the Joint Pipeline Office.
0173-10	Delta Bison Calving Area: This area is not truly "critical" and should not be designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) habitat as recommended under Alternative C and D. … Alternative C is unjustified and should not be adopted. BLM must manage its lands for multiple use. This alternative further restricts multiple use.	The Delta Bison Calving Area is only designated as an ACEC in Alternative C (see pages 80 and 83, Draft RMP/EIS). Evaluating this area as an ACEC within the range of alternatives does not restrict multiple use of BLM lands within the planning area. The definition of "multiple use" is shown on page 687 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0283-1	I recommend that Alternative "A" remain in effect. Alaska is a land of diverse habitat, topography and opportunity. There are currently dozens of millions of acres that are restricted for public use. Leave what we have now alone for public use at all levels. I support Alternative A because it represents a no nonsense, common sense approach to land use.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative A is evaluated throughout the range of alternatives presented within the Draft RMP/EIS.
0312-97	We request that the Proposed RMP/Final EIS addresses the impacts of the State navigable waters issue as a method of accessing public lands. The Draft RMP/EIS does not adequately assess this issue.	Decisions made as a part of this RMP process will not affect navigability determinations made as conveyance of State and ANCSA entitlements are fulfilled. However, since navigable waters are a major means of access in the state and within this planning area, the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will include a discussion in Chapter 3, under the Travel Management Issue, Access.
0331-4	Lands along the Tok Cutoff are neglected; there are no special areas set up, no values given special protection.	The lands along the Tok Cut-off, which are State- and Native-selected, are included in the Cantwell - Chistochina Travel Management Area under Alternatives C (Draft RMP/EIS, page 40) and Alternative D (Draft RMP/EIS, page 47), which emphasizes working with the Native communities to manage OHV use and impacts. This area also falls into the Extensive Recreation Management Area, see page 64.
0355-6	Navigable waters should be defined in the plan per the Gulkana decision and so identified.	See response to comment 0312-97.
0355-14	Table 1 on land status appears to have an error under the section of BLM administered lands. How can "Dual-selected" land be 2,100,000 acres while native-selected land is	Table 1 of the Draft RMP/EIS is accurate. The total amount of land the Natives have selected is the combination of land that is Dual-selected and Native-selected (44,000 + 2,100,000 = 2,144,000 acres total). The same is true for land selected by the State. Map 18 of the Draft RMP/EIS only shows land status for those lands currently open to

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	only 44,000? Also, Map 18 appears to support the notion of a lesser area of dual-selected lands.	mineral entry. Much of the dual-selected land is closed to mineral entry by a d(1) withdrawal and is therefore displayed as light pink.
0355-42	Alternative C is not acceptable. The restrictions included in Alternative C are not needed to manage the area. There are a multitude of regulations already in place that can assure that resource damage does not occur and closures and restrictions are not needed, no matter which alternative or mix of alternatives is selected and becomes the final plan.	NEPA requires an analysis of a wide range of alternatives in order to compare environmental consequences. Alternative C considers management actions that would implement strong area-wide protections. The Draft RMP/EIS analyzes the effects of implementing such an alternative on all resources, including the mineral industry (see pp. 519, 520).
0386-7	The boats is another thing. Up along the Gulkana River, we talked about the drinking water and the fisheries, the spawning areas. I don't know if it's really truly addressed but I hear locally that there's too many boats, too many motors, too much oil coming down on that river there. And there needs to be some type of, you know, limited restrictions on those areas there.	Concurrent to the development of the RMP, the River Management Plan for the Gulkana is being revised. Explanation of proposals under that revision (which will be consistent with decisions made in the RMP) are presented on page 56 of the Draft RMP/EIS.
0390-2	And also regarding the Pipeline Corridor, when they had that agreement there, we weren't -- this village here wasn't notified on the agreement between Alyeska and AHTNA for the Pipeline Corridor, and if we were notified we would have been there at that meeting, but we -- it wasn't so.	The agreement referred to was between Alyeska and Ahtna and is not affected by this planning document.
EDUCATION		
0010-2	AHTNA Incorporated has close to two million acres, I think it's 1.7 something million acres of land scattered throughout the Basin along the highway and so it is a great concern and when you're considering recreational uses and so forth, make sure that people the public knows that there are cabins out in the distant lands and so forth, that they observe the no trespassing rule.	BLM is committed to educating 17(b) easement users that they are using a limited right-of-access along a specific route when crossing Native corporation owned lands BLM will work with the land owner, state and other Federal agencies and the public regarding the rights reserved by the federal government and the fact that easements users are crossing privately owned lands to reach public lands.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
0020-30	We need some education. I've testified many times before, not only with elders to know the regulations, but people have to be aware that this private lands they're destroying.	Comment is referring to 17(b) easements. The Draft RMP/EIS identifies education/interpretation as one of the discretionary actions it would take on 17(b) easements, based on priorities listed on page 34.
0044-19	Educational signs with consequences for violators should explain the irresponsibility of using wildlife for target practice. [sic] (I speak specifically of the Parka Squirrel)	Thanks for the suggestion. Specifics for education/interpretation signage will be considered in implementation-level planning. Also see response to comment 0333-2.
0060-3	[T]here's a need to set a precedent … in terms of off-highway vehicle use. [T]here's a need to place a strong emphasis on education while that's still a possibility rather than trying to manage after the fact.	On page 32 of the Draft RMP/EIS, a goal for Travel Management is: "Manage trails with an emphasis on education where appropriate." Alternatives C and D under Travel Management focus on a ramped up education effort with regards to OHV use, especially on State-selected lands. The plan acknowledges the importance of education.
0333-2	[A]ll management of these lands should include education, not just regulations. People need to know their actions effect everything and everyone. They need to know that driving ATV' into salmon streams is harmful, that riding snowmachines too close to caribou in winter is wrong, that wetlands provide important habitat to birds and animals.	Education is an important component of BLM's proposed management described in Chapter 2 of the Draft RMP/EIS. See page 33 (Implementation-level planning), Recreation table on page 66 (Education and interpretation), and page 75 (Cultural Resources, 1st bullet statement).
MANAGEMENT OF SELECTED LANDS		
0020-16	You have a custodial management duty on Native [selected] lands until they are conveyed. Custodial means, not ignoring the damage being done. Inaction is creating damage on our lands that we're waiting conveyance, we can't speed up this conveyance process so Native lands that are waiting conveyance need to be protected, not just managed, or "managed", they're not being managed, but they're not being protected. So somewhere in your policy you need to write that these are private lands, irregardless of their conveyance status.	The Draft RMP/EIS clearly states that Native lands are private lands. However, Native or dual-selected lands are not private lands but are public until such time that conveyance takes place. The Draft RMP/EIS, particularly in Travel management, emphasizes the need to work with Ahtna Inc. or village corporations in trail management. See pp. 40 and 47 under "Chistochina-Cantwell Area". This travel management area is considered under both alternatives C and D. In addition, BLM is committed to working with Ahtna, Inc. on management of 17(b) easements. See responses under the Access category.
0020-24	Interim management. You emphasize education but you will not issue citations, well,	BLM, Glennallen Field Office, does issue citations for a variety of natural resources related violations (eight were issued in fiscal year 2004). However, we are limited in the

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	how are you going to enforce this if you're not going to issue citations? Native lands need to be protected. Our allotments, we have people crossing our Native allotments here and nobody's stopping it and Troopers won't respond, we need your help, that's your job, your duty to protect those Native allotments.	enforcement we can conduct on 17(b) easements. See response to comment 0379-3 under the Access category.
0060-5	There are several arguments that support BLM taking a proactive approach in management despite future land transfers, each of which is worth a brief discussion below. First, the depth and scope of the planning process thus far overwhelmingly demonstrates BLM's commitment. Second, the precedents set by BLM will have impacts long after land exchanges occur. And finally, there are no guarantees that ownership will be transferred on the predicted schedule, given that this has rarely been the case in the past. … While state, Native, and federal management imperatives differ, precedents are nonetheless extremely powerful across land ownership categories. This is particularly true in the case of disallowing uses that have formerly been popular in a given area. If, for example, off-road use becomes common in an area while that area is open to such use, subsequent closure becomes politically, socially, and logistically challenging. If, on the other hand, an area has previously been closed to a particular use, users may become habituated to a different area. Because of this tendency, it is much easier for new land managers to follow the precedents set by previous land managers than to create new ones. In particular, it is sometimes almost impossible for new land managers to create regulations that are substantially stricter than the old ones from an environmental perspective. Thus, it behooves	Thank you for the comment. Your line of reasoning was a driving force in BLM's recognition that this current planning effort needed to be completed, even with an accelerated conveyance process in place.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	BLM to set precedents with this in mind. Land transfers have been delayed before, and they may be delayed again. Use patterns, development patterns, human populations, and technology are all changing, and much can happen in a few short years. Even if some of the lands in question remain under BLM control for only four or five more years, the management practices during that time period will have important impacts. If they remain in BLM control far longer, the effects will multiply. Short duration of tenure does not preclude the best possible management decisions. Thus, NAEC [Northern Alaska Environmental Center] urges BLM to show the most responsible, complete, and forward-looking stewardship possible throughout the planning area. In most cases, Alternative C, the conservation alternative, meets this level of stewardship; thus NAEC endorses it as the preferred alternative.	
0173-12	It is totally inappropriate to include State and Native selected lands in any designation of an ACEC. These selected lands will in all likelihood become State or Native lands in the future. Therefore, no restrictions should be imposed on these lands that could complicate transfer or management of the lands.	There are no ACEC designations proposed on selected lands in Alternatives A, B, and D (BLM's preferred alternative). Also see response 0173-33.
0173-33	It is inappropriate to include State and Native lands in the defined alternatives. These selected lands will in all likelihood become State or native lands in the future. Therefore, no restrictions should be imposed on these lands.	We disagree. None of the proposals considered under alternatives C or D would create encumbrances on State or Native selections. BLM's current and proposed management of selected lands is completely consistent with ANILCA, section 906(k). ANILCA and ANCSA task BLM with interim management of these lands so we would be remiss in not considering them.
0312-89	The BLM should proactively manage all lands it administers, regardless of status, until conveyed. Management of selected lands should err toward conservative 'stewardship'	BLM's proposals for management of selected lands within the Draft RMP/EIS are consistent with ANILCA 906(k) and were developed in coordination with the State and with Native and village corporations. BLM is committed to the management of these lands until they are conveyed or relinquished.

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	obligations. This will ensure that the lands remain in high quality, minimally disturbed resource condition when, and if, State and Native-selected land conveyance occurs. By preserving lands it administers today, the agency is preserving lands it may retain after conveyances are settled. We support cooperative agreements between the BLM and Tribal Governments within the planning area regarding the management of Native Selected lands.	
0312-90	All proposed SRMAs, RNAs, and ACECs should include selected lands within their boundaries. This will prevent management and enforcement problems when, and if, land ownership changes in the planning area.	Selected lands are included in designations under Alternative C.
0329-52	The East Alaska BLM lands that are state and native selected are likely to be among those that are left over when over-selections have been dealt with. While lots of this land will lapse into private ownership, lots of it will not. Please manage all this land as if you were managing it forever.	Please see response to comment 0312-89.
0329-120	It is interesting that "Realistically, if exploration showed true potential for development, these lands would likely be conveyed to the Native corporations or the State." (p.521) Given this, what impact would the action alternatives have on conveyance? Areas opened to exploration would become more likely to be conveyed.	No actions proposed within this plan will have an affect on the conveyance process, see page 13 of the Draft RMP/EIS, "Issues beyond the scope of the plan".
0331-3	The proposed methods of interim management (before lands are either conveyed or become unencumbered BLM lands) are seriously flawed. BLM should be a good steward of selected lands, so that resource values are protected for whatever entity ultimately controls them. Instead, by following the state's weak management guidelines, BLM proposes, under	The intent of the preferred alternative (D) is to limit OHV users to existing or designated trails. However, in order to designate trails in any given area and enforce no OHV travel off of designated trails, the following must occur: a) complete inventory of all existing trails in the area; b) determination of which trails are necessary based on public input, providing for subsistence, recreation, resource development, etc; c) publishing the designated trails in the Federal Register; and d) enforcement. BLM recognizes that it is not ready for that level of detail in this RMP decision. Therefore, it must set the stage in this RMP and prioritize areas for implementation-level planning. Logically, the first

Letter #-Comment #	Comment	Response
	alternative D, to allow degradation of lands and resources during the interim. The same problem would occur with regard to "existing trails" on selected lands in Alternative C.	priority is for areas that we know we will manage long-term. In the meantime, BLM will increase it's OHV management on other lands (such as State-selected lands) through education and enforcement.

E. Index of Comment Letter Numbers

Below is a list of names of those who commented on the Draft East Alaska RMP/EIS and their assigned comment letter number. Also shown are the page numbers where responses to their specific comments can be found. If, through the content analysis process, it was found that a letter was a variation of a form letter rather than unique comment, the comment number of the form letter will be referenced and responses to all comments can be found by looking under that form letter number. Organizations and government entities are listed by the organization or the government agency rather than by the signature to the submission. An index organized by comment letter number rather than alphabetically by last name follows as well.

Index of Comment Letter Numbers, alphabetical by last name or organization

Name of Commenter	***Comment Letter #***	***Pages referenced***
Adler, Lee	0003	J-190
Ahtna Inc.	0164	J-20, J-22, J-41, J-42, J-64, J-65, J-66, J-76 J-77, J-82, J-86, J-87, J-95, J-97, J-104, J-112 J-113, J-122, J-204, J-205, J-225, J-228, J-232 J-233, J-234, J-255, J-256, J-257, J-277, J-278 J-294, J-301, J-308, J-311, J-312
Alaska Coalition	0017	J-27, J-193, J-228, J-247
Alaska Coalition et al	0312	J-49, J-50, J-67, J-78, J-89-91, J-100, J-115 J-122-125, J-133-136, J-147-159, J-165-171 J-181, J-183-185, J-209, J-230, J-240, J-242 J-243, J-250, J-260-265, J-281, J-287, J-302 J-303, J-312, J-316, J-317
Alaska Extreme Four Wheelers	0313	J-50, J-281, J-282
Alaska Miner's Association	0355	J-70, J-71, J-94, J-97, J-121, J-123, J-141 J-163, J-215, J-231, J-241, J-253, J-268, J-271 J-306-309, J-312, J-313.
Alaska Outdoor Access Alliance	0049	J-83, J-298
Alaska Outdoor Council	0326	J-67, J-68, J-266, J-283, J-304
Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition	0097	J-38, J-76, J-86, J-128, J-203, J-249, J-276 J-277, J-300
Alaska, State of	0175	J-23, J-43, J-44, J-45, J-66, J-82, J-83, J-96 J-97, J-105, J-106, J-113, J-114, J-131, J-132 J-145, J-146, J-164, J-165, J-189, J-207, J-229 J-230, J-232-234, J-257-J-260, J-278-280 J-308, J-309
Alderson, George & Frances	0171	*see comment letter # 0084*
Allen, Jim	0037	J-85
Allen, Butch	0307	*see comment letter # 0084*
Anchorage Fish & Game Advisory Committee	0176	*see comment letter # 0310*
Ausman, Dave	0320	*see comment letter # 0310*
Austin, Charles	0093	J-37, J-276
Bailey, Scott	0327	J-51
Baker, Melanie	0103	*see comment letter # 0084*

Name of Commenter	***Comment Letter #***	***Pages referenced***
Baker, Carl	0191	*see comment letter # 0310*
Barber, Ken	0047	J-32, J-293, J-297
Barker, William	0223	*see comment letter # 0310*
Beeter, Evelyn	0004	J-190, J-221
Behm, Joe	0347	*see comment letter # 0310*
Behm, Wade	0350	*see comment letter # 0310*
Berge, Anna	0042	J-30, J-197, J-297
Bergman, Ross	0277	*see comment letter # 0310*
Billstrom, Robert	0074	*no substantive comments found*
Black, William	0353	*no substantive comments found*
Blaess, Alexis	0145	*see comment letter # 0084*
Blomskog, Eric	0222	*see comment letter # 0310*
Blowers, Robert	0001	*no substantive comments found*
Blythe-Madson, Erin	0150	*no substantive comments found*
Boos, Paul	0160	J-142-144, J-204, J-277
Booth, Judy	0113	*see comment letter # 0084*
Booth, Bill & Michelle	0245	*see comment letter # 0310*
Brandt, Joel	0259	*see comment letter # 0310*
Brandt, Brian	0274	J-48
Brandt, Cathy	0278	J-48
Britt, Mike	0038	J-30, J-296
Brown, Michael	0158	J-224, J-225
Brown, Stephen	0165	J-183
Brown, Garret	0204	*see comment letter # 0310*
Burke, Brenda	0065	J-223
Burkhart, Elizabeth & Roy	0183	*see comment letter # 0310*
Burton, Canary	0363	*no substantive comments found*
Busemeyer, Dan	0126	*see comment letter # 0084*
Cameron, Don	0092	J-37
*Campaign for America's Wilderness e-mail	0084	J-76, J-86, J-99, J-142, J-202, J-239, J-286
Campbell, Bruce	0366	*see comment letter # 0084*
Campbell, Jack	0255	*see comment letter # 0310*
Campbell-Charlebois, Margaret	0107	*see comment letter # 0084*
Carlton, Keith	0130	*see comment letter # 0084*
Caron, Allen	0166	J-183
Carr, Vivki	0143	J-242
Carter, Alison	0184	J-250
Carter, Stanley	0216	*see comment letter # 0310*
Cascadia Wildlands Project,	0329	J-24, J-51-54, J-68, J-79, J-97, J-100 J-107-110, J-116-119, J-126, J-137-139 J-159-163, J-172-182, J-185-188, J-190, J-212 J-225, J-233-237, J-243-247, J-250-252, J-266 J-267, J-283, J-284, J-288-292, J-317
Cheesh-na Tribal Council,	0172	J-206
Chitna Native Corporation,	0357	J-62, J-71, J-98, J-215
Chmielowski, Steve	0318	J-266
Christianson, Carol	0250	*see comment letter # 0310*
Clark, Todd	0314	*see comment letter # 0310*
Clark, Jennifer	0339	J-59, J-60, J-80
Collins, Billy	0066	J-275
Cook, Brenda	0135	*see comment letter # 0084*
Cook, Tim	0254	*see comment letter # 0310*
Copper Basin Fish & Game Advisory Committee	0156	J-38, J-39, J-40

Name of Commenter	*Comment Letter #*	*Pages referenced*
Copper Country Alliance	0331	J-55-57, J-92, J-93, J-100, J-139, J-140, J-163 J-212, J-240, J-252, J-267, J-292, J-312, J-317
Copper River Watershed Project	0308	J-77, J-89, J-209
Cordova District Fishermen United	0311	J-49, J-209, J-269-271
Couch, Country	0139	*see comment letter # 0084*
Coutts, Dick	0271	J-48
Craig, Albert	0389	*no substantive comments found*
Crain, Marjorie	0266	*see comment letter # 0310*
Cranston, Edwin	0109	*see comment letter # 0084*
Cremer, Kellie	0127	*see comment letter # 0084*
Crosby, Norman	0247	*see comment letter # 0310*
Crosby, Linnea	0248	*see comment letter # 0310*
Cruz, Dave	0229	*see comment letter # 0310*
Cumming, Diana	0117	*see comment letter # 0084*
Curtis, Richard	0144	*see comment letter # 0084*
DePriest, Tiny Rose Marie	0188	J-47, J-77, J-83
DeWitt, Catherine	0005	*no substantive comments found*
Dube, Ray	0067	J-34, J-249
Dugan, Troy	0039	*no substantive comments found*
Duhn, Danyl	0239	*see comment letter # 0310*
Duncan, Winston	0174	J-207
Duncan, Tom	0371	J-82, J-121
Durgeloh, Rhonda	0348	*see comment letter # 0310*
Durgeloh, Bennett	0349	*see comment letter # 0310*
Eames, Cliff	0006	J-24-27, J-75, J-84, J-182, J-183, J-190 J-191, J-296
Earnhart, Darlene	0099	*see comment letter # 0084*
Eastham, Bill	0288	*see comment letter # 0310*
Ecotrust	0341	J-60, J-93, J-100, J-120, J-140, J-163, J-213 J-237, J-254, J-285
Edwards, Bruce	0221	*see comment letter # 0310*
Eldridge, Cheryl	0208	J-281
Eldridge, John	0214	*see comment letter # 0310*
Elkins, Rich	0147	J-142, J-249
English, William	0301	*see comment letter # 0310*
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10	0323	J-51, J-136, J-137, J-171, J-172, J-181, J-210 J-282, J-288, J-294, J-295
Epstein, Erica	0133	*see comment letter # 0084*
Erickson, Mike	0298	*see comment letter # 0310*
Eskeuda, Karen	0034	J-29, J-248, J-275, J-311
Evenson, Timothy	0234	*see comment letter # 0310*
Ewan, Crystal	0009	J-184, J-192
Ewan, Roy	0010	J-21, J-62, J-96, J-192, J-193, J-310, J-313
Ewan, Faye	0380	J-182, J-218, J-295
Ewan, Harding	0387	*no substantive comments found*
Falldorf, Dennis	0180	J-46
Finnesand, David	0376	J-95, J-98, J-218, J-231, J-232, J-238
Fiscus, Warren	0192	J-47
Flackett, Rachel	0152	*see comment letter # 0084*
Flora, Louie	0317	J-78, J-159
Flory, Steven	0050	J-32, J-275, J-298
Flowers, Bobbie Dee	0362	*see comment letter # 0084*
Fournier, Eric	0155	*see comment letter # 0084*
Fox, Delesta	0260	*see comment letter # 0310*

