



3 3500 00181 3799

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON FEDERAL AREAS

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

1989 ANNUAL REPORT

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

JANUARY 18, 1990

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *



Citizens' Advisory Commission on Federal Areas

250 Cushman St.
Suite 4H
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
(907) 456-2012
Fax: 456-2039

January 18, 1990

Dear Reader:

The Citizens' Advisory Commission on Federal Areas was established in 1981 by the Alaska State Legislature to protect the rights of Alaskans to continue their traditional uses of federal lands throughout the State. The need for an official State agency to oversee the management of federal lands in Alaska was created primarily by the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) in 1980. ANILCA placed 104 million acres of land in Alaska into federal conservation units, and outlined specific use requirements and restrictions for those areas.

The changes in land status and the statutory requirements for the use and management of federal lands often conflict with the traditional activities to which Alaska's peoples have become accustomed. The Commission is charged with the responsibility of researching issues and determining the impact of federal statutes, regulations and management decisions on the citizens of Alaska in order to minimize or resolve potential conflicts. Through the development and maintenance of a good working relationship with the various federal agencies, the Commission has been effective in assuring that land management decisions are consistent with both statutory language and Congressional intent and in protecting the interests of Alaska's citizens. This document represents the Commission's annual report to the Governor and the Alaska State Legislature as required by AS 41.37.080(f).

COMPOSITION

The Commission is composed of sixteen members, eight appointed by the Governor and eight by the Legislature. The Commission officers until mid-1988 were: Chairman, Ms. Dorothy Jones (Talkeetna) and Vice-Chairman, Senator Bettye Fahrenkamp (Fairbanks). The Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Phil Holdsworth (Juneau), Jim Palmer (Anchorage), and Bob Pederson (Kodiak), comprised the Executive Committee. New officers were elected at the Commission's June 23 meeting in Anchorage. Commission officers for the remainder of 1989 were: Chairman, Mr. Lew Williams (Ketchikan) and Vice-Chairman, Ms. Thyges Shaub (Juneau), with Andy Hope (Juneau), Dorothy Jones (Talkeetna), and Senator Bettye Fahrenkamp (Fairbanks) serving on the Executive Committee.

STAFF

There are currently two staff positions for the Commission: an executive director and an administrative assistant. The office is located in Fairbanks.

GOALS

The Commission objective of working to "assure that Alaskans' rights are protected from federal encroachment, and that the stated congressional intent of refraining from interrupting traditional Alaskan activities (fishing, hunting, mining, camping) be continued to the best extent practicable" has been carried out by meeting the past year's goals as stated in the 1988 annual report. These same goals are projected for 1990. The Commission will continue to function as a vehicle for citizen input to the executive, legislative, and local/municipal decision-making processes with respect to federal management areas in Alaska.

Specifically:

The Commission will continue to monitor federal agency planning, management activities and implementation efforts.

Review of any federal/public lands proposed for exchange will also be continued.

Commission research on special projects mandated by ANILCA or other federal statutes will continue.

The Commission will continue its involvement at the earliest stages of planning activities for the conservation system units established or expanded by ANILCA.

Commission efforts to resolve conflicts between land managers and land users will be emphasized.

The Commission will help to assure that the best interests of the State of Alaska are brought into the decision making process.

The Commission will continue to work with the congressional offices and monitor federal legislation and regulations which have an impact on the administration and management of federal lands in Alaska.

The Commission will continue to report to the Governor and the Legislature on any recommendations made on federal land management decisions that affect Alaskans.

The Commission has developed and maintained good working relationships with federal and State agencies and with individual and organizational contacts by thoroughly analyzing issues before submitting comments and recommendations on land management issues. Although the Commission's primary role is advisory, it has the authority to recommend suit by the State's Attorney General against any federal agency which fails to act within the bounds of congressional intent or within the limits of the law. For the first time in 1987, the Commission exercised this authority and recommended, through the Governor's office, that the State file suit against the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service over that agency's final regulations on the use and construction of cabins and other structures in the national parks in Alaska. Final action by the U.S. District Court on the State's lawsuit in this issue is still pending.

COMMISSION ACTIVITIES IN 1989

1989 was the seventh full calendar year of operation for the Commission. The year's objectives were divided between reviewing and commenting on federal agency planning documents and regulations, investigating citizen complaints and working to ensure maximum levels of public participation in all stages of planning for the management of federal lands in Alaska. Following is a brief discussion of the major issues in which the Commission was involved during this past calendar year. Detailed minutes, as well as tapes, of all Commission meetings held during 1989 are available if any reader desires more detailed information on any issue. Additionally, copies of all resolutions or recommendations made by the Commission are also available from Commission staff upon request.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Same-day Airborne Wolf Hunting

In November, 1988 the National Park Service implemented a temporary ban on the practice of same-day airborne hunting of wolves within the national preserve units in Alaska. The NPS cited management and law enforcement problems and uncertain biological consequences as the primary reasons for implementing the temporary ban. The agency had submitted a proposal to the Board of Game in September, 1988 asking the Board to close the national preserves to this practice. The Board declined to act on the proposal because the issue was not scheduled for consideration until the November, 1990 meeting. The Board was not prepared to deviate from that schedule because no biological emergency had been identified.

The NPS action received wide-spread support, but also sparked considerable controversy. The following months brought a series of meetings and negotiations between state and federal officials over this issue. At the heart of the discussions were questions regarding NPS authority to unilaterally implement regulations without going through the Board of Game

and the extent of the state's authority to manage fish and game on federal lands. No resolution of this issue was reached, although the Board of Game agreed to change its schedule and consider the NPS proposal at its November, 1989 meeting. Nevertheless, the NPS indicated its intention to move forward with a permanent ban on the practice of same-day airborne wolf hunting.

In June, 1989 draft regulations which would permanently ban same-day airborne wolf hunting in the national preserves were released for a sixty day public review period by the National Park Service. Sixteen public hearings on the proposal were also scheduled throughout Alaska and in Washington, D.C. The permanent closure regulations were scheduled to go into effect in November, upon expiration of the temporary ban. While the proposal received widespread public support, many people encouraged the National Park Service to utilize the Board of Game process rather than implementing separate federal closure regulations.

Still others objected to the proposal and saw the NPS efforts to implement its own regulations as a violation of both the Master Memorandum of Understanding for management of fish and game between the state and federal governments and the provisions of ANILCA.

At its October 27, 1989 meeting the Commission took up consideration of this issue. Testimony was given by the National Park Service, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Board of Game and the public. Following extensive discussion and debate of this issue, the Commission passed, on a 6 to 4 vote, a resolution urging the Board of Game to adopt regulations prohibiting the practice of same-day airborne hunting of wolves in the national preserve units in Alaska. The resolution also asked the NPS to defer any action on their proposed regulations until the Board of Game had an opportunity to act.

The Commission also directed staff to request clarification from the NPS on certain portions of the proposed regulations that appeared to improperly change the procedures and criteria for implementing future closures. The portions in question appear to allow permanent closure to subsistence activities, while the ANILCA only allows for temporary closures under certain criteria. Staff worked with the Attorney General's office and the governor's Washington, D.C. office