Name of Commenter	***Comment Letter #***	***Pages referenced***
Francis, Mary	0121	*see comment letter # 0084*
Freeburg, Ruth	0370	*no substantive comments found*
Freelove, Sam	0270	*see comment letter # 0310*
Freelove, Angie	0272	J-48
Frey, Stephanie	0299	*see comment letter # 0310*
Friend, Bruce	0332	*see comment letter # 0310*
Friesen, Sara	0281	*see comment letter # 0310*
Fritiz, Cecily	0306	J-49, J-133, J-147, J-208, J-281
Gakona Village	0082	J-201
Gans, Clint	0102	*see comment letter # 0084*
Gardner, George	0161	*no substantive comments found*
Gardner, Sam	0162	*no substantive comments found*
Geagley, Ben	0068	J-35, J-87
Gene, Virginia	0011	*no substantive comments found*
Gene, Christopher	0379	J-62, J-73, J-218
Gerken, Vicki	0267	J-48
Gerkin, Gene	0279	*see comment letter # 0310*
Giaugue, Greg & Lori	0242	*see comment letter # 0310*
Gilligan, Ainslie	0149	*see comment letter # 0084*
Godduhn, Anna	0061	J-128
Gojenola, Curt	0292	*see comment letter # 0310*
Goodlataw, Genevive	0012	*no substantive comments found*
Goodlataw, Johnny	0013	*no substantive comments found*
Goodlataw, Linda	0014	*no substantive comments found*
Goodlataw, Betty	0373	J-226
Gordon, Lorraine	0383	J-219
Graham, Jeff	0181	J-46
Graham, Todd	0294	*see comment letter # 0310*
Greenwalt, Art	0043	J-30
Griswold, Bret	0087	*see comment letter # 0084*
Gschwind, Ted	0291	J-49
Gulkana Village	0081	J-200
Gutler, Stan	0015	*no substantive comments found*
Hadaway, Bob	0182	*no substantive comments found*
Hahn, Virginia	0094	*see comment letter # 0084*
Hala, Kurt	0289	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hall, Karen	0151	*see comment letter # 0084*
Hamann, Dennis	0237	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hamann, Dennis	0241	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hamilton, Norma	0110	*see comment letter # 0084*
Hansen, Roger	0372	*no substantive comments found*
Harper, Christine	0129	*see comment letter # 0084*
Harris, Bob	0228	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hash-Koonuk, Evelyn	0377….	*no substantive comments found*
Haynes, Fred	0240	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hein, Jill	0118	*see comment letter # 0084*
Helms, Jo	0119	*see comment letter # 0084*
Hensel, Chase	0335	J-252
Hermann, Jerry	0262	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hershberger, James	0072	J-223
Hertrich, Daniel	0264	J-48
Hicks, Theresa	0236	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hicks, Joeneal	0381	J-62, J-73, J-219, J-226, J-227, J-296

Name of Commenter	***Comment Letter #***	***Pages referenced***
Hiller, Marty	0157	*see comment letter # 0084*
Hitchcock, J.C.	0224	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hoaglund, Maria	0154	*see comment letter # 0084*
Hodeds, Hal	0217	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hofler, Allen	0304	*see comment letter # 0310*
Holden, Grace	0305	J-239
Homan, Don	0123	*see comment letter # 0084*
Howard, Ron	0185	J-46, J-132, J-147, J-208, J-281
Huey, Aaron	0258	*see comment letter # 0310*
Huey, Brian	0265	*see comment letter # 0310*
Hull, William	0283	J-312
Jackman, Jeff	0243	*see comment letter # 0310*
Jackson, Nick	0016	J-27, J-63, J-193
Jackson, Stephanie	0112	*see comment letter # 0084*
Jacquot, Michael	0275	*see comment letter # 0310*
Jasper, Gary	0256	*see comment letter # 0310*
Jasper, Stephanie	0287	*see comment letter # 0310*
Javis, Tony	0203	*see comment letter # 0310*
Jeffries, Kyle	0361	*no substantive comments found*
Jenski, Robert	0212	*see comment letter # 0310*
Joe, Marilyn	0385	J-20, J-111, J-219
John Jr, Robert	0384	*no substantive comments found*
Johns, Ken	0386	J-74, J-123, J-220, J-268, J-313
Johnson, Rick	0069	J-276, J-293
Johnson, Brian	0296	*see comment letter # 0310*
Jon, Miller	0035	J-29, J-30, J-75, J-296
Justice, Stan	0062	J-198, J-299
Justin, Wilson	0033	J-255, J-274
Kari, Jim	0063	*no substantive comments found*
Keefe, Kathleen	0142	*see comment letter # 0084*
Keeler, Kevin	0187	J-47, J-89, J-147
Keim, Frank	0077	J-36, J-199, J-300
Kennedy, Judy	0368	*see comment letter # 0084*
Kenny, Constance	0108	*see comment letter # 0084*
King, Andy	0051	J-32
Sierra Club, Alaska Chapter, Knik Group	0321	J-50, J-92, J-100, J-115, J-136, J-159, J-210 J-243, J-304
Knowles, Bruce	0206	*see comment letter # 0310*
Kochendrfa, Diane	0018	*see comment letter # 0008*
Kostlin, Hal	0205	*see comment letter # 0310*
Kostyuick, Sopluker	0168	J-183
Kubat, Wayne	0244	*see comment letter # 0310*
Kuch, Carolyn	0251	*see comment letter # 0310*
Kuch, Leo	0280	*see comment letter # 0310*
LaCour, Murry	0215	*see comment letter # 0310*
Lammers, Gary	0249	*see comment letter # 0310*
Lang, John	0325	*see comment letter # 0310*
Langman, James	0293	*no substantive comments found*
Larson, Kelly	0052	J-33
Larson, Link	0053	*no substantive comments found*
Larson, Alan	0195	*see comment letter # 0310*
Leach, J	0098	*see comment letter # 0084*
Lee, Shari	0336	J-59
Leffler, Leslie	0100	*see comment letter # 0084*

Name of Commenter	***Comment Letter #***	***Pages referenced***
Leider, Randy	0194	*see comment letter # 0310*
Leider, William	0226	*see comment letter # 0310*
Lindun, Michael	0290	*see comment letter # 0310*
Lindun, Karen	0297	*see comment letter # 0310*
Littleton, Wayne	0225	*see comment letter # 0310*
Lyle, John	0045	J-84, J-197, J-297
Macdonell, Caroline	0095	*see comment letter # 0084*
Marlink, Milen	0198	J-272
Marlink, Rita	0199	J-272
Marsh, Melba	0148	*see comment letter # 0084*
Marshall, Elmer	0391	J-220
Masco, Angela	0365	*no substantive comments found*
Mathews, Sue	0088	*see comment letter # 0084*
Matson, Cheryl	0115	*see comment letter # 0084*
Mat-Su trails Council Inc.	0169	J-22, J-42, J-78
McAllister, Jeffery	0284	*see comment letter # 0310*
McDonnell, Glen	0134	*see comment letter # 0084*
McGuire, Sean	0078	J-36, J-300
McHenry, Ruth	0019	J-99
McIntosh, Larry	0040	J-30
McNicholas, Thomas	0359	*see comment letter # 0084*
McRoberts, Steve	0146	*see comment letter # 0084*
Medeiros, Chris	0300	*see comment letter # 0310*
Meielke, Kesley & Jeanne	0178	*see comment letter # 0310*
Melm, Joe	0209	*see comment letter # 0310*
Melton, Monica	0177	*see comment letter # 0310*
Menser, Ty	0358	*no substantive comments found*
Meyer, Buffy	0213	*see comment letter # 0310*
Meyers, Brian	0218	*see comment letter # 0310*
Mielke, Daniel	0257	*see comment letter # 0310*
Miknich, Charles	0295	*see comment letter # 0310*
Moran, Kate	0104	J-86
Morce, Erik	0285	*see comment letter # 0310*
Murphree, Tom	0364	*no substantive comments found*
Native Village of Tazlina	0328	J-210
Nevada Star	0173	J-23, J-42, J-82, J-87, J-88, J-104, J-129-131 J-144, J-145, J-207, J-229, J-269, J-278, J-305 J-312, J-316
Newman, Ty	0269	*see comment letter # 0310*
Nielsen, Gretchen	0201	*see comment letter # 0310*
Nielsen, Lyle	0252	*see comment letter # 0310*
Nolen, Jeff	0232	*see comment letter # 0310*
Northcott, T.J.	0356	*see comment letter # 0310*
Nothern Alaska Environmental Center	0060	J-33, J-34, J-84, J-85, J-127, J-141, J-197 J-198, J-228, J-248, J-249, J-275, J-298, J-299 J-314, J-315
National Park Service	0342	J-80, J-81, J-140, J-213, J-231
O'Conner, Patrick	0200	J-47
Ogden, Doug	0310	J-20, J-281
Ojala, Leslie	0141	*see comment letter # 0084*
Olson, Warren	0054	*no substantive comments found*
Olson, Susan	0159	J-41, J-142, J-203, J-278, J-301
Olson, Gary	0263	*see comment letter # 0310*
Olzenak, Nick	0324	*see comment letter # 0310*

Name of Commenter	*Comment Letter #*	*Pages referenced*
Oppegard, Michael	0302	*see comment letter # 0310*
Oppegard, Theresa	0303	*see comment letter # 0310*
Orrison, David	0211	*see comment letter # 0310*
Otcheck, John	0219	*see comment letter # 0310*
Ourllette, Tracy	0153	*see comment letter # 0084*
Owens, Pat	0333	J-57, J-314
Pahl, Aleta	0091	*see comment letter # 0084*
Paragi, Tom	0055	J-97, J-103, J-112, J-197
Paulsen, Bruce	0253	J-47, J-67
Payne, Karen	0116	*no substantive comments found*
Peckham, Dustin	0286	*see comment letter # 0310*
Pennington, Donna	0020	J-28, J-63, J-64, J-101, J-121, J-122, J-124 J-194, J-221, J-228, J-232, J-273 J-292, J-310 J-311, J-314
Pennington et al, Donna	0354	J-61, J-69, J-70, J-82, J-95, J-110, J-111 J-120, J-123, J-126, J-189, J-214, J-233, J-240 J-268, J-272, J-286, J-295, J-306
Pete, Markyl	0021	*no substantive comments found*
Pete, Carl	0390	J-98, J-269, J-313
Pete, Steve	0374	J-215
Peters, Bob	0022	J-28, J-194
Peters, Kari	0230	*see comment letter # 0310*
Petrich, Dean	0124	*see comment letter # 0084*
Petty, Charlene	0101	*see comment letter # 0084*
Post, Thomas	0170	*see comment letter # 0084*
*Public Land Order 5150 subsistence, long	0008	J-191
*Public Land Order 5150 subsistence, short	0007	J-191
Quist, Elizabeth	0140	*see comment letter # 0084*
Rader, Heidi	0344	J-60
Rammon, Desiree	0137	*see comment letter # 0084*
Raya-Carlton, Pamela	0131	*see comment letter # 0084*
Reed, Gene	0202	*see comment letter # 0310*
Rehme, Ann	0106	*see comment letter # 0084*
Reidsma, Steve	0070	J-35, J-76, J-142
Reifenstahl, Rockey	0064	J-34
Reynolds, Andy	0340	J-60, J-80
Rice, Marshell	0136	*see comment letter # 0084*
Richards, Gene	0138	*see comment letter # 0084*
Richardson, Katherine	0073	J-312
Richardson Jr., Ricky	0231	*see comment letter # 0310*
Richarson Sr., Ricky	0233	*see comment letter # 0310*
Riddle, Donna	0369	J-82, J-272
Riley, Joe	0023	J-222, J-273
Rilling, Gerald	0085	*no substantive comments found*
Rizzo, Steve	0282	*see comment letter # 0310*
Robbins, Mike	0375	J-72, J-215, J-216, J-217
Robert, Glenn	0197	*no substantive comments found*
Robinson, Kevin	0238	*see comment letter # 0310*
Rondoh, Dave	0024	J-194
Rutledge, Charlie & Linda	0163	J-103, J-104, J-144
Sachu, Mr. or Ms. B.	0002	*no substantive comments found*
Sampson, Wade	0025	*no substantive comments found*
Sanford, Shawn	0026	J-28, J-99, J-293
Saunders, Craig	0190	*see comment letter # 0310*

Name of Commenter	*Comment Letter #*	*Pages referenced*
Schachle, Vern	0179	*see comment letter # 0310*
Schendel, Dale	0210	*see comment letter # 0310*
Scott, Elizabeth	0096	*no substantive comments found*
Sedlacek, Robert & Helen, Jacob & Jessica	0337	J-59, J-80
Sehm, George	0196	*see comment letter # 0310*
Shields, Mary	0338	J-59, J-240
Siebels, Ron	0316	*see comment letter # 0310*
Sinyon, Elaine	0027	J-29, J-222, J-293
Sirkis, Jon	0360	J-84
Smid, Tamara	0044	J-21, J-31, J-83, J-95, J-96, J-98, J-99 J-101-103, J-111, J-112, J-164, J-189, J-239 J-255, J-275, J-314
Snyder, Cara	0105	*see comment letter # 0084*
Soloway, Diana	0125	*see comment letter # 0084*
Southcentral Subsistence Advisory Council	0080	J-36, J-64, J-128, J-199, J-224, J-255 J-276, J-294
Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Council	0075	J-198, J-311
Spates, Gigi	0122	J-201 *and see comment letter # 0084*
Spence, Wesley	0220	*no substantive comments found*
Stallard, Tim	0346	J-61, J-214, J-253
State of Alaska, *see Alaska, State of*		
Statscewich, Marla	0343	J-81
Steffes, Dolores	0235	*see comment letter # 0310*
Sterling, Catherine	0276	*see comment letter # 0310*
Stern, William	0132	*see comment letter # 0084*
Stickwan, Gloria	0028	J-194, J-293
Sullivan, M	0111	*see comment letter # 0084*
Summerlin, Kristin	0367	J-95, J-188
Sutton, David	0189	*see comment letter # 0310*
Swald, John	0273	*see comment letter # 0310*
Tanzy, Roy	0388	*see comment letter # 0164*
Tarfman, Aaron	0120	*see comment letter # 0084*
Tatlow, Wendy	0246	*see comment letter # 0310*
Tatlow, Mark	0309	*see comment letter # 0310*
Thomasson, June	0319	J-50, J-243
Tweed, Clifton	0261	*see comment letter # 0310*
Tweton, Pamela	0322	*no substantive comments found*
Tyone, Andrew	0029	*no substantive comments found*
Tyone, Andrew Sr.	0030	*no substantive comments found*
Tyone, Jay	0031	J-196
Tyone, Sharon	0032	*no substantive comments found*
Tyone, Linda	0382	J-73, J-219
Underwood, Aaron	0345	J-141
Unknown, Ben	0193	*see comment letter # 0310*
United States Geological Service	0036…	*no substantive comments found*
Vach, Norm	0114	*see comment letter # 0084*
van der Berg, Jennifer	0041	J-196, J-297
Voight, Fred	0057	J-22, J-222, J-223
Vose, Sam	0071	*no substantive comments found*
Ward, David	0076	J-224
Waters, Rose	0207	*see comment letter # 0310*
Watson, Vivki	0086	J-128, J-203
Wilber, Michelle	0186	J-115, J-301
*Wild Salmon postcard	0083	J-113

Name of Commenter	*Comment Letter #*	*Pages referenced*
Wilkinson, John	0167	J-129, J-183
Wolf, Lisa	0378	J-226
Woods, Noel	0058	J-33
Woods, Dee	0315	J-282
WRST, Subsistence Resource Commission	0079	J-300
Wynne, J. Judson	0090	*see comment letter # 0084*
Wyse, Frank	0128	*see comment letter # 0084*
Yakutat Salmon Board	0330	J-119, J-271, J-284
Yude, Eric	0059	J-33, J-197
Zandstra, Craig	0089	*see comment letter # 0084*
Zirnheld, Sandra	0334	J-58, J-163

* Denotes a form letter with multiple signatures.

Index of Comment Letter Numbers, numerical

Comment Letter #	*Name of Commenter*
0001	Blowers, Robert
0002	Sachu, Mr. or Ms. B.
0003	Adler, Lee
0004	Beeter, Evelyn
0005	DeWitt, Catherine
0006	Eames, Cliff
0007	*Public Land Order 5150, short
0008	*Public Land Order 5150, long
0009	Ewan, Crystal
0010	Ewan, Roy
0011	Gene, Virginia
0012	Goodlataw, Genevive
0013	Goodlataw, Johnny
0014	Goodlataw, Linda
0015	Gutler, Stan
0016	Jackson, Nick
0017	Alaska Coalition
0018	Kochendrfa, Diane
0019	McHenry, Ruth
0020	Pennington, Donna
0021	Pete, Markyl
0022	Peters, Bob
0023	Riley, Joe
0024	Rondoh, Dave
0025	Sampson, Wade
0026	Sanford, Shawn
0027	Sinyon, Elaine
0028	Stickwan, Gloria
0029	Tyone, Andrew
0030	Tyone, Andrew Sr.
0031	Tyone, Jay
0032	Tyone, Sharon
0033	Justin, Wilson
0034	Eskeuda, Karen
0035	Jon, Miller
0036	United States Geological Service
0037	Allen, Jim
0038	Britt, Mike
0039	Dugan, Troy
0040	McIntosh, Larry
0041	van der Berg, Jennifer
0042	Berge, Anna
0043	Greenwalt, Art
0044	Smid, Tamara
0045	Lyle, John
0047	Barber, Ken
0049	Alaska Outdoor Access Alliance
0050	Flory, Steven
0051	King, Andy
0052	Larson, Kelly
0053	Larson, Link
0054	Olson, Warren
0055	Paragi, Tom
0056	Petrivelli, Pat
0057	Voight, Fred
0058	Woods, Noel
0059	Yude, Eric
0060	Nothern Alaska Environmental Center
0061	Godduhn, Anna
0062	Justice, Stan
0063	Kari, Jim
0064	Reifenstahl, Rockey
0065	Burke, Brenda
0066	Collins, Billy
0067	Dube, Ray
0068	Geagley, Ben
0069	Johnson, Rick
0070	Reidsma, Steve
0071	Vose, Sam
0072	Hershberger, James

0073 ....Richardson, Katherine
0074 ....Billstrom, Robert
0075 ....Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
0076 ....Ward, David
0077 ....Keim, Frank
0078 ....McGuire, Sean
0079 ....WRST, Subsistence Resource Commission
0080 ....Southcentral Subsistence Advisory Council
0081 ....Gulkana Village
0082 ....Gakona Village
0083 ....* Wild Salmon postcard
0084 ....* Campaign for America's Wilderness e-mail
0085 ....Rilling, Gerald
0086 ....Watson, Vivki
0087 ....Griswold, Bret
0088 ....Mathews, Sue
0089 ....Zandstra, Craig
0090 ....Wynne J., Judson
0091 ....Pahl, Aleta
0092 ....Cameron, Don
0093 ....Austin, Charles
0094 ....Hahn, Virginia
0095 ....Macdonell, Caroline
0096 ....Scott, Elizabeth
0097 ....Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition
0098 ....Leach, J.
0099 ....Earnhart, Darlene
0100 ....Leffler, Leslie
0101 ....Petty, Charlene
0102 ....Gans, Clint
0103 ....Baker, Melanie
0104 ....Moran, Kate
0105 ....Snyder, Cara
0106 ....Rehme, Ann
0107 ....Campbell-Charlebois, Margaret
0108 ....Kenny, Constance
0109 ....Cranston, Edwin
0110 ....Hamilton, Norma
0111 ....Sullivan, M.
0112 ....Jackson, Stephanie
0113 ....Booth, Judy
0114 ....Vach, Norm
0115 ....Matson, Cheryl
0116 ....Payne, Karen
0117 ....Cumming, Diana
0118 ....Hein, Jill
0119 ....Helms, Jo
0120 ....Tarfman, Aaron
0121 ....Francis, Mary
0122 ....Spates, Gigi
0123 ....Homan, Don
0124 ....Petrich, Dean
0125 ....Soloway, Diana
0126 ....Busemeyer, Dan
0127 ....Cremer, Kellie
0128 ....Wyse, Frank
0129 ....Harper, Christine
0130 ....Carlton, Keith
0131 ....Raya-Carlton, Pamela
0132 ....Stern, William
0133 ....Epstein, Erica
0134 ....McDonnell, Glen
0135 ....Cook, Brenda
0136 ....Rice, Marshell
0137 ....Rammon, Desiree
0138 ....Richards, Gene
0139 ....Couch, Country
0140 ....Quist, Elizabeth
0141 ....Ojala, Leslie
0142 ....Keefe, Kathleen
0143 ....Carr, Vivki
0144 ....Curtis, Richard
0145 ....Blaess, Alexis
0146 ....McRoberts, Steve
0147 ....Elkins, Rich
0148 ....Marsh, Melba
0149 ....Gilligan, Ainslie
0150 ....Blythe-Madson, Erin
0151 ....Hall, Karen
0152 ....Flackett, Rachel
0153 ....Ourllette, Tracy
0154 ....Hoaglund, Maria
0155 ....Fournier, Eric
0156 ....Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee
0157 ....Hiller, Marty
0158 ....Brown, Michael
0159 ....Olson, Susan
0160 ....Boos, Paul
0161 ....Gardner, George
0162 ....Gardner, Sam
0163 ....Rutledge, Charlie & Linda
0164 ....Ahtna Inc.
0165 ....Brown, Stephen
0166 ....Caron, Allen
0167 ....Wilkinson, John
0168 ....Kostyuick, Sopluker
0169 ....Mat-Su trails Council Inc.
0170 ....Post, Thomas
0171 ....Alderson, George & Frances
0172 ....Cheesh-na Tribal Council
0173 ....Nevada Star
0174 ....Duncan, Winston
0175 ....State of Alaska (Alaska, State of)
0176 ....Anchorage Fish & Game Advisory Committee
0177 ....Melton, Monica
0178 ....Meielke, Kesley & Jeanne

0179 ....Schachle, Vern
0180 ....Falldorf, Dennis
0181 ....Graham, Jeff
0182 ....Hadaway, Bob
0183 ....Burkhart, Elizabeth & Roy
0184 ....Carter, Alison
0185 ....Howard, Ron
0186 ....Wilber, Michelle
0187 ....Keeler, Kevin
0188 ....DePriest, Tiny Rose Marie
0189 ....Sutton, David
0190 ....Saunders, Craig
0191 ....Baker, Carl
0192 ....Fiscus, Warren
0193 ....Unknown, Ben
0194 ....Leider, Randy
0195 ....Larson, Alan
0196 ....Sehm, George
0197 ....Robert, Glenn
0198 ....Marlink, Milen
0199 ....Marlink, Rita
0200 ....O'Conner, Patrick
0201 ....Nielsen, Gretchen
0202 ....Reed, Gene
0203 ....Javis, Tony
0204 ....Brown, Garret
0205 ....Kostlin, Hal
0206 ....Knowles, Bruce
0207 ....Waters, Rose
0208 ....Eldridge, Cheryl
0209 ....Melm, Joe
0210 ....Schendel, Dale
0211 ....Orrison, David
0212 ....Jenski, Robert
0213 ....Meyer, Buffy
0214 ....Eldridge, John
0215 ....LaCour, Murry
0216 ....Carter, Stanley
0217 ....Hodeds, Hal
0218 ....Meyers, Brian
0219 ....Otcheck, John
0220 ....Spence, Wesley
0221 ....Edwards, Bruce
0222 ....Blomskog, Eric
0223 ....Barker, William
0224 ....Hitchcock, J.C.
0225 ....Littleton, Wayne
0226 ....Leider, William
0228 ....Harris, Bob
0229 ....Cruz, Dave
0230 ....Peters, Kari
0231 ....Richardson Jr., Ricky
0232 ....Nolen, Jeff
0233 ....Richarson Sr., Ricky
0234 ....Evenson, Timothy
0235 ....Steffes, Dolores
0236 ....Hicks, Theresa
0237 ....Hamann, Dennis
0238 ....Robinson, Kevin
0239 ....Duhn, Danyl
0240 ....Haynes, Fred
0241 ....Hamann, Dennis
0242 ....Giaugue, Greg & Lori
0243 ....Jackman, Jeff
0244 ....Kubat, Wayne
0245 ....Booth, Bill & Michelle
0246 ....Tatlow, Wendy
0247 ....Crosby, Norman
0248 ....Crosby, Linnea
0249 ....Lammers, Gary
0250 ....Christianson, Carol
0251 ....Kuch, Carolyn
0252 ....Nielsen, Lyle
0253 ....Paulsen, Bruce
0254 ....Cook, Tim
0255 ....Campbell, Jack
0256 ....Jasper, Gary
0257 ....Mielke, Daniel
0258 ....Huey, Aaron
0259 ....Brandt, Joel
0260 ....Fox, Delesta
0261 ....Tweed, Clifton
0262 ....Hermann, Jerry
0263 ....Olson, Gary
0264 ....Hertrich, Daniel
0265 ....Huey, Brian
0266 ....Crain, Marjorie
0267 ....Gerken, Vivki
0269 ....Newman, Ty
0270 ....Freelove, Sam
0271 ....Coutts, Dick
0272 ....Freelove, Angie
0273 ....Swald, John
0274 ....Brandt, Brian
0275 ....Jacquot, Michael
0276 ....Sterling, Catherine
0277 ....Bergman, Ross
0278 ....Brandt, Cathy
0279 ....Gerkin, Gene
0280 ....Kuch, Leo
0281 ....Friesen, Sara
0282 ....Rizzo, Steve
0283 ....Hull, William
0284 ....McAllister, Jeffery
0285 ....Morce, Erik
0286 ....Peckham, Dustin
0287 ....Jasper, Stephanie
0288 ....Eastham, Bill
0289 ....Hala, Kurt
0290 ....Lindun, Michael
0291 ....Gschwind, Ted
0292 ....Gojenola, Curt

0293 ....Langman, James
0294 ....Graham, Todd
0295 ....Miknich, Charles
0296 ....Johnson, Brian
0297 ....Lindun, Karen
0298 ....Erickson, Mike
0299 ....Frey, Stephanie
0300 ....Medeiros, Chris
0301 ....English, William
0302 ....Oppegard, Michael
0303 ....Oppegard, Theresa
0304 ....Hofler, Allen
0305 ....Holden, Grace
0306 ....Fritiz, Cecily
0307 ....Allen, Butch
0308 ....Copper River Watershed Project
0309 ....Tatlow, Mark
0310 ....Ogden, Doug
0311 ....Cordova District Fishermen United
0312 ....Alaska Coalition et al
0313 ....Alaska Extreme Four Wheelers
0314 ....Clark, Todd
0315 ....Woods, Dee
0316 ....Siebels, Ron
0317 ....Flora, Louie
0318 ....Chmielowski, Steve
0319 ....Thomasson, June
0320 ....Ausman, Dave
0321 ....Sierra Club, Alaska Chapter, Knik Group
0322 ....Tweton, Pamela
0323 ....Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
0324 ....Olzenak, Nick
0325 ....Lang, John
0326 ....Alaska Outdoor Council
0327 ....Bailey, Scott
0328 ....Native Village of Tazlina
0329 ....Cascadia Wildlands Project
0330 ....Yakutat Salmon Board
0331 ....Copper Country Alliance
0332 ....Friend, Bruce
0333 ....Owens, Pat
0334 ....Zirnheld, Sandra
0335 ....Hensel, Chase
0336 ....Lee, Shari
0337 ....Sedlacek, Robert & Helen, Jacob & Jessica
0338 ....Shields, Mary
0339 ....Clark, Jennifer
0340 ....Reynolds, Andy
0341 ....Ecotrust
0342 ....National Park Service
0343 ....Statscewich, Marla
0344 ....Rader, Heidi
0345 ....Underwood, Aaron
0346 ....Stallard, Tim
0347 ....Behm, Joe
0348 ....Durgeloh, Rhionda
0349 ....Durgeloh, Bennett
0350 ....Behm, Wade
0353 ....Black, William
0354 ....Pennington et al, Donna
0355 ....Alaska Miner's Association
0356 ....Northcott, T.J.
0357 ....Chitna Native Corporation
0358 ....Menser, Ty
0359 ....McNicholas, Thomas
0360 ....Sirkis, Jon
0361 ....Jeffries, Kyle
0362 ....Flowers, Bobbie Dee
0363 ....Burton, Canary
0364 ....Murphree, Tom
0365 ....Masco, Angela
0366 ....Campbell, Bruce
0367 ....Summerlin, Kristin
0368 ....Kennedy, Judy
0369 ....Riddle, Donna
0370 ....Freeburg, Ruth
0371 ....Duncan, Tom
0372 ....Hansen, Roger
0373 ....Goodlataw, Betty
0374 ....Pete, Steve
0375 ....Robbins, Mike
0376 ....Finnesand, David
0377 ....Hash-Koonuk, Evelyn
0378 ....Wolf, Lisa
0379 ....Gene, Christopher
0380 ....Ewan, Faye
0381 ....Hicks, Joeneal
0382 ....Tyone, Linda
0383 ....Gordon, Lorraine
0384 ....John Jr., Robert
0385 ....Joe, Marilyn
0386 ....Johns, Ken
0387 ....Ewan, Harding
0388 ....Tanzy, Roy
0389 ....Craig, Albert
0390 ....Pete, Carl
0391 ....Marshall, Elmer

* Denotes a form letter with multiple signatures.

Appendix K: Master Memorandum of Understanding

APPENDIX K: MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN

THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Juneau, Alaska

AND

THE U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Anchorage, Alaska

This Master Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, hereinafter referred to as the Department, and the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, hereinafter referred to as the Bureau, reflects the general policy guidelines within which the two agencies agree to operate.

WHEREAS, the Department, under the Constitution, laws, and regulations of the State of Alaska, is responsible for the management, protection, maintenance, enhancement, rehabilitation, and extension of the fish and wildlife resources of the State on the sustained yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau, by authority of the Constitution, Laws of Congress, executive orders, and regulations of the U.S. Department of Interior has a mandated responsibility for the management of Bureau lands, and the conservation of fish and wildlife resources on these lands; and

WHEREAS, the Department and the Bureau share a mutual concern for fish and wildlife conservation, management, and protection programs and desire to develop and maintain a cooperative relationship which will be in the best interest of both parties, the concerned fish and wildlife resources and their habitats, and produce the greatest public benefit; and

WHEREAS, it has been recognized in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and subsequent implementing Federal regulations that the resources and

uses of Bureau lands in Alaska are substantially different than those of similar lands in other states; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Congress and the Alaska Legislature have enacted laws to protect and provide the opportunity for continued subsistence use of Alaska's fish and wildlife resources by rural residents; and

WHEREAS, the Department and the Bureau recognize the increasing need to coordinate resource planning, policy development, and program implementation;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto do hereby agree as follows:

THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME AGREES:

1. To recognize the Bureau as the Federal agency responsible for multiple-use management of Bureau lands including wildlife habitat in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, ANILCA, and other applicable law.

2. To regulate and manage use of fish and wildlife populations on Bureau lands in such a way as to maintain or improve the quality of fish and wildlife habitat and its productivity.

3. To consult with the Bureau in a timely manner and comply with applicable Federal laws and regulations before embarking on enhancement or construction activities on or which could affect Bureau lands.

4. To act as the primary agency responsible for management of all uses of fish and wildlife on State and Bureau lands, pursuant to applicable State and Federal laws.

5. To notify the Bureau of any animal damage control activities on Bureau lands; and to obtain Bureau approval for the use of pesticides, herbicides, or other toxic chemical agents in the course of animal damage control.

6. To provide all maintenance on facilities, structures, or other construction owned by the Department on Bureau lands; and to hold the Bureau harmless for liability claims resulting from these constructions, facilities, and/or structures.

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AGREES:

1. To recognize the Department as the primary agency responsible for management of use and conservation of fish and wildlife resources on Bureau lands.

2. To recognize the right of the Department to enter onto Bureau lands at any time to conduct routine management activities which do not involve construction, disturbance to the land, or alterations of ecosystems.

3. To recognize the Department as the primary agency responsible for policy development and management direction relating to uses of fish and wildlife resources on State and Bureau lands, pursuant to applicable State and Federal laws.

4. To incorporate the Department's fish and wildlife management objectives and guidelines in Bureau land use plans unless such provisions are not consistent with multiple use management principles established by FLPMA, ANILCA, and applicable Federal law.

5. To adopt the State's regulations to the maximum extent allowed by Federal law when developing new or modifying existing Federal regulations governing or affecting the taking of fish and wildlife on Bureau lands in Alaska.

6. To notify the Department of any portion of the Department's fish and wildlife management objectives, guidelines, or State regulations that the Bureau determines to be incompatible with the purposes for which Bureau lands are managed.

7. To manage Bureau lands so as to conserve and enhance fish and wildlife populations.

8. To inform the Department of proposed development activities on Bureau lands which may affect fish and wildlife resources, subsistence and other uses, and to provide or require appropriate mitigation where feasible.

9. To permit, under appropriate agreement or authorization, the erection and maintenance of facilities or structures needed to further fish and wildlife management activities of the Department on Bureau lands, provided their intended use is not in conflict with Bureau policy and land-use plans.

10. To recognize that the taking of fish and wildlife by hunting, trapping, or fishing on Bureau lands in Alaska is authorized in accordance with applicable State and Federal law unless State regulations are found to be incompatible with Bureau regulations.

THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. To coordinate planning for management of fish and wildlife resources on Bureau lands and adjacent lands having common fish and wildlife resources so that

conflicts arising from differing legal mandates, objectives, and policies either do not arise or are minimized.

2. To cooperate in planning, enhancement, or development activities on Bureau lands which require permits, environmental assessments, compatibility assessments, or similar regulatory documents by responding in a timely manner with requirements, time tables, and any other necessary input.

3. To consult with each other when developing or implementing policy, legislation, and regulations which affect the attainment of wildlife resource management goals and objectives of the other agencies.

4. To cooperate in the management of fish and wildlife resources and habitat (including planning, regulation, enforcement, protection, restoration, research, inventories, and habitat enhancement) on Bureau lands and adjacent lands having common fish and wildlife resources consistent with the species and habitat management plans and objectives of both agencies.

5. To develop specific plans for cooperative development and joint management of habitat areas determined to be essential to the continued productivity or existence of fish and wildlife populations.

6. To consult with the Department prior to entering into any cooperative land management agreements which could affect fish and wildlife resources.

7. To cooperate in the development of fire management plans which may include establishment of priorities for the control of wildfires, or use of prescribed fires.

8. To make facilities, equipment and assistance mutually available on request for use in fish and wildlife work and habitat improvement consistent with Bureau and Department requirements.

9. Neither to make nor sanction any introduction or transplant of any fish or wildlife species on or affecting Bureau lands without first consulting with the other party and complying with applicable Federal and State laws and regulations.

10. To provide to each other upon request fish and wildlife data including subsistence and other uses, information, and recommendations for consideration in the formulation of policies, plans and management programs regarding fish and wildlife resources.

11. To cooperate in the preparation of announcements and publications and the dissemination of fish and wildlife information; any material obtained from cooperative studies may be published or reproduced with credit given to the agencies or organizations responsible for its acquisition or development. Any

news release relating specifically to cooperative programs will be made only by mutual consent of the agencies.

12. To cooperate and coordinate in the issuance of permits to persons, industry, or government agencies for activities affecting designated anadromous fish streams on Bureau lands, in accordance with Alaska Statute 16.05.870 and to cooperate in the formulation of comments and recommendations on permits issued by other governmental agencies in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Clean Water Act and other applicable laws.

13. To resolve, at field office levels, all disagreements pertaining to the cooperative work of the two agencies which arise in the field and to refer all matters of disagreement that cannot be resolved at equivalent field levels to the State Director and to the Commissioner for resolution before either agency expresses its position in public.

14. To meet annually at the Director/Commissioner level and discuss matters relating to the management of fish and wildlife resources and their habitats on, or affected by, respective programs; to provide for other meetings at various administrative levels for discussion of law enforcement, educational programs, cooperative development, hunting, fishing, trapping seasons, and such other matters as may be relevant to fish and wildlife populations and their habitats.

15. To develop such supplemental memoranda of understanding and cooperative agreements between the Bureau and the Department as may be required to implement the policies contained herein.

16. That this Master Memorandum is subject to the laws of the State of Alaska and the United States. Nothing herein is intended to conflict with current directives, laws or regulations of the signatory agencies. If conflicts arise or can be foreseen, this Memorandum will be amended or a new Memorandum of Understanding will be developed.

17. That this Master Memorandum of Understanding is subject to the availability of appropriated State and Federal funds.

18. That this Master Memorandum of Understanding establishes procedural guidelines by which the parties shall cooperate, but does not create legally enforceable obligations or rights.

19. That this Master Memorandum of Understanding supersedes all previous Master Memoranda of Understanding between the Bureau and Department and all supplements and amendments thereto.

20. That this Master Memorandum of Understanding shall become effective when signed by the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and

the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management and shall continue in force until terminated by either party by providing a notice in writing 120 days in advance of the intended date of termination.

21. That amendments to this Master Memorandum of Understanding may be proposed by either party and shall become effective upon approval by both parties.

STATE OF ALASKA	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Department of Fish and Game	Bureau of Land Management
By (signed by Collinsworth) Don W. Collinsworth Commissioner	By (signed by McVee) Curtis McVee State Director
Date: 6/28/83	Date: 8/3/83

Supplement to the
MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
between
THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
AND
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ALASKA

SIKES ACT IMPLEMENTATION

This supplemental memorandum of understanding is pursuant to the Master Memorandum of Understanding between the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Alaska, dated August 3, 1983. Public Law 93-452, of October 18, 1974, 16 U.S.C. 670a et seq., commonly referred to as the Sikes Act, provides the broad authority to: 1) Plan and carry out fish and wildlife conservation and habitat rehabilitation programs on Bureau lands consistent with overall land use plans; 2) Protect significant habitat for threatened and endangered species; and 3) Enforce regulations to control off road vehicle (ORV) traffic or other public use of lands subject to conservation and rehabilitation programs conducted under the Act.

The Act in no way diminishes the authority of the State of Alaska to manage resident fish and wildlife populations.

It is the purpose and intent of this supplement to provide a working relationship and procedure for implementation of the Sikes Act on Bureau lands in Alaska between ADF&G and BLM.

Terms used in this supplement are defined as follows:

1. Conservation and rehabilitation program: Includes programs necessary to protect, conserve, and enhance wildlife resources to the maximum extent practicable on Bureau lands consistent with any overall land-use and management plans for the lands involved.
2. Habitat Management Plan (HMP): BLM's intensive, detailed action plan for wildlife management on a specific geographic area of biological interest on Bureau lands. The HMP is a cooperative plan with the State Wildlife agency and is based on current public input. The HMP shall be the implementing document for the Sikes Act.
3. Bureau Lands: These are public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPLEMENTING P.L. 93-452, ADF&G and BLM mutually agree to the following:

1. HMPs will be implemented for areas where land-use plans have been prepared, unless otherwise authorized by the State Director, BLM.

2. HMPs will be based on priorities within Alaska, as mutually selected by the Commissioner, ADF&G, and the State Director, BLM. Guidelines for establishing HMP priorities shall be based on the following:
    a. The basic resource values which may be enhanced and benefits produced by implementation of active management programs and/or regulations.
    b. The identification, through the BLM or ADF&G planning systems, of areas having a need for intensive wildlife management.
    c. The potential for wildlife habitat to be altered by land use activities such as energy and industrial development, urban expansion, road construction, and ORV traffic.
    d. The need to protect important and/or critical fish and wildlife habitat such as salmon spawning areas, moose winter range, or the habitats of endangered or threatened species.

3. Protection will be afforded to those fish and wildlife species designated as threatened or endangered by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game or by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

4. HMPs will specify fish and wildlife habitat improvements or modifications needed.

5. Rehabilitation of Bureau lands will be undertaken where necessary to support HMP recommendations and consistent with the availability of funds for that purpose.

6. Hunting, fishing, and trapping of resident fish and wildlife on HMP areas will be in accordance with applicable laws and regulations of the State of Alaska.

7. It is herein recognized that the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to promulgate regulations to control the public use of Bureau lands consistent with the HMP, including, but not limited to ORV use. BLM and ADF&G will coordinate federal land use and state hunting, fishing and trapping regulations during Sikes HMP development.

8. Funds authorized and appropriated for HMP implementation on Bureau lands in Alaska shall include, but not be limited to all activities associated with scientific resource management, such as the following: protection, research, census, law enforcement, habitat management, propagation, live trapping, transplantation, and regulated taking. Funds may be allocated for hiring of personnel, contractual services, physical habitat improvement projects, and grants to colleges. It shall

be the joint responsibility of the Commissioner, ADF&G, and the State Director, BLM, to define areas and projects for priority funding under the Sikes Act. It shall be the responsibility of the State Director, BLM to secure funding through BLM's program funding procedures. Final disbursement of Sikes Act Funds shall be made through the State Director, BLM, after consultation with the Commissioner, ADF&G.

9. Plans and programs initiated on Bureau lands under the Sikes Act in Alaska shall not conflict with comprehensive plans required of the State under any Federal or State Acts.

10. BLM and ADF&G will discuss the following Sikes Act items during the course of their annual coordination meeting:
    a. A progress report on the current status of HMP implementation.
    b. The review of wildlife values produced under the existing conservation and rehabilitation program.
    c. The priorities for HMP implementation.
    d. The program and budget recommendations for the upcoming and succeeding fiscal years.

This supplement shall become effective on the date when last signed and shall remain in force until terminated by mutual agreement, by amendment or abolishment of the Act by Congress, or by either party upon thirty days notice in writing to the other party of its intention to terminate upon a date indicated.

STATE OF ALASKA	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Department of Fish and Game	Bureau of Land Management
By (signed by Collinsworth) Don W. Collinsworth Commissioner	By (signed by McVee) Curtis V. McVee State Director
Date: 6/28/83	Date: 8/3/83

Acronyms, Glossary, References, and Index

ACRONYMS

ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
ADEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
ADF&G	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
AEA	Alaska Energy Authority
AHRS	Alaska Heritage Resource Survey
AKRR	Alaska Railroad
ANCSA	Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
ANILCA	Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act
ANS	Air Navigation Sites
AO	Authorizing Officer
APD	Application for Permit to Drill
ARDF	Alaska Resource Data File
B.P.	Before Present
BBS	Breeding Bird Survey
BEG	Biological Escapement Goal
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMEWS	Ballistic Missile Early Warning System
BMP	Best Management Practice
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CR&NWRR	Copper River and Northwestern Railroad
DMV	Department of Motor Vehicles
DNR	Department of Natural Resources
DOD	Department of Defense
DOT	Department of Transportation
EA	Environmental Assessment
EARMP	East Alaska Resource Management Plan
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EM	Electromagnetic method
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FS	Forest Service
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
GFO	Glennallen Field Office
GMU	Game Management Unit
GPS	Global Positioning System
GVW	Gross Vehicle Weight

IM	Instruction Memorandum
IP	Induced polarization
MAC	Multi-agency Coordinating Group
MFP	Management Framework Plan
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPS	National Park Service
OHV	Off-highway Vehicle
PGE	Platinum Group Elements
PLO	Public Land Order
PP	Power Project
ppm	parts per million
PSC	Power Site Classifications
R&PP	Recreation and Public Purposes [Act]
RAC	Resource Advisory Council
RMIS	Recreation Management Information System
RMP	Resource Management Plan
RMZ	Recreation Management Zone
RNA	Research Natural Area
ROD	Record of Decision
ROP	Required Operating Procedure
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
ROW	Right-of-Way
SCMFP	Southcentral Management Framework Plan
Sec.	Section
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SRMA	Special Recreation Management Area
T&E	Threatened and Endangered [species]
TAPS	Trans-Alaska Pipeline System
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TLAD	Tangle Lakes Archaeological District
UAF	University of Alaska Fairbanks
USC	U.S. Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VFR	Visual Flight Rule
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
W/D	Withdrawal

GLOSSARY

17(b) easement
A public easement across native lands to access public land and waters established under section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANSCA) in 1971.

3809 regulations
Surface management regulations for locatable mineral operations.

- A -

aboriginal
Refers to those people who reported identifying with at least one Aboriginal group, that is, North American Indian, Metis, or Inuit.

Ahtna
Regional language dialect shared by Athabaskans living in the Copper River Basin of Alaska.

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA)
A law passed in 1980 designating 104 million acres for conservation by establishing or expanding national parks, wildlife refuges, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness areas, forest monuments, conservation areas, recreation areas, and wilderness study areas to preserve them for future generations.

Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA)
A law passed by Congress in 1971 to settle aboriginal land claims in Alaska by conveying title to some lands and paying Natives for extinguishing their claims to other lands. Under the settlement the Natives received title to a total of 40 million acres, to be divided among some 220 Native Villages and 13 Regional Corporations established by the act. The corporations shared in a payment of $462,500,000.

alternative
One of a number of possible options for responding to the purpose and need for action.

ambient
Environmental or surrounding conditions

anadromous
Ascending rivers from the sea for spawning. Salmon are an anadromous species.

aquatic
Living or growing in or near water.

archaeology
The study of past human cultures through the analysis of their material and physical remains.

Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)
An area within the public lands where special management attention is required to protect important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife or natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards.

artifact
An object that was made, used, and/or transported by humans that provides information about human behavior in the past. Examples include pottery, stone tools, bones with cut marks, and coins.

assessment
The act of evaluating and interpreting data and information for a defined purpose.

Athabaskan
The name of a broad group of closely-related languages that characterize the people who live in the Alaskan Interior, Canadian Interior, and the Southwestern United States.

aufeis
Ice formed by water flowing over a frozen surface. These ice forming situations can occur wherever there are continuous sources of water and freezing temperatures.

- B -

Back Country Byway
The BLM contribution to the national Byway Program. A Back Country Byway is a designation for a road that has unique scenic and historical significance. These roads provide the public with recreational opportunities while informing them about natural and cultural resources and multiple use activities on the public domain.

Before Present (B.P.)
A term used to describe the time periods before the present.

beneficial outcomes
Also references as “Recreation Benefits”; improved conditions, maintenance of desired conditions, prevention of worse conditions, and the realization of desired experiences. (BLM, 2005b)

benthic
Of or pertaining to the bottom of a stream, lake, sea, or ocean.

Best Management Practices
A suite of techniques that guide, or may be applied to, management actions to aid in the achieving of desired outcomes.

- C -

cache
A place to store something temporarily.

cairn
Stones piled up as a landmark, monument, or memorial.

closed
Generally denotes that an area is not available for a particular use or uses (BLM, H-1601-1).

closed area *(in reference to OHV designations)*
An area where OHV use is prohibited. Use of OHVs in closed areas may be allowed for certain reasons (e.g., to access subsistence resources); however, such use shall be made only with the approval of the authorizing officer (43 CFR 8340.05(h)).

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)
A codification of the general and permanent rules published in the Federal Register by the Executive Departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The Code is divided into 50 titles which represent broad areas subject to Federal regulation. Each volume of the Code is revised at least once each year and issued on a quarterly basis.

collaboration
A cooperative process in which interested parties, often with widely varied interests, work together to seek solutions.

commercial use
Any use of public lands where money is paid for services provided.

conveyed
Land where the title has been transferred to the selecting organization.

cumulative effects
Impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

cygnet
A young swan.

- D -

d(1) withdrawal
A withdrawal made under section 17(d)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act for study to determine the proper classification of the lands and to determine the public values of the lands which need protection.

decomposition
The breakdown of matter by bacteria and fungi. Decomposition changes the chemical makeup and physical appearance of materials

designated trail
A trail that is marked on the ground and mapped for public use. It is an administrative and not a legal designation. In some areas, motorized travel may be limited to designated trails.

Destination recreation-tourism market
National or regional recreation-tourism visitors and other constituents who value public lands as recreation-tourism destinations. Major investments in facilities and visitor assistance area authorized within SRMAs where BLM's strategy is to target demonstrated destination recreation-tourism market demand. (BLM, 2005b)

developed recreation
Recreation dependent on facilities provided to enhance recreation opportunities in concentrated use areas.

dispersed recreation
Recreation activities of an unstructured type which are not confined to specific locations such as recreation sites. Example of these activities may be hunting, fishing, off-road vehicle use, hiking, and sightseeing.

drainage
A general term applied to the removal of surface or subsurface water from a given area either by gravity or by pumping.

- E -

EM
"Electromagnetic" A process used to determine the electrical properties of the rocks. An electromagnetic pulse is emitted and then collapsed, which induces a current in the rocks if they are conductive. The size of the induced current in the rocks is measured to determine the conductive properties of the rocks. High EM response is from conductors in contact with each other

ecosystem
A naturally occurring, self-maintained system of varied living and non-living interacting parts that are organized into biophysical and human dimension components.

ecosystem health
A condition where the parts and functions of an ecosystem are sustained over time and where the system's capacity for self-repair is maintained, such that goals for uses, values, and services of the ecosystem are met.

endangered species
An animal or plant species designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to receive Federal protection status because the species is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its natural range.

environmental analysis
A comprehensive evaluation of alternative actions and their predictable short- and long-term environmental effects, including physical, biological, economic, social, and environmental design factors and their interactions.

environmental assessment (EA)
A concise analysis of the significance of a given project's potential environmental consequences. An EA is required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and determines if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.

environmental impact statement (EIS)
A detailed statement of a given project's environmental consequences, including unavoidable adverse environmental effects, alternatives to the proposed action, the relationship between local short-term uses and long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

environmental justice
The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.

essential habitat
All habitat essential for the survival and recovery of any listed species, including habitat that was used historically, that has retained its potential to sustain listed species, and is deemed to be essential to their survival. BLM Manual 6840.06-A.4

Executive Order
A rule or order having the force of the law.

existing trail
A trail that is on the ground but has not been inventoried and evaluated by the managing agency to determine designation.

- F -

Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA)
A law passed in 1976 to establish public land policy, guidelines for its administration, and provide for the management, protection, development, and enhancement of the public lands.

FLPMA 302 permits
Section 302 of FLPMA provides for use, occupancy, and development of public lands with consideration for multiple use and sustained yield by requiring permits for utilization of public lands for habitation, cultivation, and the development of small trade or manufacturing concerns.

Federal Register
A daily publication that reports Presidential and Federal Agency documents.

fishery
Habitat that supports the propagation and maintenance of fish.

- G -

Generally Allowed Uses
The State of Alaska's uses and activities that are generally allowed on State land. For travel across State land (OHV use) it allows, "Using a highway vehicle with a curb weight of up to 10,000 pounds, including a four-wheel-drive vehicle and a pickup truck, or using a recreational-type vehicle off-road or all-terrain vehicle with a curb weight of up to 1,500 pounds, including a snowmobile and four-wheeler, on or off an established road easement, if use off the road easement does not cause or contribute to water quality degradation, alteration of drainage systems, significant rutting, ground disturbance, or thermal erosion. An authorization is required from ADF&G for any motorized travel in fish bearing streams" (ADNR 2004). All generally allowed uses are subject to conditions outlined in 11 AAC 96.005.

Geographic Information System (GIS)
An information processing technology to input, store, manipulate, analyze, and display all forms of geographically referenced information.

Glennallen District
The geographic region that defines the BLM public lands administered by the BLM Glennallen Field Office.

Glennallen Field Office
One of the three BLM Field Offices located in Alaska. The Glennallen Field Office is responsible for managing approximately 7.6 million acres of public lands from Yakutat to Black Rapids.

GPSed
A geographic location that has been inventoried using the Global Positioning System

goal
A broad statement of a desired outcome that is usually not quantifiable (e.g., "maintain ecosystem health and productivity").

- H -

haul-out site
A specific out-of-water substrate site such as a particular area with a beach, rock, or iceberg component onto which marine mammals (e.g., sea lions or seals) hoist themselves for purposes of gaining solar warmth, physical rest and relaxation, safety from underwater predators (sharks), pup nursing and care, more efficient molting, and more energetic efficiency than remaining in frigid waters.

Holocene
The most recent geologic era; from about 10,000 years ago to the present.

housepit
The depression left by a lodging structure after it has burnt down or decomposed.

hydrocarbons
A group of chemical compounds containing only hydrogen and carbon; these include petrol, diesel, gas, oil, and some solvents

Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC)
A hierarchical system of numbering watersheds initiated by the U.S. Water Resources Council (1970) and expanded by Seaber et al. (1987) for use by water-resource organizations as a standardized base "for locating, storing, retrieving, and exchanging hydrologic data." The U.S., including Alaska, Hawaii, and parts of the Caribbean, is divided into 21 major hydrologic regions, then subdivided into 222 sub-regions, 352 accounting units, and 2,149 cataloging units. At each division, a 2-digit numerical code is added so that each watershed is assigned a unique numerical identifier.

hydrophytic vegetation
Plant species that live in water or very wet soils.

- I -

IP

"Induced polarization" . IP is a measure of the electrical properties of rocks. A charge is induced into the rocks and when the induced charge is removed, the remnant charge in the rocks is measured. The remnant charge is greater if the rocks are conductive, but also if there is a lot of surface area to the conductive particles/grains in the rock.

Implementation plan

A site-specific plan written to implement decisions made in a Resource Management Plan. Also called an Activity Plan.

invasive species

Organisms that have been introduced into an environment where they did not evolve. Executive Order 13112 focuses on organism whose presence is likely to cause economic harm, environmental harm, or harms to human health. See also *noxious weeds*.

- L -

land status

The legal standing of land within BLM boundaries. Land status includes private, military, State, State-selected, Native, Native-selected, and unencumbered public lands.

land use allocation

The identification in a Resource Management Plan of the activities and foreseeable development that are allowed, restricted, or excluded for all or part of the planning area, based on desired future conditions.

leasable minerals

Minerals subject to exploration and development under leases, permits, and licenses under various mineral leasing acts. Leasable minerals include oil, gas, and coal. See also *locatable minerals*.

lease

A means of allowing long-term use of public lands without transferring ownership of that land.

Leave No Trace (LNT)

A set of ethics used to minimize damage to the environment while recreating on public lands. Developed by the National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS 2005).

lessee

A person or entity holding record title in a lease issued by the United States (see 43 CFR 3160.0-5).

limited
Generally denotes that an area or roads and trails are available for a particular use or uses (BLM, H-1601-1). See also *limited area* below.

limited area *(in reference to OHV designations)*
An area restricted at certain times, in certain areas, and/or to certain vehicular uses. These restrictions may be of any type, but can generally be grouped into the following categories: number of vehicles; types of vehicles; time or season of vehicle use; permitted or licensed use only; use on existing road and trails; use on designated roads and trails; and other restrictions (CFR 43 sec. 8340.05(g)).

locatable minerals
Minerals subject to appropriation under the mining laws and 43 CFR 3809. Locatable minerals include gold, silver, copper, gypsum, and other hard rock minerals. See also *leasable minerals*.

- M -

macroinvertebrate
An animal having no backbone or internal skeleton, large enough to be seen without magnification.

Management Framework Plan
A planning decision document prepared before the effective date of the regulations implementing the land use planning provisions of FLPMA. The MFP establishes, for a given area of land, land-use allocations, coordination guidelines for multiple-use, and objectives to be achieved for each class of land use or protection.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
A formal, written agreement between organizations or agencies that presents the relationship between the entities for purposes of planning and management.

metaliferous
Yielding or containing metal.

microblade
A small prismatic parallel-sided flake struck from a prepared core. Microblades were probably inserted end-to-end in a slotted bone or antler shaft to provide a continuous cutting edge for points or knives.

mine
An opening or excavation in the earth for extracting minerals.

mineral entry
The filing of a claim on public land to obtain the right to any minerals it may contain.

mineral materials
The BLM authorizes disposal of mineral materials such as gravel and sand to third parties on unimproved lands. Materials cannot be bartered or sold and must be used in connection with project construction or maintenance.

mitigation measures
Actions taken to reduce adverse impacts on resource values.

model
An analytical framework based on the past behavior of numeric variables that is able to predict the future behavior of those variables. 10 CFR Part 960.2 defines a model as "a conceptual description and the associated mathematical representation of a system, subsystem, component, or condition that is used to predict changes from a baseline state as a function of internal and/or external stimuli and as a function of time and space."

monitoring
The process of collecting information to evaluate if objectives and anticipated results of a management plan are being realized, or if implementation is proceeding as planned.

multiple-use
According to the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960, the management of all the various renewable surface resources so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; that some land will be used for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.

muskeg
A water-soaked form of peat or moss, 3-10 feet thick. Similar to a bog.

- N -

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)
An act mandating an environmental analysis and public disclosure of Federal actions.

National Wild and Scenic Rivers System

A system of nationally designated rivers and their immediate environments that have outstanding scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, and other similar values and are preserved in a free-flowing condition. The system consists of three types of streams: 1) recreation—rivers or sections of rivers that are readily accessible by road or railroad and that may have some development along their shorelines and may have undergone some impoundments or diversion in the past, 2) scenic—rivers or sections of rivers free of impoundments with shorelines or watersheds still largely un-developed but accessible in places by roads, and 3) wild— rivers or sections of rivers free of impoundments and generally inaccessible except by trails, with watersheds or shore-lines essentially primitive and waters unpolluted.

no action alternative

The most likely condition expected to exist if current management practices continue unchanged. The analysis of this alternative is required for Federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

No Surface Occupancy (NSO)

A limitation of oil and gas leasing. It denotes that the area is open for mineral leasing but analysis has found that in order to protect other resource values, no well sites, tank batteries, or similar facilities are to occupy the surface of specified lands unless site-specific analysis shows that resource values can be protected.

noxious weed

A plant species designated by Federal or State law as generally possessing one or more of the following characteristics: aggressive and difficult to manage; parasitic; a carrier or host of serious insects or disease; or nonnative, new, or not common to the United States. See also *invasive species*.

nunatak

An isolated hill or peak which projects through the surface of a glacier. A hill or peak which was formerly surrounded but not overridden by glacial ice. An Eskimo word meaning “lonely peaks.”

- O -

objective

A concise statement of a specific desired outcome for a resource. Objectives are usually quantifiable and measurable.

off-highway vehicle (OHV)
Any motorized vehicle capable of, or designed for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain, excluding: 1) any non-amphibious registered motorboat; 2) any military, fore, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle being used for emergency purposes; 3) any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by the authorizing officer, or otherwise officially approved; 4) vehicles in official use; and 5) any combat or combat support vehicle when used for national defense (CFR 43 sec. 8340.05(a)).

open
Generally denotes that an area is available for a particular use or uses (BLM, H-1601-1). See also *open area* below.

open area *(in reference to OHV designations)*
Any area where all types of vehicle use is permitted at all times, anywhere in the area subject to the operating regulations and vehicle standards set forth in subparts 8341 and 8342 of the Title 43 CFR (CFR 43 sec. 8340.05(f)).

organic material
Referring to or derived from living organisms; compounds containing carbon.

outstandingly remarkable value
As defined by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, an "outstandingly remarkable value" is the characteristic of a river segment that is judged to be a rare, unique, or exemplary feature that is significant at a regional or natural scale. Values can be recreational, scenic, geological, historical, cultural, biological, botanical, ecological, heritage, hydrological, paleontological, scientific, or research-related.

oxidation
The chemical process of oxygen combining with an element or compound

- P -

paleontological
Of or relating to past geological periods. Paleontological resources include fossils of shellfish, swamp forests, dinosaurs, and other prehistoric plants and animals.

paleontology
The study of ancient plants and animals now known only from fossil remains.

palisades
A line of bold cliffs.

particulates
Fine liquid or solid particles such as dust, smoke, mist, fumes or smog, found in the air or emissions.

permit
A means of authorizing use of public lands in an equitable, safe, and enjoyable manner while minimizing adverse impacts and user conflicts. A permit does not transfer ownership of the land, it simply allows the permittee to use the land in a pre-determined fashion for a set amount of time.

photochemical
Any chemical reaction that is initiated by light. Such processes are process important in the production of ozone and sulfates in smog.

planning area
The region within which the BLM will make decisions during a planning effort. A planning area boundary includes all lands regardless of jurisdiction; however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the BLM jurisdiction (including subsurface minerals).

play
When referring to oil and gas resources, play is defined as a specific combination of geological features with perceived potential for oil and gas accumulation.

Pleistocene
A geologic period, usually thought of as the Ice Age, which began about 1.6 million years ago and ended with the melting of the large continental glaciers creating the modern climatic pattern about 11,500 years ago.

pollutants
Any substance introduced into the environment that adversely affects the usefulness of a resource or the health of humans, animals, or ecosystems.

prehistory
Any period in the past for which there is no contemporary written historical evidence. For the Copper River Basin, “prehistory” refers to any events occurring before 1850.

prescribed fire
A fire purposefully ignited to meet specific objectives. Prior to ignition, a written, approved fire plan must exist and legal requirements must be met.

primary trumpeter swan breeding habitat
Those slow-moving bodies of water and associated wetland habitats where concentrations of trumpeter swans are found during breeding/cygnet-rearing season due to the quality of available habitat.

proliferation
To spread or grow by rapid production of new parts such as unmanaged growth of trails.

public land
Land or interest in land owned by the U.S. and administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the BLM without regard to how the U.S. acquired ownership, except land located on the Outer Continental Shelf, and land held for the benefit of Native Americans, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

Public Land Order (PLO)
Congressional orders defining withdrawals of public lands by statute or secretarial order from operation of some or all of the public land laws.

PLO 5150
Public Land Order defining withdrawals for transportation and utility corridors.

PLO 6329
Public Land Order resulting from an amendment to the 1980 Southcentral Management Framework Plan. This PLO modified existing ANCSA d(1) withdrawals to allow for mineral entry, mineral leasing, and land disposals in some areas.

pump station
A facility that serves as a base of operations, maintenance, and monitoring of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. There are 12 pump stations along the entire length of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

- R -

R&PP lease
A lease issued by the Federal government for use of public lands to serve community and recreational purposes on public lands by issuing leases for uses such as parks, cemetery, and landfills.

radiocarbon dating
A chemical analysis used to determine the age of organic materials based on their content of the radioisotope carbon-14; believed to be reliable up to 40,000 years

record of decision
A public document associated with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that identifies all alternatives, provides the final decision, the rationale behind that decision, and commitments to monitoring and mitigation.

Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act
An act authorizing the sale or lease of public lands for recreational or public purposes to State and local governments and to qualified non-profit organizations.

Recreation Management Zone (RMZ)

Subunits within an SRMA managed for distinctly different recreation products. Recreation products are comprised of recreation opportunities, the natural resources and community settings within which they occur, and the administrative and service environmental created by all affecting recreation-tourism providers, within which recreation participation occurs. (BLM, 2005b)

recreation niche

The place or position within the strategically targeted recreation –tourism market for each SRMA that is most suitable and appropriate given available supply and current demand, for the production of specific recreation opportunities and the sustainable maintenance of accompanying natural resource and/or community setting character. (BLM, 2005b)

recreation opportunity

Favorable circumstances enabling visitors' engagement in a leisure activity to realize immediate physiological experiences and attain more lasting, value-added beneficial outcomes(BLM, 2005b)

Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)

A framework for stratifying and defining classes of outdoor recreation environments, activities, and experience opportunities. The settings, activities, and opportunities for obtaining experiences are arranged along a continuum or spectrum divided into seven classes: Primitive (P), Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM), Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM), Roaded Natural (RN), Roaded Modified (RM), Rural (R), Urban (U), Remote Developed Lakeside (RDL), and Special (S).

Recreation-Tourism Market

Recreation-tourism visitors, affected community residents, affecting local governments and private sector business, or other constituents and the communities and other places where these customers originate (local, regional, national, or international). Based on analysis of supply and demand, land use plan strategically identify primary recreation-tourism markets for each SRMA – destination, community, or undeveloped. (BLM, 2005b)

Required Operating Procedures (ROPs)

ROPs are requirements, procedures, management practices, or design features that the BLM adopts as operational requirements. In this Draft RMP/EIS, the ROPs would be common to all action alternatives. ROPs would apply to all permitted activities, including FLPMA leases and permits, Special Recreation Permits, oil and gas operations, mining Plans of Operation, and Right-of-Way authorizations. Obviously, not all ROPs would apply to all permitted activities. ROPs have been developed to ensure that objectives identified within the Alaska Land Health Standards are met when carrying out permitted activities and management practices.

Research Natural Area (RNA)
An area that is established and maintained for the primary purpose of research and education because the land has one or more of the following characteristics: 1) a typical representation of a common plant or animal association; 2) an unusual plant or animal association; 3) a threatened or endangered plant or animal species; 4) a typical representation of common geologic, soil, or water features; or 5) outstanding or unusual geologic, soil, or water features.

Resource Advisory Council (RAC)
A council established by the Secretary of the Interior to provide advice or recommendations to BLM management. (BLM, 2005b)

right-of-way (ROW)
The legal right to pass over another owner's land, or the area over which a right-of-way exists.

Right-of-way avoidance and exclusion areas
Areas to be avoided but may be available for location of right-of-ways with special stipulations and areas which are not available for location of right-of-ways under any conditions. (BLM, 2005b)

riparian zones
Wetlands that are transitional between permanently saturated lowlands and drier upland sites. Riparian habitat is characterized by hydrophytic vegetation (plants that often grow in water or wet soils) that grows in nonhydric (moist but not wet) soils.

R.S. 2477
A provision originally part of the 1866 Mining Act that states in its entirety, “The right-of-way for the construction of highways over public lands, not reserved for public uses, is hereby granted.” In 1873, the provision was separated from the Mining Act and reenacted as Revised Statute (R.S.) 2477. In 1938, it was recodified as 43 U.S.C. Section 932. FLPMA repealed both the 1866 Mining Act and R.S. 2477, but all rights-of-way that existed on the date of the repeal (October 21, 1976) were preserved under 43 U.S.C. Section 1769. The State of Alaska recognizes approximately 650 R.S. 2477 routes throughout the State. The assertion of these routes has not been recognized and current BLM policy is to defer any processing of R.S. 2477 assertions except where there is a demonstrated and compelling need to make a determination.

- S -

scoping
The process used to determine, through public involvement, the range of issues that the planning process should address.

sedentary
Abiding in one place; not migratory; not moving.

sedimentary
Having the quality of being layered. Sedimentary rocks are those that were created through the deposition of layers of materials that were compressed into hard rock.

Sensitive Status Species
Those wildlife, fish, or plant species designated by the BLM Alaska State Director, usually in cooperation with the State agency responsible for managing the species, as sensitive. They are: 1) species under status review by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service; 2) species whose numbers are declining so rapidly that Federal listing may be necessary; 3) species with typically small and widely dispersed populations; or 4) species inhabiting ecological refugia or other specialized or unique habitats.

seral
Relating to ecological communities where all successional stages of biotic development are represented.

smog
Generic term used to describe mixtures of pollutants in the atmosphere.

snowmachine
A motor vehicle of 850 pounds or less gross vehicle weight, primarily designed to travel over ice or snow, and supported, in part, by skis, belts, cleats, or low-pressure tires (11 AAC 12.340(9)).

Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA)
Areas where the management emphasis is on recreation, though other resource uses and development are allowed.

special recreation permit
A means of authorizing recreational uses of public lands and waters. Special recreation permits are issued for specific recreational uses as a means to manage visitor use, protect natural and cultural resources, and provide a mechanism to accommodate commercial recreational uses. There are four types of permits: commercial, competitive, organized groups/events, and individuals or groups in special areas.

Standard Lease Terms (SLT)
Denotes that no special stipulations are applied to a lease. Current environmental protection laws and the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act orders provide the direction for the oil and gas operation.

stipulations
Stipulations are specific to oil and gas exploration, development, and production. They constitute restrictions on the conduct of operations under a lease. As part of a lease contract, lease stipulations are specific to the lessee. All oil and gas activity permits subsequently issued to a lessee will comply with the lease stipulations appropriate to the activity under review. The *Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations* in Appendix III are example of stipulations.

subsistence/subsistence use
Relying on fish, wildlife and other wild resources for food, shelter, clothing, transportation, handicrafts, and trade. An Alaskan resident living in a rural area may participate in Federal subsistence hunting on certain unencumbered BLM lands.

succession
The replacement in time of one plant community with another. The prior plant community (or successional stage) creates conditions that are favorable for the establishment of the next community.

sustained-yield
According to the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960, the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a high-level annual or regular output of the various renewable resources of the national forests without impairment of the productivity of the land.

- T -

Tangle Lakes Archaeological District (TLAD)
An area rich in historic and prehistoric remains located between mileposts 17 and 37 on the Denali Highway. TLAD was accepted to the National Register of Historic Places in 1971 and encompasses 226,660 acres. The boundary was revised in 1993 to follow natural features and more closely contain the archaeological resources for which the district was designated.

terminal moraine
An accumulation of earth and stones formed across the course of a glacier at its farthest advance, at or near a relatively stationary edge, or at places marking the termination of important glacial advances.

thermokarsting
Ground subsidence due to the thawing of permafrost.

threatened species
A designation by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service when a plant or animal species is likely to become endangered throughout all or a specific portion of its range within the foreseeable future.

tiering
The coverage of broad, general information in environmental impact statements, with subsequent site-specific analyses incorporating that general information by reference.

transportation and utility corridor
A specific corridor along the Richardson Highway that is used for purposes of concentrating transportation and utility facilities within a specified area. The Trans-Alaska Pipeline is located within the corridor. Shown on Map 41, this corridor was withdrawn from mineral entry by PLO 5150, as amended by PLO 5151. The corridor consists of an inner and outer corridor that are often referred to within this document as separate areas with different management strategies. However, unless otherwise specified, the term "transportation and utility corridor" refers to both the inner and outer corridors.

tundra
A level or undulating treeless plain characteristic of northern arctic regions in both hemispheres. It consists of black mucky soil with a permanently frozen subsoil, but supports a dense growth of mosses and lichens, and dwarf herbs and shrubs, often showy-flowered.

- U -

Undeveloped recreation-tourism market
National , regional, and/or local recreation-tourism visitors, communities, or other constituents who value public lands for the distinctive kinds of dispersed receration produced by the vast size and largely open, undeveloped character of their recreation settings. Major investments in facilities are excluded within SRMAs where BLM's strategy is to target demonstrated undeveloped recreation-tourism demand. (BLM, 2005b)

unencumbered/unencumbered BLM lands
Public lands that have not been selected by the State or Native organizations. These are the lands that will be retained in long-term Federal ownership.

- V -

viewshed
A region or area that can be seen from a particular location.

Visual Resource Management

A means of managing visual resources by designating areas as one of four classes: Class I: maintaining a landscape setting that appears unaltered by humans: Class II: designing proposed alterations so as to retain the existing character of the landscape; Class III: designing proposed alterations so as to partially retain the existing character of the landscape; and Class IV: providing for management activities which require major modifications of the existing character of the landscape.

- W -

Wild and Scenic River

A river that is part of the National Wild and Scenic River System. In Alaska, most Wild and Scenic Rivers were designated through the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). The Glennallen Field Office manages two of these rivers: the Delta National Wild and Scenic River, and the Gulkana National Wild River. See also *National Wild and Scenic Rivers System*.

wildland fire

Any nonstructural fire, other than prescribed fire, that occurs in an area under the fire management jurisdiction of a land management agency. This term encompasses fires previously called "wildfires."

withdrawal

Federal land set aside and dedicated to a present, governmental use; public land set aside for some other public purpose, e.g., pending a determination of how the land is to be used; an action approved by the Secretary or a law enacted by Congress that closes land to specific uses under the public land laws (usually sale, settlement, location, and entry), or limits use to maintain public values or reserves area for particular public use or program, or that transfers jurisdiction of an area to another Federal agency.

REFERENCES

Abercrombie, William. 1900. Report of a supplementary expedition into the Copper River Valley, Alaska, 1884. In Compilation of narratives of explorations in Alaska, pp. 381-408. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

ACIA. *See* Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.

ADF&G. *See* Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

ADGGS. *See* Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys

ADNR. *See* Alaska Department of Natural Resources.

AHRS. *See* Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Alaska Heritage Resources Survey.

Ahtna, Inc. 1973. The Ahtna Region: Background for Regional and Community Planning. The Arctic Environmental Information and Data Center, University of Alaska.

Ahtna-Tanacross Association. 1988. Cultural and traditional aspects of subsistence. Draft unpublished. Glennallen, AK. Report for Hart Crowser, Inc. 24 pp.

Airport and Airway Improvement Act, as amended, 49 U.S.C. App. 2201 *et seq.,* September 3, 1982.

Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act. P.L. 108-452, signed 12-10-2004.

Alaska Statehood Act. Public Law 85-508, 72 Stat. 339, July 7, 1958.

Alaska, State of. 2003. Scoping comments for the East Alaska Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. August 26.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 1973. Alaska's wildlife and habitat, Federal aid in wildlife restoration funds. Division of Wildlife Conservation. Juneau, Alaska; undetermined number of pages.

——. 1984. Household survey of subsistence resource uses. Division of Subsistence. Juneau, Alaska.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 1986. Alaska habitat management guide, southcentral region. Habitat Division, Juneau, Alaska.

——. 1990. Off-road vehicles and hunting in Alaska: A report to the Alaska Board of Game. Division of Wildlife Conservation.

——. 1994. Wildlife notebook series, Juneau, Alaska; http://www.adfg.state.ak.us/pubs/notebook/notehome.php

——. 1996. Off road vehicle and snowmachine use in Alaska: A report to the Alaska Board of Game. Division of Wildlife Conservation. 52 pp.

——. 2001b. Caribou management report of survey-inventory activities, 1 July 1998-30 June 2000. Division of Wildlife Conservation. Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Grants W-27-2 and W-27-3, Project 3.0, Juneau, Alaska; 286 pp.

——. 2002a. Bison management report of survey-inventory activities, 1 July 1999-30 June 2001, GMU 11 and GMU 20D, C. Healy, editor. Division of Wildlife Conservation. Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Grants W-27-3, W-27-4, Project 9.0 Juneau, Alaska; 55 pp.

——. 2002b. Moose management report for survey-inventory activities, 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2001, C. Healy, editor. Division of Wildlife Conservation. Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Grants W-27-3, W-27-4. Project 1.0, Juneau, Alaska; 596 pp.

Alaska Department of Natural Resources. 1982. Denali to Wrangell-St. Elias: Assessment and management of scenic resources along the highways between Denali and Wrangell-St. Elias National Parks. Division of Research and Development Land and Resource Planning Section. July.

——. 1995. Yakataga area plan. Division of Land Resource Assessment of Development Section. 332 pp.

——. 2004. 11 AAC 96.025, Conditions for generally allowed uses. Division of Mining, Land, and Water. April.

Alaska Department of Natural Resources and Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 1985. Susitna area plan, with Matanuska Susitna Borough. In cooperation with U.S. Department of Agriculture. Anchorage, Alaska; 440 pp.

——. 1986. Copper River Basin area plan for state lands. Anchorage, Alaska; 98 pp.

——. 1988. Prince William Sound area plan for state lands. Anchorage, Alaska: 423 pp.

Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Alaska Heritage Resources Survey. 2005.

Alaska Department of Revenue, Tax Division Online. 2005. Alaska Petroleum Taxes. http://www.tax.state.ak.us/programs/oil/production/petroleumtax.asp. Accessed November 22, 2005.

Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys. 1984. Geothermal resources of Alaska: Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, Geothermal and Hydropower Technologies Division, scale 1:2,500,000.

Alaska Interagency Fire Management Council. 1984. Alaska interagency fire management plan, Forty Mile planning area, 51pp.

Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. U.S. Public Law 92-203. December 18, 1971.

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. U.S. Public Law 96-487. December 2, 1980.

Alaska Natural Heritage Program. 2003. Dusky Canada goose status report, Anchorage, Alaska; http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/enri/aknhp_web/biodiversity/zoological/spp_of_concern/.../goose.htm (Version 06March03).

Alaska Natural History Association. 1993. Checklist of the birds of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. Unpaginated. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/othrdata/chkbird/r7/Wrangell.htm (Version 22May98).

Alaska Statutes 41.14.870. Protection of fish and game. Executive Order No. 107 Sec. 44 (2003) repealed Alaska Statute 16.05.870 and replaced it with this section.

Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. 2004. Impacts of a Warming Artic, Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. Cambridge University Press.

Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. 2005. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. Cambridge University Press, 1042p.

Armstrong, Robert H. 1995. Guide to the birds of Alaska. 322 pp. Portland, Oregon: Graphic Arts Center Publishing Company.

Babcock, Walter C. 1899. Report of First Lieutenant Walter C. Babcock, Eighth U.S. Cavalry, From April 26, 1899, to October 9, 1899. In William R. Abercrombie, Alaska, 1899. Copper River Exploring Expedition. GPO, Washington D.C.

Baranov, Aleksandr. 1979. Letter to Shelikhov from Chugach Bay, July 24, 1793. In A history of the Russian American Company Vol. 2. Eds R.A. Pierce and A.S. Donnelly. Kingston Ontario: Limestone Press. Pp. 27-37.

Barnes F.F.. 1967. Coal resources of Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin 1242-B, p. B1-B36., map, scale 1:250,000, 1 sheet.

Barr, J. F., C. Eberl, and J. W. McIntyre. 2000. Red-throated loon (*Gavia stellata*). *In* The birds of North America, no. 513 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA. http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/BNA/account/Red-throated_Loon/INTRODUCTION.html

Beikman, H.M.. 1980. Geologic map of Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey, 1 sheet, scale 1:1,000,000.

Belowich, M.A.. 1987. Basinal trends in coal, petrographic, and elemental composition with applications toward seam correlation, Jarvis Creek coal field, Alaska, in Rao, ed., Focus on Alaska's coal '86: Mineral Industry Research Laboratory Report No. 72, p. 266-299.

Benedict, Neal D. 1899. The Valdez and Copper River Trail 1899. Unpublished manuscript on file, Valdez Museum and Archives, Valdez, Alaska.

Bent, Arthur Cleveland. 1942. Life histories of North American flycatchers, larks, swallows, and their allies, May 8, 1942. http://www.si.edu/archives/archives/findingaids/FARU7120.htm

BIA. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Bittenbender, Peter. 2005. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Juneau Minerals Group. Personal communication with Mike Kasterin, 10/24/05.

Blasko, Donald, P. 1976. Oil and gas seeps in Alaska--North-Central Gulf of Alaska: U.S. Bureau of Mines Report of Investigations 8136, 123 p.

Bleakley, Geoffrey T. 1996. Historic properties associated with the Valdez Trail, 1898-1943, a multiple property nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Manuscript on file, Bureau of Land Management, Glennallen Field Office, Glennallen. Alaska.

BLM. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management.

Bowers, Peter. 1989. A cultural resources management plan for the Tangle Lakes Archaeological District, Bureau of Land Management. Alaska State Office, Anchorage, Alaska.

Bowers, Peter. 1992. Excerpt from the Tangle Lakes Archaeological District Revised National Register Nomination. U.S.P.S. National Register of Historic Places: Washington D.C.

Bowers, Peter, and Owen Mason. 1992. Cultural resources inventory and assessment of a proposed power transmission line between Cantwell and McKinley Village, Alaska. Golden Valley Electric Association, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Brink, S.R. 1995. Summer habitat ecology of rainbow trout in the Middle Fork of the Gulkana River, Alaska. MS Thesis, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Bruns, T. R., and George Plafker. 1982. Geology, structure and petroleum of the southeastern Alaska and northern Gulf of Alaska continental margins, in Bruns, T. R., ed., Hydrocarbon resource report for proposed OCS lease sale 88.

BUCY Associates. 1999. Interpretive master plan for the Denali Highway. Corvallis, Oregon. October 29.

Burns, Jennifer and Danielle Savarese. 2003. Behavioral ecology of harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina richardsi*) at the Bering Glacier. Cool school: Bering Glacier workshop 2003. University of Alaska Anchorage and Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage, Alaska.

Buzzell, Rolfe G., and J. David McMahann. 1995. McCarthy road cultural resources reconnaissance survey, 1994-1995. Office of History and Archaeology Report Number 50. Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, Alaska Department of Natural Resources: Anchorage.

Calderwood, Travis. 2003a. Management situation analysis report: Fire. Natural resource specialist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

——. 2003b. Management situation analysis report: Forestry. Natural resource specialist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

CFR. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior, Code of Federal Regulations.

Clark, Gerald. 1975. Archaeology in the Copper River Basin: Survey and excavations along the Southern Portion of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (Valdez to Hogan Hill), 1974. Alaska Methodist University, Alaska.

Clark, R.N. and D.R. Gibbons. 1991. Recreation. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19: 459-482.

CNIPM. *See* Strategic Planning Committee for Noxious and Invasive Plant Management.

Cody, W. J. 1994. Flora of the Yukon Territory. National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa. 643 pp.

Cole, Terrence. 1992. Exploration of Alaska 1865-1900. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks.

Cook, Mary Beth, and Carl A. Roland. 2002. Notable vascular plants from Alaska in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve with comments on the floristics. In Canadian Field-Naturalist 116(2):192-304, 96-396, 96-740, 96-741A, 96-479, 96-284, 96-295.

Copper Valley Economic Council. 2003. Comprehensive economic development strategy.

Cote, S. D. et al. 1996. Mountain goat responses to helicopter disturbance. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 24(4):681-685, p681-685.

Cuccarese, S. V. and P. O. McMillan. 1988. Alaska Over-The-Horizon Backscatter Radar System: Characteristics of Contemporary Subsistence Use Patterns in the Copper River Basin and Upper Tanana Area, Volume I. Arctic Environmental Information and Data Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage. Prepared for: Hart Crowser, Inc., Seattle, WA.

de Laguna, Frederica. 1972. Under Mount St. Elias: the history and culture of the Yakutat Tlingit. Smithsonian Contribution to Anthropology. Vol. 7. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, pp. 100-101.

de Laguna, Frederica. 1990. Eyak. In Handbook of North American Indians: Northwest Coast. Vol. 7. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 189-196.

de Laguna, Frederica, and Catherine McClellan. 1981. Ahtna. In Handbook of North American Indians: Subarctic. Vol. 6. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 641-663.

de Laguna, Frederica, Francis Riddell, Donald McGeein, Kenneth Lane, Arthur Freed, and Carolyne Osbourne. 1964. Archaeology of the Yakutata Bay Area, Alaska. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 192. Washington D.C.

Dessauer, Peter F., and David W. Harvey. 1980. An historical resource study of the Valdez Creek Mining District, Alaska - 1977. Edited by John L. Beck. Ms. on file, Bureau of Land Management Glennallen Field Office, Glennallen. Alaska.

Dilts, Thomas. 2004. Report: Assessment of summer recreation opportunity spectrum current conditions in the Glennallen District.

Dixon, James, George Smith, Robert Betts, and Robert Thorson. 1982. Final Report Sub-Task 7.06 Cultural Resources Investigation for the Sustina Hydroelectric Project – A Preliminary Cultural Resource Survey in the Upper Susitna River Valley. University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, Alaska, April.

Dubois, Steve. 2001. Macomb herd caribou management report, C. Healy, editor. Caribou management report of survey and inventory activities, 1 July 1998-30 June 2000; Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Grants W-27-2 and W-27-3, Project 3.0; Juneau, Alaska; pp. 78-94.

Ehm, Arlen. 1983. Oil and gas basins map of Alaska: Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys Special Report 32, 1 sheet, scale 1:2,500,000.

EPA. *See* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

FAA. *See* U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Aviation Administration.

Fall, James A. and William E. Simeone. 2005. Customary and Traditional Use Worksheets prepared for the Alaska Board of Game. March.

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. U.S. Public Law 94-579.

Federal Register. 1980. DOI, BLM, Interim designation order AK-010-8002. Action: Notice of off-road vehicle designation decisions. Vol. 45, No. 175 Monday, September 8. p. 59208 U.S. Government Printing Office.

——. 2003. DOI, BLM, resource management plan; east Alaska planning area. AK 050-02-1610-DO-085L. Vol. 689, No. 52 Tuesday, March 18. pp. 12931-12932. U.S. Government Printing Office.

——. 2005. DOI, BLM, Notice of Availability of the Draft East Alaska Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. AK–910–02–1410–PG. Vol. 70, No. 82 Friday, April 29, pp. 22370-22371. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ferrians, O. J., D. R. Nichols, and J. R. Williams. 1983. Copper River Basin, guidebook to permafrost and quaternary geology along the Richardson and Glenn Highways between Fairbanks and Anchorage, Alaska. University of Alaska, Fairbanks: Fairbanks, Alaska.

Foley, J.Y., and Summers, C.A., 1990, Source and bedrock distribution of gold and platinum-group metals in the Slate Creek area, northern Chistochina mining district, east-central Alaska: U.S. Bureau of Mines Open-File Report 14-90, 49 p.

Frid, A. 2003. Dall's sheep responses to overflights by helicopter and fixed-wing aircraft, Biological Conservation; 110: 387 - 399.

FS. *See* U.S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service.

FWS. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Gangloff, Roland. 1995. *Edmontonia* sp., the first record of an ankylosaur from Alaska, Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology (15) pp. 195-200.

Gibson, Margie Ann and Sallie B. Schullinger. 1998. Answers from the Ice Edge, The consequences of climate change on life in the Bering and Chukchi Seas, Actic Network and Greenpeace USA, Washington DC, June.

Goldstein, M.I., A.J. Poe, E. Cooper, D. Youkey, B.A. Brown, and T.L. McDonald. Forthcoming. In press. Mountain goat response to helicopter overflights in Alaska. Wildlife Society Bulletin, in press; 28 pp.

Gunn, Dan. 2005. Trail Inventory Project May 4, 2005 – September 29, 2005. Bureau of Land Management, Glennallen Field Office

Hamilton, C.I., S.J. Starr, and L.L. Trasky. 1979. Recommendations for minimizing the impacts of hydrocarbon development on fish, wildlife, and aquatic plant resources of lower Cook Inlet. Volumes I and II. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage, Alaska.

Hanson, Diane. 1999. Interim report of archaeological activities at the Ringling Material Site (MS-71-2-020-5), Gulkana, Alaska.

Haskins, Mike. 1986. Notice: Relinquishment acknowledged case closed, Unpublished letter on file with the BLM's Glennallen Field Office. Glennallen, Alaska.

Hawley, C.C., and Clark, A.L., 1974, Geology and mineral deposits of the Upper Culitna District, Alaska, U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 758-B, 47 pp., 2 sheets, scale 1:12,000 and 1:48,000.

Hoffecker, John, W. Roger Powers, and Nancy H. Bigelow. 1996. Dry Creek, American beginnings the prehistory and paleoecology of Beringia. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. pp. 343-352.

Hopkins, D.M.. 1951. Lignite deposits near Broad Pass Station, Alaska, in Barnes, F.F. and others, Coal investigation in southcentral Alaska, 1944-46: U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin 963-E, p. 197-191.

ICRC. *See* Integrated Concepts and Research Corporation.

Integrated Concepts and Research Corporation. 2001. Trail condition survey: Haggard Creek trail, Landmark Gap South trail, Swede Lake trail, Top of the World trail, Middle Fork trail.

Integrated Concepts and Research Corporation 2002. Trail condition survey: Alphabet Hills trail, Dickey Lake trail, Ewan Lake trail, Fish Creek trail, Gunn Creek trail, NE Middle Fork extension trail, NW Middle Fork extension trail, Osar Lake trail, South Middle Fork extension trail, Twelve Mile creek trail.

Institute of Social and Economic Research. 2005. The Economic Multiplier (Interim Report). http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/publications/client/afnjobs/ecmulti.pdf.

ISER. See Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Jackson, Richard. 2001. Phone conversation between Jackson, Army Corps of Engineers, and John Jangala, BLM Archaeologist, Glennallen Field Office regarding Yakataga Bridge on September 25, 2001.

Jangala, John. 2001. Assessment of heritage and paleontological resources for Yakataga River bridge (GFO-02-02), Glennallen Field Office. Ms. on file, Bureau of Land Management, Glennallen Field Office, Glennallen, Alaska.

——. 2002. FY 2002 annual report for Glennallen. Ms. on file, BLM, Glennallen Field Office, Glennallen, Alaska.

——. 2003. FY 2003 annual report for Glennallen. Ms. on file, Bureau of Land Management, Glennallen Field Office, Glennallen, Alaska.

——. 2004. Management situation analysis report: Cultural resources. Archaeologist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

Jansons, U., Hoekzema, R.B., Kurtak, J.M., and Fechner, S.A., 1984. Mineral occurrences in the Chugach National Forest, southcentral Alaska. U.S. Bureau of Mines, Mineral Land Assessment report MLA 5-84, 219 pp., 2 sheets.

Joint Pipeline Office. 2005. http://www.jpo.doi.gov/JPO/agencies.htm. Downloaded 1:51 pm 10/27/05.

Joly, Kyle, Layne Adams, Bruce Dale, and William Collins. 2002. Evaluating the impacts of wildland fires on caribou in interior Alaska. Arctic Research of the United States, Volume 16, U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Research Division; pages 63-67.

Joslin, G. 1986. Mountain goat population changes in relation to energy exploration along Montana's Rocky Mountain Front. Proceedings of the Biennial symposium of the Northern Wild Sheep and Goat Council; 5: 253 - 271.

JPO. *See* Joint Pipeline Office.

Keating and Jangala. 2003. A preliminary report of the Gulkana project. BLM, Glennallen Field Office, Alaska.

Keith, Gene. 1992. Letter to Donald G. Sisson pertaining to trespass cabins located on top of an old village site. January 8.

Ketz, James. 1983. GUL-079: Two nineteenth century Ahtna Sites at Paxson Lake, Alaska. Masters Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Kineman, J.J., R. Elmgren, and S. Hansson (eds). 1980. The *Tsesis* Oil Spill: Report of the first year scientific study (October 1977 to December 1978). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Marine Pollution Assessment, Boulder, Colorado.

Krausman, P. R., M. C. Wallace, C. L. Hayes, and D. W. DeYoung. 1998. Effects of jet aircraft on mountain sheep, Journal of Wildlife Management; 62:1246 - 1254.

Kurtak, J. M., D. D. Southworth, M. D. Balen, and K. H. Clautice. 1992. Mineral investigations in the Valdez Creek Mining District, South-Central Alaska. U.S. Bureau of Mines Open File Report 1-92, 658 pp.

Lanctot, R. B. and C. D. Laredo. 1994. Buff-breasted sandpiper (Tryngites subruficollis). In The birds of North America, No. 91 (A. Poole and F. Gill, Eds.). Philadelphia: The Academy of Natural Sciences; Washington, D.C.: The American Ornithologists' Union.

Lethcoe, Jim, and Nancy Lethcoe. 1996. Valdez gold rush trails of 1898-1899. Prince William Sound Books, Valdez, Alaska.

——. 2001. A history of Prince William Sound, Alaska. Prince William Sound Books, Valdez, Alaska.

Lindsey, Don K. 1986. Paleontological inventory and assessment of public lands administered by Bureau of Land Management, State of Alaska. Bureau of Land Management Contract #AK-950DT5-15. Ms. on file, Bureau of Land Management Glennallen Field Office, Glennallen, Alaska.

MacArthur, R. A. et al. 1982. Cardiac and behavioral responses of mountain sheep to human disturbance: J. Wild. Manage, 46(2) p 351-358.

Malins, D.C. 1977. Effects of petroleum on arctic and subarctic marine environments and organisms. Academic Press, Inc., New York, New York.

Matsuoka, S.M. 1996. Habitat selection and nestling ecology of Townsend's Warblers (Dendroica townsendi) in southcoastal Alaska. M.S. Thesis. University of Alaska Fairbanks.

McCoy, Pat. 1991. Memorandum to File, Suslota Lake, ANCSA 14 (h)(1) Selection AA-10714. November 18.

McDowell v. *State of Alaska*. 1989. Opinion, Supreme Court of the State of Alaska, No. 3540. December 22.

McGee, D.L., O'Connor, K.M.. 1975. Mineral resources of Alaska and the impact of Federal land policies on their availability: Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys Open-File Report 51, p. 1-26.

McKennon, Robert. 1981. Tanana. In Handbook of North American Indians: Subarctic. Vol. 6. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 562-576.

Mclain, Holli. 2004. Management situation analysis report: Visual resources. Visual Resource Management Specialist, BLM Northern Field Office.

Mendenhall, W.C., 1905, Geology of the central Copper River region, Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 41, 133 p.

Merritt, R.D.. 1986. Alaska coal fields and seams: Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys Public-data File 86-67, 30 p.

Merritt, R.D., and Hawley, C.C.. 1986. Map of Alaska's coal resources: Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys Special Report 37, 1 sheet, scale 1:2,500,000.

Meyer, Kevin. 2002. Managing degraded off-highway vehicle trails in wet, unstable, and sensitive environments. USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program. 2E22A68-NPS OHV Management.

Miller, D. J. 1959. Geology of the southeastern part of the Robinson Mountains, Yakataga District, Alaska: Oil and Gas Investigations Map OM-187, scale 1: 63,360.

Minerals Management Service. 2004. Oil and Gas Economic Model.

Accessed November 21, 2005.

Moffit, F.H., 1912, Headwater regions of Gulkana and Susitna rivers, Alaska, with accounts of the Valdez Creek and Chistochina placer districts: U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin 498, 82 p.

Multiple Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960. U.S. Statutes at Large 74:215.

Murray, D.F. and Robert Lipkin. 1987. Candidate threatened and endangered plants of Alaska with comments on other rare plants. University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, Alaska; 75 pp.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. U.S. Statutes at Large 83:852.

National Historic Preservation Act National of 1966 as amended through 2000. 16 USC section 470 et seq.

National Outdoor Leadership School. 2005. Leave No Trace Principles. http://www.lnt.org

Neff, J.M. 1991. Long-term trends in the concentration of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the water column of Prince William Sound and the Western Gulf of Alaska following the Exxon Valdez oil spill. In Fourteenth Annual Arctic and Marine Oil Spill Program Technical Seminar, June 12-14, 1991, Vancouver, British Columbia.

New Mexico Center for Wildlife Law. 2003. Federal Wildlife and Related Laws Handbook, Chapter 4. Statute Summaries, University of New Mexico School of Law, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

NMFS. *See* U.S. Department of Commerce. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. National Marine Fisheries Service.

Nokleberg, W. J., Nokleberg, W. J, West, T. D., Dawson, K. M., Shpikerman, V. I., Bundtzen, T. K., Parfenov, L. M., Monger, J. W. H., Ratkin, V. V., Baranov, B. V., Byalobzhesky, S. G., Diggles, M. F., Eremin, R. A., Fujita, K., Gordey, S. P., Gorodinskiy, M. E., Goryachev, N. A., Feeney, T. D., Frolov, Y. F., Grantz, A., Khanchuk, A. I., Koch, R. D., Natal'in, B. A., Natapov, L. M., Norton, I. O., Patton, W. W., Jr., Plafker, G., Pozdeev, A. I., Rozenblum, I. S., Scholl, D. W., Sokolov, S. D., Sosunov, G. M., Stone, D. B., Tabor, R. W., Tsukanov, N. V., and Vallier, T. L.. 1998. Summary terrane, mineral deposit, and metallogenic belt maps of the Russian Far East, Alaska, and the Canadian Cordillera, U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 98-136, CD-ROM.

NOAA. *See* U.S. Department of Commerce. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

NOLS. *See* National Outdoor Leadership School

NPS. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service.

PAI. *See* Phillips Alaska, Inc.

Payne, John F., S. Guyer, C. Noyles, R. Shuchman, E.G. Josberger, S. Savage. 2004. Bering Glacier system program: a scientific approach to understanding a unique natural environment. Compilation by Bureau of Land Management, U.S, Geological Survey, and the Altarum Institute; 25 pp.

Phillips, Water T. 1984. Roadhouses of the Richardson Highway: The first quarter century 1898 to 1923. Alaska Historical Commission, Alaska.

Phillips Alaska, Inc. (PAI). 2002. Colville River unit satellite development environmental evaluation document. Revised June, 2002. Anchorage, Alaska.

Plafker, George. 1971. Possible future petroleum resources of Pacific-margin Tertiary basin, Alaska. in Future petroleum provinces of North America: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Memoir 15, pp. 120-135.

Pogson, T. H., S. E. Quinlan, B. Lehnhausen, E. Campbell, and N. Andison. 1997. A manual of selected neotropical migrant birds of Alaska national forests. USDA Forest Service, Juneau, Alaska.

Powell, Addison. 1997. Trailing and camping in Alaska, abridged. Eds. Jim and Nancy Lethcoe. Prince William Sound Books, Valdez, Alaska.

Prince William Sounds Aquaculture Corporation. 2000. Gulkana Hatchery I and II Basic Management Plan. Casefile AA 085606.

Purtov, Egor, and Demid Kulikalov. 1979. Report, company employees Egor Putov and Demid Kulikalov, to Baranov, from Pauls Harbor, August 9, 1794. In A History of the Russian American Company Vol. 2. Eds R.A. Pierce and A. S. Donnelly. Kingston, Ontario: Limestone Press. Pp. 46-52.

Quirk III, William A. 1974. Historical aspects of the building of the Washington, D.C. - Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System, with special emphasis on the Eagle-Valdez and Goodpaster Telegraph Lines 1902-1903. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management.

Reckord, Holly. 1983a. Where raven stood: Cultural resources of the Ahtna Region. Anthropology and Historic Preservation Cooperative Park Studies Unit, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska. Occasional Paper No. 35.

———. 1983b. That's the Way We Live: Subsistence in the Wrangell-St. Elias National

Recreation and Public Purposes Act, as amended. 43 USC 869 et seq. June 14, 1926.

Reynolds, Georgeanne. 1988. Historical overview and inventory: White Alice Communications System. Prepared for U.S. Air Force, Alaska Command, Copies available from Alaska State Historic Preservation Office, Anchorage Alaska.

Ritter, R.A., G.T. Koeln, and Craig Altop. 1989. Use of landsat thematic mapper data for waterfowl habitat inventory in Alaska. A cooperative project for the Bureaus of Land Management by Ducks Unlimited, Long Grove, Illinois.

Robertson, G. J., and R. I. Goudie. 1999. Harlequin duck (*Histrionicus histrionicus*). *In* The birds of North America, No. 466 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA. http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/BNA/account/Harlequin_Duck/INTRODUCTION.html

Rogers, Bruce. 2005. Personal Communication with Tom Taube. Alaska Department of Fish and Game fisheries biologist, Glennallen Office, regarding freshwater fish subsistence use and permitting in the Copper Basin.

Rogers, Kari. 2003c. Personal communication with John Payne. BLM-Alaska State Wildlife and T&E Program Lead, regarding existing condition and status of Tule white-fronted geese.

———

———. 2004a. Management situation analysis report: Wildlife. Wildlife Biologist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

———. 2004b. Summary of rare plant database. Various sources. Alaska Natural Heritage Program. Environment and Natural Resources Institute, University of Alaska-Anchorage, Anchorage, Alaska. 7pp.

———. 2005a. Personal communication with Mary Beth Cook. E-mail subject: “re.rare plants info needed”, Jan 26.

———. 2005b. Personal communication with Ted Swem regarding distribution of peregrine falcon subspecies. February 18.

Roland, C. A., and M. B. Cook. 1998. A notable range extension for the globally rare endemic plant *Cryptantha shackletteana L.C. Higgins, in east-central Alaska*. In Canadian Field Naturalist 112:158-160.

Rose, A.W., 1965, Geology and mineralization of the Midas Mine and Sulphide Gulch areas near Valdez, Alaska. Division of Mines and Minerals, Geologic Report No. 15, 21 pp., 1 sheet.

Saverese, Danielle and J. Burns. 2004. Significant seasonal variation in harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina richardsi)* abundance at Bering Glacier, Alaska, University of Alaska.

Schweger, Charles E. 1981. Chronology of late glacial events from the Tangle Lakes, Alaska Range, Alaska. Arctic Anthropology 28(1):97-101.

Scott, W.B., and E.J. Crossman. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Fisheries Research Board of Canada Bulletin. 198 p.

Sherwood , Morgan B. 1995. Exploration of Alaska 1865-1900. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Shinkwin, Anne D. 1979. Dakah De'Ninin's Village and the Dixthada Site a contribution to Northern Athapaskan Prehistory, in National Museum of Man Mercury Series No. 91. Archaeological Survey of Canada: Ottawa, Canada.

Simeone, William E., and James Kari. 2004. The Harvest and Use of Non-Salmon Species in the Copper River Basin, Final Report for Study 01-110. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Office of Subsistence Management, Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

Skarland, Ivar and Charles Keim. 1958. Archaeological discoveries on the Denali Highway, Alaska. Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska. 6(2): pp. 79-87.

Smith, J, and Rao, P.D.. 1987. Geology and coal resources of the Bering River coal field in Rao, ed., Focus on Alaska's coal 1986: Mineral Industry Research Labratory Report No. 72, p. 266-299.

Sondergaard, Mike, and Scott Guyer. 2002. Gulkana river properly functioning condition assessment, draft. ongoing,unpublished.

Sondergaard, Mike. 2003a. Management situation analysis report: Air. Natural resources specialist. BLM Glennallen Field Office.

——. 2003b. Management situation analysis report: Soils. Natural resources specialist. BLM Glennallen Field Office.

——. 2003c. Management situation analysis report: Vegetation. Natural resources specialist. BLM Glennallen Field Offce.

——. 2003d. Management situation analysis report: Water. Natural resources specialist. BLM Glennallen Field Office.

Starr, S.J., M.N. Kuwada, and L.L. Trasky. 1981. Recommendations for minimizing the impacts of hydrocarbon development on fish, wildlife, and aquatic plant resources of the northern Bering Sea and Norton Sound. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage, Alaska.

Stark, T.C. 1999. Spawning stocks and juvenile summer habitat of rainbow trout and steelhead, Gulkana River, Alaska. MS Thesis, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

State of Alaska. *See* Alaska, State of

Stevens, D.L. 2001. Alaska resource data file, Healy quadrangle. U.S. Geological Survey 01-109, 441 pp.

Strategic Planning Committee for Noxious and Invasive Plant Management. 2001. Strategic plan for noxious and invasive plants management in Alaska.

Stratton, Lee. 1982. Patterns of Use of the Nelchina Caribou Herd. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Office of Subsistence. March.

Stratton, Lee and Susan Georgette. 1984. Use of Fish and Game in Communities in the Copper River Basin, Alaska: A Report on a 1983 Household Survey. Technical Paper No. 107. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Anchorage, Alaska.

Sutherlin, Steve. 2005. Glennallen Gas Well Looks Promising. Petroleum News June 12, 2005 http://www.petroleumnews.com/pnads/301292274.shtml.

Thorson, Robert M., E. James Dixon, George S. Smith, and Alan R. Batten. 1981. Interstadial Proboscidean from South-Central Alaska: Implications for Biogeography, Geology, and Archeology. Quaternary Research 16: 404-417.

Tobey, Robert. 2001. Nelchina caribou herd management report of survey-inventory activities, 1 July 1998-30 June 2000, Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Grants W-27-2 and 3, Project 3.0, Juneau, Alaska. Alaska Department of Fish & Game – Glennallen. Pp. 90-105. http://www.wildlife.alaska.gov/pubs/techpubs/mgt_rpts/mca01-1_interior.pdf.

——. 2002. Unit 11 Copper River herd bison management report of survey-inventory activities, 1 July 1999-30 June 2001. Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Grants W-27-3, W-27-4, Project 9.0, Juneau, Alaska. 7pp. http://www.wildlife.alaska.gov/pubs/techpubs/mgt_rpts/bi02mt.pdf.

Townsend, Joan. 1981. Tanaina. In Handbook of North American Indians: Subarctic. Vol. 6. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 641-663.

USDOL. *See* U.S. Department of Labor

USGS. *See* U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1998. Environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact, Cape Yakataga radio relay station, Alaska. Anchorage, Alaska: Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

U.S. Bureau of Mines, Alaska Earth Sciences and Resource Data, Inc., 1995, Mineral terranes and known deposit areas of Alaska, digital map documentation: Bureau of Mines Open File Report 82-95.

U.S. Department of Commerce. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. National Marine Fisheries Service. 2004. Re: BLM Resource Management Plan for the East Alaska planning area. 05/13.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1979. Exploratory survey of Alaska. Soil Conservation Service.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service. 2003. Chugach National Forest land and resource management plan. Chugach National Forest.

U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2002. State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates Alaska. http://www.bls.gov/oes/2002/oes_ak.htm).

U.S Department of the Interior. Bureau of Indian Affairs. 1993. Ahtna (BIA 14(H)(1)) Site Lists; Oral History; Betts Material 1993. Anchorage: BIA-ANCSA Office.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. 1980a. Management framework plan, southcentral planning area. As amended in 1983.

——. 1980b. BLM land use plan for southcentral Alaska – a summary. Anchorage, Alaska; 39 pp.

——. 1983a. River management plan for the Delta National Wild and Scenic River. Anchorage District, Alaska. December.

——. 1983b. River management plan for the Gulkana National Wild River. Anchorage District, Alaska. December.

——. 1988a. BLM Manual, 6840 – special status species management, glossary, page 6.

——. 1988b. BLM handbook H-1790-1 National Environmental Policy Act handbook.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. 1989a. The Birds of the Copper River Basin and Surrounding Areas. BLM in association with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Glennallen, Alaska and Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, Copper Center, Alaska. Unpaginated. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/othrdata/chekbird/r7/copper.htm (Version 23FEB2001).

——. 1989b. Draft management situation analysis for southcentral resource management plan and environmental impact statement. Glennallen, Alaska; 480 pp.

——. 1989c. Management situation analysis report: Fire.

——. 1989d. Management situation analysis report: Fish and wildlife.

——. 1989e. Management situation analysis report: Forestry.

——. 1989f. Management situation analysis report: Lands and realty.

——. 1989g. Management situation analysis report: Minerals.

——. 1989h Management situation analysis report: Recreation.

——. 1989i. Management situation analysis report: Social and economic conditions.

——. 1989j. Management situation analysis report: Soil, water, air, vegetation.

——. 1989k. National Wild and Scenic River eligibility worksheets.

——. 1989l. Proposed resource management plan and final environmental impact statement for the utility corridor planning area. BLM-AK-PT90-002-1610-060 Arctic District, Alaska. 09/27.

——. 1990. BLM Manual 8300 – Recreation Management.

——. 1992. BLM Form 3100-11 – Offer to lease and lease for oil and gas, October.

——. 1993. BLM Manual 8351 – Wild and scenic river policy and program direction for identification, evaluation, and management.

——. 1997. BLM National cultural programmatic agreement for section 106 compliance.

——. 1998. Implementing protocol with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer for managing cultural resources on lands administered by the BLM in Alaska.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. 1999. Interim guidance – changes to the list of critical elements of the human environment in BLM's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) handbook. Instruction Memorandum No. 99-178. Washington, D.C..

——. 2000. BLM Handbook H-1601-1. Land use planning handbook.

——. 2001. National management strategy for motorized off-highway vehicle use on public land. January 19.

——. 2002. Final Environmental Impact Statement - Renewal of the Federal Grant for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Right-of-Way. Publication No. BLM/AK/PT-03/005+2880+990.

——. 2003a. Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) data, 1999-2003.

——. 2003b. Scoping report: east Alaska resources management plan.

——. 2003c. Northwest National Petroleum Reserve Alaska Final Integrated Activity Plan/EIS. Anchorage, AK.

——. 2004a. Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) data.

——. 2004b. Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) data, 1999 and 2004.

——. 2004c. Draft land use amendment for fire and fuels management. Alaska State Office.

——. 2004d. BLM's Alaska statewide land health standards.

——. 2004e. Mineral occurrence and development potential report. Branch of Solid Minerals.

——. 2004f. Reasonably foreseeable oil and gas development scenario for the Glennallen Field Office planning area, Alaska. Division of Energy and Minerals.

——. 2004g. Management situation analysis report: Recreation. Glennallen Field Office Recreation Program.

——. 2004h. Management situation analysis report: Off-highway vehicles and trails. Glennallen Field Office Recreation Program.

——. 2004i. Management situation analysis report: Rivers. Glennallen Recreation Program.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. 2004j. Draft BLM Handbook H-1601-1. Draft land use planning handbook.

——. 2004k. Draft Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska IAP/EIS.

——. 2004l. Annual bald eagle occupancy and productivity survey data, 1976-2004. Glennallen Field Office.

——. 2005a. Final environmental assessment for revision of the 1983 Gulkana River management plan, February draft. AK-050-EA-03-001.[fix reference in text to include the letter a]

——. 2005b. Final BLM Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1. March 11.

——. 2005c. Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment and Environmental Assessment for Wildland Fire and Fuels Management for Alaska. Alaska Fire Service. AK-313-04-EA-001.

——. 2005d. Official Transcript of the SouthCentral Federal Subsistence Regional

U.S. Department of Interior. Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Department of Energy. 2003. Assessing the potential for renewable energy on public lands. February.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management and Joint Pipeline Office. 2002. Trans-Alaska Pipeline right-of-way renewal environmental impacts statement.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service. 2001. Off-Highway Vehicle Final Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Plan Amendment for Montana, North Dakota, and portions of South Dakota. January.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Code of Federal Regulations. Mineral Resources. Title 30 Section 745.

——. Energy. Title 10 Part 960.2.

——. Protection of the Environment. Title 40 Section 1500-1508.

——. Public Lands: Interior. Title 43. Sections 24; 1610; 2091.3-2; 2200; 2561; 2640; 2740; 2912; 2920; 3101.2-1; 3150.05 (b); 3160.0-5; 3400.2 1-4; 3425; 3731; 3809; 8223; 8342; 8351.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Code of Federal Regulations. Transportation. Title 49 Section 171.8.

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. 1986. Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve general management plan. Anchorage, Alaska, 240 pp.

U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. n.d. Bird Checklist for Alaska Department of Game and Fish, Game Management Unit 12. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/othrdata/chekbird/r7/unit12.htm (Version 30Dec2002).

——. 1991. Alaska productivity surveys of geese, swans, and brant 1990; Migratory Bird Management, Juneau, Alaska; 30 pp.

——. 1996a. Alaska trumpeter swan status report 1995. Migratory Bird Management, Juneau, Alaska; 35 pp.

——. 1996b. Alaska trumpeter swan atlas, volume I. Migratory Bird Management, Juneau, Alaska, 31+ pp.

——. 2000. Trumpeter swan census quadrangles. Migratory Bird Management, Juneau, Alaska, 8 pp.

——. 2004. Re: East Alaska Resource Management Plan *(consultation # 2005015)*. Ellen W. Lance, Endangered Species Biologist. November, 22. 1 pp.

——. 2005. Ecological Services Division, Region 7 – Alaska. http://Alaska.fws.gov/fisheries/enviro_review/index.html.

U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey. 2000. Progress report: re-nesting, nest depredation, and gosling survival of dusky Canada geese on the Copper River Delta, Anchorage, Alaska. 17 pp.

U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey. 2001. Wetland subsidence, fault reactivation, and hydrocardon production in the U.S. Gulf Coast Region. USGS Fact Sheet FS-091-01, USGS Coastal Marine Geology Program, http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/fs091-01; 9pp.

U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Aviation Administration. 1958. Plan and profile Yakataga River bridge Site, Yakataga, Alaska. Anchorage: Federal Aviation Administration, Alaska Region.

U.S. District Court. 1993. Civil Case #J91-023, United States District Court, District of Alaska.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1998. Interim air quality policy on wildland and prescribed fire. April 23.

Environmental Protection Agency. 2003. Final Environmental impact Statement Pogo Mine Project Delta, Alaska. Seattle, WA.

Wahrhaftig, C. 1965. Physiographic divisions of Alaska. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 482, 52 pp., 6 sheets.

Wahrhaftig, Clyde, and Hickox, C.A.. 1955. Geology and coal deposits, Jarvis Creek coal field, Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin 989-G, p. 353.

Wahrhaftig, Clyde, Wolfe, J.A., Leopold , E.B., and Lanphere, M.A.. 1969. The coal-bearing group in the Nenana coal field, Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin, 1274-D, 30 p.

Walker, R.J., C. Olnes, K. Sundet, A.L. Howe, and A.E. Bingham. 2003. Participation, catch, and harvest in Alaska sport fisheries during 2000. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Data Series No. 03-05, Anchorage.

Walsh, John and Dave McGuire. 2004. Arctic Biota/Vegetation: The role of land-cover change and permafrost dynamics in the delivery of fresh water to the arctic ocean. International Arctic Research Center.

Waters, Elijah. 2003. Management situation analysis report: fisheries. Wildlife Biologist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

——. 2004a. Management situation analysis report: Subsistence. Wildlife Biologist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

——. 2004b. Subsistence section 810 evaluation report. Wildlife Biologist, BLM Glennallen Field Office.

West, Frederick Hadleigh. 1981. The archaeology of Beringia. New York: Columbia University Press

——. 1996. American beginnings: The prehistory and paleoecology of Beringia. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

White, C.M., N.J. Clum, T.J. Cade, and W.G. Hunt. 2002. Peregrine falcon *(Falco peregrinus).* In the Birds of North America, No. 660 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/BNA/account/Peregrine_Falcon/

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as amended. U.S. Public Law 90-542. October 2, 1968

Wilderness Act. U.S. Public Law 88-577. September 3, 1964.

Williams, J.R.. 1985. Engineering-geologic map of the southwestern Copper River Basin and upper Matanuska river valley, Alaska. U.S. Gological Survey Open-File Report 85-143, scale 1:125,000.

Wolfe, Robert J.. 2004. Local traditions and subsistence: A synopsis from twenty-five years of research. Juneau : Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence.

Workman, William. 1976. A late prehistoric Ahtna site near Gulkana, Alaska: 1975 salvage excavations on the Ringling property (GUL-077) sponsored by Alyeska Pipeline Service Company. Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Alaska Anthropological Association, Anchorage, March 26.

Wright, A. L., G. D. Hayward, S. M. Matsouka, and P. H. Hayward. 1998. Townsend's warbler (*Dendroica townsendi*). In The Birds of North America, No. 333 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA. http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/BNA/account/Townsends_Warbler/INTRODUCTION.html

Yakutat Planning Commission. 2004. Icy Bay-Cape Suckling City and Borough of Yakutat Draft Comprehensive Development Plan. Draft unpublished. Sheinberg Associates, Juneau, Alaska.

Zinck, Brian, and Teresa Zinck. 1976. Survey of archeological sites, Tangle Lakes Arecheological District near Paxson, Alaska, 1976. Bureau of Land Management – Anchorage, Alaska.

Index

INDEX

INDEX

A

ACEC. *See* Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Access.....10, 40-43, 49, 51, 52, 54, 59, 71, 73, 74, 88, 89, 96, 115, 117, 122, 130-132
.....134, 141, 143, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 174, 177, 184, 185, 187, 194, 195
.....200-202, 341-343, 403, 413-416, 474, 507, 519, 522, 525, 579, J62- J74
Acquisition. *See* Land Acquisition
Acronyms .....619-620 (Volume II)
Air Quality.....218, 219, 327, 404, 463, 582, 593, J98
Airport 114, 317, 318, 322
Airstrips 90, 91, 188, 286, A3, A5, A9, A13, B3, B6, B10, B15
Alaska Department of Fish and Game 16, 82-85, 88, 94, 96, 128, 130, 173, 195, 208
.....234-281, 327, Appendix K
Alaska Moonwort..... 228, 230
Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act 18, 42, 45, 47, 48, 51-53, 56, 59
.75, 86, 96, 114, 116, 119, 120, 122, 125, 137, 166, 195, 279, 310-312, 325, 373
.....378-380
ANILCA Section 810 Analysis .....166, 168, Appendix E
Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act ...18, 41, 48, 86, 114, 118, 187, 319, 321, 322, 380
17(b) Easements .....10, 41, 42, 49, 56 ,74, 76, 85, 187, 188, 287, 413
ANCSA (d)(1) Withdrawals. *See* Withdrawals, ANCSA (d)(1) Withdrawals
Allotments. *See* Native Allotment
Amphibians 258
Anadromous Rivers and Streams 39, 83, 88, 93, 98, 142, 146, 273, 277, 278, 280
..... 281, 291
ANCSA. *See* Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
ANILCA. *See* Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) 37, 39, 131, 135, 171-177, 305
..... 438, 540-543, 585, 595, Appendix B, J127-J141
Delta Bison Calving ACEC 45, 50, 87, 90, 94, 98, 120-122, 132, 136, 143
.....306, B3, B5
Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC 45, 51, 59, 87, 90, 94, 98, 120-122, 142-145
.....148, 306, 307, B6, B9
West Fork ACEC ... 39, 44, 50, 54, 59, 91-93, 95, 96, 120-122, 124, 142-145, 174
..... 307, B10-B14
ATV. *See* Travel Management, Off-Highway Vehicle
Assumptions..... 402-412

B

Back Country Byways 67, 76, 200, 207
Bald Eagle.....84, 88, 91, 143, 146, 254, 307, 311, C10, C23
Bear 233, 234, 236, 306, 308
Beaver..... 251, 252, 308, 310, 311

Benefits Based Planning .....Appendix H
Bering Glacier *See* Research Natural Area, Bering Glacier RNA
Big Game 128, 139, 146, 174, 233, 375
Bison *See also* ACEC, Delta Bison ACEC.....128, 130, 132, 136, 141, 143, 144, 234
.....235, 340, C23
Black Bear. *See* Bear
Blackpoll Warbler 259, 260
Boat Ramps 191
Brown Bear. *See* Bear
Budget..... 288, 305, 312, 386
Buffbreasted Sandpiper..... 259, 260

C

Cabin. *See* Public Use Cabins
Canada Lynx 251, 259, 261, 310, 311
Caribou *See also* ACEC, Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC.....86, 128, 130, 133, 136, 141
.. 143, 145, 146, 167, 174, 177, 220, 235, 237, 252, 253, 288, 289, 291, 275, 276
.....C23
Chinook. *See* Salmon, Chinook
Climate Change 315, 587, J181-J182
Coal. *See* Minerals, coal
Cody's Rockcress 228, 230
Coho. *See* Salmon, coho
Collaboration ..... 22, 128, 232, 271, Chapter V
Comments. *See* Public Comments
Commenter names.....J319-J330
Communication sites 191, 317, 325, 326
Conservation System Units 42, 43, 321
Consistency..... 42
Consultation ..... Chapter V
Fish and Wildlife Service 609
Tribal 610
Content Analysis J4-J5
Conveyance. *See* Land Conveyance
Cooperating Agency..... 23, 610
Coyote..... 251, 252, 261, 308, 311
Cultural Resources..... 48, 55, 82, 85, 82, 96, 98 ,176, 282-299, 406, 517-529, 544
.....585, 599, C17, C18, J121-J124
Cumulative Effects 171-177, 579-592

D

(d) (1) Withdrawals. *See* Withdrawals, ANCSA (d)(1) Withdrawals
Dall Sheep..... 84, 88, 91, 94, 130, 133, 136, 147, 236, 237, 252, 253, 310, C10
Delta Bison Calving Area. *See* ACEC, Delta Bison Calving ACEC
Delta Mountains Sub-unit. *See* Non-motorized sub-units
Delta National Wild and Scenic River. *See* National Wild and Scenic Rivers, Delta River

Delta Range Area. *See* SMRA, Delta Range SRMA
Denali Highway Area. *See* SRMA, Denali Highway SRMA
Disposal. *See* Land Disposal
Distribution List..... 611-614
Drinking Water 86, 199
Draft Alternatives. *See* Public Involvement, Draft Alternatives
Draft RMP/EIS. *See* Public Involvement, Draft RMP/EIS
Dusky Canada Goose 259, 261, 271

E

Eagle See *also* Bald Eagle..... 253
Easements. *See* Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, 17(b) Easements
Economics. *See* Social and Economic Conditions
Environmental Justice 386, 388, 566, 572, 574, 577, 591
Erosion 82, 92, 147, 172, 173, 175, 185, 193, 210, 216, 255, 294, 358, C6, C24
Exchange. *See* Lands Exchanges
Exploration. *See* Mineral Resources, Exploration

F

Facilities 36, 38, 66-74, 88, 91, 96, 138, 139, 172, 191, 199, 200, 202, 208, 218, 293
..... 327, A4, A7, A9, B4, B7, B12, B15, J21-J24
Fire 13, 216, 224, 238, 303, 328-341, 418, 439, 441, 443, 446, 449, 451, 453, 455
460, 462, 475, 478, 482, 493, 499, 502, 531, 546, 554, A7, A9, A15, B5, B9, B14
.....J232-J233
prescribed fire.....91, 128-131, 133, 136, 174, 175, 218, 219, 336, 408, 555-558
wildland fire.....91, 128, 129-1331,136, 169, 174, 175, 216, 218, 224, 236, 238
..... 261, 303, 408, 555
Firewood gathering, personal.....13, 131, 132, 134, 135, 217, 325, 328, 342, 343
Fish 44, 49, 56, 83, 84, 88, 95, 95, 98, 114, 128, 277, 278, 281, 406, 501-517, 544
.....584, J111-J121
Fishing.....42, 166, 173, 199, 200, 277-281, 373, 377, 378, 384, 387
Fisheries..... 12, 82, 83, 85, 93, 173, 175, 273, 277, 278-280, 373-378
FLPMA 302 Permits. *See* Land Use Authorization, FLPMA 302 Permits
FLPMA Leases. *See* Land Use Authorizations, FLPMA Leases
Forestry 73, 91, 128, 130-135, 169, 172, 174, 175, 184, 211, 212, 240, 303
.....384, A16, B14, B17, J233-J238
Forest Products....128, 131, 216, 341, 342, 408, 422, 426, 431, 439, 441, 443, 446, 449
..453, 456, 460, 462, 478, 493, 499, 505, 507, 513, 516, 532, 548, 550, 552, 553
..... 555-558, 588, 596
Fox. *See* Red Fox
Fuels reduction..... 224, 343
Furbearers.....84, 251, 261, D3

G

Geology 347-357, J242
Geothermal Energy 361
Glossary ..... 621-640 (Volume II)
Gray Wolf 252
Gray-cheeked Thrush 259, 263, 272
Grazing 129, 234, 234, 340
Grizzly Bear. *See* Bear
Gulkana National Wild River. *See* National Wild and Scenic Rivers, Gulkana River

H

Habitat Management Plans 94
Harbor Seal 84, 259, 263, 271, 308
Harlequin Duck 259, 265, 272
Hazardous Materials 389, 390, 546, C20-C22
Helicopter 47, 70, 73, 74, 84, 88, 93, 94, 172, 226, 228, 369, C10
Heli-skiing 69, 73, 76, 199, 237, 208, 298
Hunting 171, 174, 186, 187, 196, 232
sport hunting 201, 216, 387
subsistence hunting ..... 42, 51, 59, 74, 123, 126, 166, 167, 169, 177, 192, 193 ..... 373-379, Appendix E

I

Implementation-Level Planning 21, 35, 41, 42, 44, 45, 71, 76, 171, 172
Invasive Species 84, 90, 93, 175, 225, 229, 405, 589
Inventory and Monitoring ..... 35, 40, 52, 66, 70, 74, 82, 85, 128, 137, 188, 201, 210, 211 ..... 218, 226, 271, 277, 282, 295, 298, 300, 304, 312, 316, 341, 389

J

Joint Pipeline Office 226, 227

K

King Salmon. *See* Salmon, Chinook

L

Land Acquisition ..... 17, 71, 115, 117, 120, 121, 124, 321, 421, 425, 430, 434, 477, 481 ..... 492, 497, 504, 507, 511, 515, A4,A7, A9, A11, A15, B8
Land Conveyance ..... 15, 36, 38, 58, 71, 72, 86, 113, 114, 117, 119, 123, 126, 137 ..... 167, 177, 188, 234, 305, 312, 313, 316, 318, 319, 335, 370, 385, 386
Land Disposal 83, 113, 114, 117, 119, 121, 125, 126, 318, 319, 421, 425, 430, 434, 441 .. 443, 446, 448, 453, 455, 459, 461, 466, 468, 470 ,472, 477, 480, 491, 497, 504 .. 507, 512, 515, 518, 520, 523, 527, 534, 535, 537, 538, 547, 548, 551, 553, 565 ..... 569, 573, 575
Slana Disposal 13, 113, 117, 119, 121, 124, 320, 322, 325, J221-J228

Land Exchange 114, 115, 117, 119, 121, 318, 321, 477, 481, 492, 497, 547, 549, 551
Land Use Authorizations 316, 317, 407, 421, 425, 430, 435, 441, 443, 446, 448, 453
..455, 459, 462, 466, 468, 470, 472, 478, 481, 492, 498, 504, 507, 512, 515, 518
.....521, 524, 527, 534, 535, 537, 538, 547, 549, 551, 553
FLPMA 302 Permits 90, 91, 93, 115, 116, 119, 120, 122, 317, A4, A7, A11
..... A17, B4, B8, B13, B17
FLPMA Leases.....87, 88, 90, 91-93, 115, 117, 1191, 120, 122, 317, A4, A7, A11
..... A17, B4, B8, B12, B16
Military Permits.....90, 91, A4,A7, A12, A17, B5, B9, B13, B17
R&PP Leases 114, 115, 119, 120, 122, A4, A7,A11, A17, B4, B8, B12, B16
Unauthorized Use.....116, 117, 121, 134, 188, 317, 316, 320, 389
Lands and Realty ..13, 113, 117, 124, 169, 316-327, 544-553, 583, 588, 595, J189-J123
Laws .....Appendix G
Lease. *See* Land Use Authorizations, FLPMA Leases *and* R&PP Leases
Leasable minerals. *See* minerals, leasable
Locatable Minerals. *See* minerals, locatable

M

Marten. *See* Pine Marten
Memorandums of Understanding ..... 225, , 611, Appendix K
Migratory Birds 257, 310
Mineral Entry. *See* Mineral resources, locatable
Mineral resources.....14, 347-372, 559-563, 565, 569, 573, 575, 583, J239-J253
coal.....91, 92, 94, 95, 138216, 301, 348, 357-361
coalbed methane 138, 139, 361, 367
exploration and development.....36, 67, 68, 87, 90, 137, 167, 170, 172-177
..... 361-364, 368-370
leasable 69, 70, 72-74, 89, 96, 120, 125, 137, 138, 140-145, 171, 357-371
..410, 422, 427, 431, 436, 442, 444, 447, 449, 454, 456, 460, 462 ,467, 469, 471
....473, 479, 483-488, 493, 500, 507-510, 513, 516, 519, 521, 524, 528, 532, 560
.....561, 562, 590, 597, A3, A6, A9, A15, B3, B7, B11, B15
locatable 39, 69, 70, 72-74, 89-96, 118, 120-122, 125, 126, 137, 139-144, 148
...170, 173, 175, 171, 367-371, 410, 419, 422, 427, 431, 436, 440, 442, 445, 447
..449, 451, 454, 458, 460, 462, 465, 467, 469, 471, 473, 479, 488, 493, 500, 503
....505, 510, 513, 517, 519, 522, 524, 529, 532, 560, 561, 562, 563 ,590 ,597, A3
.....A5, A9, A15, B3, B7, B11, B15
mineral materials .....140 ,141, 143, 144, 371, 410, 423, 428, 431, 436, 442, 445
..447, 450, 454, 458, 460, 462, 467, 469, 471, 473, 479, 489, 493, 501, 506, 511
...513, 517, 519, 522, 524, 529, 532, 560, 561-563, 597, A4, A6, A9, A15, B3, B7
B11, B15
terranes 354-357
Mink 251-252, 310, 311
Moose 52, 84, 87, 129, 130, 133, 136, 167, 174, 177, 237, 238, 252, 307, 310, 311
..... 340, 375, 376
winter range.....44, 50, 87, 91, 94, 131, 133, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 196, 336
..... C10, C23

Mountain Goat..... 84, 88, 91, 94, 130, 147, 236, 237, 252, 308, C10
Mountain Moonwort..... 228, 231

N

Narrow-leaf Grape Fern 228, 231
National Register of Historic Places 288, 294, 299, 311
National Wild and Scenic River 43, 66, 83, 95, 115, 124, 131, 135, 140, 143, 171, 199
.....309-314, 407, 586, 595, J141-J164
Delta River.....40, 43, 45, 51, 58, 59, 66, 82-84, 89, 90, 93, 96, 114, 119, 120-123
....125, 128, 130, 132, 141-146, 171, 192, 200, 203, 290-295, 310, 311, 421, 425
.....430, 434, A5, A8
Eligibility and suitability..... 85, 86, 312-314, Appendix I
Gulkana River.....39, 43, 47, 53, 58, 59, 66, 82-86, 89, 91-93, 96, 98, 120, 132
..... 141-144, 171, 174, 192, 311, 312, 200, 204, 290-295, 418
Native Allotment 113, 318-320, 387
Natural and Cultural Resources 12, 40, 82, 98, 210-315, 420, 424, 430, 434, 438-543
.. 441, 443, 446, 448, 452, 454, 459, 461, 466, 468, 470, 472, 477, 480, 491, 496
.. 504, 506, 512, 515, 518, 520, 523, 527, 534, 535, 537, 538, 547, 548, 551, 552
.....562, 567, 573, 575, J95-J188
Nelchina Caribou Calving Area, *See* ACEC, Nelchina Caribou Calving ACEC
Non-motorized sub-units/use 38, 40, 41, 46, 47, 49, 51-56, 58, 67-73, 185, 193
..... 200, 201, 207, 208, 228, A3, A14, H8, H15, H19
Noxious Weeds. *See* Invasive Species

O

Off-Highway Vehicles. *See* Travel Management, Off-Highway Vehicles
Oil and gas. *See* minerals, leasable
Olive-sided Flycatcher..... 259, 265, 266

P

Paleontological resources 82, 300-302, 407, 529, 545, 585, 595, C17, C18
Peregrine Falcon..... 259, 266
Permits. *See* Land Use Authorizations *and* Special Recreation Use Permits
Pipeline See *also* Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS)..... 87, 88, 122, 176, 325
Pine Marten..... 252, 253
Physiographic Regions.....347-353
Prescribed Fire. *See* Fire, prescribed fire
Planning process.....19-21, 24, 38, 41, 53, 76, 85, 117, 119, 139, 187, 313 ,317, 319
..... 321, 322
Policies..... 18, 22, 166
Preparers 615
Protest Procedures.....Dear Reader Letter
Public Use Cabin.....65, 70, 720, 74, 76, 316, 318, A4, A6, A9, A15, B4, B7, B11, B15
Public comments.....Appendix J
Public involvement and participation .....22, 41, 605, Appendix F, Appendix J

Draft Alternatives 37, 606
Draft RMP/EIS 85, 86, 607
Scoping 37, 82, 193, 305, 387, 606
Public Land Order 91, 114, 116, 120, 122, 125, 142, 143, 148, 320, 321
PLO 5150 .....36, 37, 46, 47, 54, 59, 68, 69, 73-75, 96, 119-123, 125, 126, 131
.....132, 142-145, 148, 167-169 177, 322, 325, 408, 422, 426, 431, 435, 441, 443
..446, 449, 453, 455, 459, 462, 467, 468, 471, 473, 478, 482, 492, 498, 505, 507
.....513, 515, 518, 521, 524, 528, 531, 549, 553, 565, 567, 573, 575, E6, E7, E13
..... E14, J190-J221
Purpose and need 6

R

R&PP Leases. *See* Land Use Authorizations
Raptors.....88, 91, 94, 145, 146, 253, 310
Recreation..... 11, 36, 39, 40, 42, 46, 52-56, 65-76, 83-85, 90, 113, 172, 173, 199-209
....403, 418-437, 439, 440, 442, 445, 448, 450, 452, 454, 459, 461, 465-467, 470
..472, 476, 480, 490, 495, 501, 504, 506, 511, 514, 518, 520, 523, 525, 531, 533
... 535, 536, 538, 547, 548, 551, 552, 564, 567, 572, 574, 580, 593, 599, J75-J94
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS).....65, 67, 70, 73, 74 ,172, 201, 202, J83-J84
Recreation Withdrawals. *See* Withdrawals, Recreation Withdrawals
Red Fox..... 251, 253
Red Knot 259, 266
Red Salmon. *See* Salmon, sockeye
Red-throated Loon 259, 266
References.....641-664 (Volume II)
Regulations .....Appendix G
Renewable Energy..... 138, 371, 372, 411
Required Operating Procedures..... Appendix C, J164-J181
Research Natural Area (RNA)..... 307
Bering Glacier RNA 89, 90, 93-96, 98, 120-122, 124, 132, 142, 143, 145, 148
..... 308, B15-B17
Rights-of-way 43,59,113,117,119-122, 187, 317, 326
.....A7, A9, A15, B4, B8, B13, B15
Riparian 82, 83, 89, 92, 95, 175, 216, 224, 225, 405, 589, 596, C11-C14
River Otter..... 251, 253
Roads 11, 40, 43-57, 59, 65, 73, 86-91, 93-96, 130-132, 134, 135, 169, 171-177
..184, 187, 202, 326, 371, 372, 420, 423, 429, 432, 439, 440, 442, 445, 447, 450
..452, 454, 459, 461, 464, 465, 467, 470, 471, 474, 476, 479, 489, 495, 503, 506
..511, 514, 517, 519, 523, 525, 530, 533, 535, 536, 538, 544, 546, 548, 550, 552
..... 580, A3, A5, A9, A13, B3, B6, B11, B15
R.S. 2477 ..... 42, 187

S

Salable Minerals. *See* Minerals, mineral materials
Salmon 82, 204, 233, 254, 265, 273, 274, 278, 279, 374-376
Chinock (king)..... 83, 204, 277, 307, 311
Coho (silver) 273
Sockeye (red) 274, 277, 311
Scoping. *See* Public Involvement
Section 810 Analysis. *See* Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA Section 810 Analysis. See *also* Subsistence
Sensitive Status Species *See also* Threatened and Endangered Species ..... 82, 88, 91 ..... 94, 226-231, 258-272, 281, 590, 594, 596, C9-C11, C25
Sessile-leaved Scurvy Grass 227, 229
Shacklette's Catseye..... 227, 229
Silver Salmon. *See* Salmon, coho
Slana. *See* Land Disposal, Slana Disposal
Smoke Management 218, 219
Snowmachine..... 43-48, 50-56, 58, 59, 67, 68, 70-74, 171, 172, 193, 195, 196, 201 ..... 204, 208
Social and Economic Conditions..... 14, 166-168, 177, 379-386, 411, 566, 570, 574, 577 .....591, 597, J269-JJ272
Soils .....82, 89, 92, 95, 96, 129, 172, 173, 193, 194, 201, 202, 210-214, 225, 294, 311 .....341, 389, 390, 404, 438-450, 581, 593, C6, C7, J96
Sockeye. See Salmon, sockeye
Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) .....208, 209, 420,423, 429, 433 ..... Appendix H, J84-J94
Delta Range SRMA 46, 52, 58, 59, 70, 73, 75, 76, 94, 208, A3, A4
Delta River SRMA. *See also* National Wild and Scenic Rivers, Delta River . 67, 68 ..... 70, 75, 76, 92, 120, 143, 203, A5-A8, H5-H9
Denali Highway SRMA .....38, 39, 46, 54, 59, 67-69, 71, 72, 75, 76, 90, 92, 93 ..... 96, 120-122, 142-144, 172, 177, 207, A9-A12, H10-H15
Gulkana River SRMA. *See also* National Wild and Scenic Rivers, Gulkana River 67, 69, 71, 75, 76, 119-122, 143, 204, H16-H21
Tiekel SRMA..... 39, 47, 54, 59, 68-70, 72, 75, 76, 92, 120-122, 142-145, 147 .....207-208, A13-A19, H22-H25
Special Recreation Use Permits.....200, 208, J82-J83
Species Lists .....228, 259, 260, Appendix D
Standard Lease Terms..... C5, C26-C30
State of Alaska's Generally Allowed Uses..... 44, 49, 58, 171
Stipulations.....192, 210, 217, 364, C3, C23-C25, J164-J181
Subsistence *See also* Hunting, Subsistence .....14, 15, 40, 42, 51, 52, 54, 55, 71, 74, 82, 93 ..... 121, 166-177, 183, 195, 278-280, 325, 373-379, 411, 564-578, 591, 597 ..... Appendix E, J254-J269

T

Tangle Lakes Archeological District .....43, 48, 55, 71, 85, 89, 93, 171, 192, 196, 207 .....290, 294, 295, 301, 302, 305
Tiekel. *See also* Special Recreation Management Area, Tiekel SRMA..... 84, 85, 96, 117, 130-132 ..... 134, 135, 207, 208, 224, 296-299, 341-344
Threatened and Endangered Species.....84, 147, 226, 271, 281, 307, C75
Tonsina North Sub-unit. *See* Non-motorized sub-units
Tonsina South Sub-unit. *See* Non-motorized sub-units
Townsend Warbler 259, 268
Trails. *See* Travel Management, Trail Management
Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) *See also* pipeline 36, 184, 211, 218, 326, 327
Transportation and Utility Corridor. *See* Public Land Orders, PLO 5150
Travel Management 10, 40, 184-198, 403, 413-417, 593, 599, J20-J74
designated trails ..... 38, 41-55, 58, 68, 69, 70-73, 90-93, 95, 171, 173-176, 192 ..... 196, 282, 294
existing trails.....40, 43-45, 49-51, 53, 56-58, 67, 71, 94-96, 173, 175-177, 192 303
hiking/non-motorized trails.....46, 52, 47, 49, 51, 58, 67, 69,70, 72, 73
loops/ trail networks.....46, 72, 38, 53, 41, 47, 195
Off-Highway Vehicles .....10, 11, 40-59, 67-73, 83-85, 87-96, 167-169, 171-177 .....191-196, A5, A9, A13, B3, B6, B10, B15
trails management..... 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47-56, 65, 66, 68, 70-72, 74, 85, 88, 89 .....92, 185-196, 403, 413-416, 419, 423, 428, 432, 438, 440, 442, 445, 447, 450 .. 452, 454, 458, 460, 464, 465, 467, 470, 471, 474, 476, 479, 489, 494, 503, 506 ..... 511, 514, 517, 519, 522, 525, 530, 533, 535, 536, 538, 579, A3, A5, A9, A13 ..... B3, B6, B10, B15, J24-J62
Travel Management Areas 44-57
weight limits/ vehicles class limitations 48, 49, 54-56, 69, 72, 92
Trespass. *See* Land Use Authorizations, Unauthorized Use
Triangle-lobe Moonwort..... 227, 229
Trumpeter Swans. *See also* ACES, West Fork ACEC .....44, 50, 84, 88, 91, 952, 95, 98, 121 .....141, 142, 145, 147, 259, 267, 268, 271, 272, 307, 311, C9, C23
Tule White-fronted Goose 259-268
Tundra Whitlow-grass 227, 230
Tunux's Moonwart..... 228, 230

U

Unauthorized use. *See* Land Use Authorizations, Unauthorized Use

V

Vegetation Management ..... 13, 128-130, 134, 136, 169, 220-231, 328-346, 404, 435 ..... 464-473 483, 518, 521, 524, 528, 534, 536-538, 545, 554-558, 564, 600 .....C15-C17, J98-J99, J232-J238
Visual Resources Management, VRM Classes.....53, 69, 70, 74, 89, 93, 96, 132, 135 . 142, 145, 176, 303, 304, 407, 530-539, 545, 585, 595, A8, C19-C20, J124-J164

W

Water Quality . 84, 89, 92, 95, 173, 215-217, 404, 450-463, 581, 593, C11-C14, J96-J98
Waterfowl 48, 55, 82, 86, 93, 95, 98, 174, 254, 307, 308
Watershed..... 39, 82-84, 173, 210, 215, 216
Weeds. *See* noxious weeds
West Fork Area. *See* ACEC, West Fork ACEC
Western Toad..... 258
Wetlands 44, 50, 89, 92, 93, 95, 98, 172, 174, 175, 193, 120, 224, 254, 258
..... 267, 405
Wild and Scenic Rivers. *See* National Wild and Scenic Rivers
Wildland Fire. *See* Fire, wildland fire
Wilderness 16, 17, J182-J188
Wildlife.....232-272, 405, 474-501, 544, 583, 594, J99-J111
Withdrawals.....69, 70, 73, 74, 86, 90-96, 119-118, 120, 122, 125, 137, 140, 144, 148
.. 172, 173, 175, 321, 322, 370, 426, 431, 435, 441, 443, 446, 449, 453, 455, 459
.. 462, 466, 468, 471, 473, 478, 482, 492, 498, 505, 507, 513, 515, 518, 521, 524
..... 528, 534, 536-538, 565, 567, 573, 575
ANCSA (d)(1) Withdrawals.....36, 37, 67-69, 87, 90, 99, 116, 117, 119, 120
.....122, 125, 140, 145, 148, 321, 421, J228-J231
Recreational Withdrawals..... 53, 71, 72, 118
Wolf. *See* Grey Wolf
Wolverine 351, 353
Wood Frog 358

Y

Yaaxudakeit's Moonwort 228, 231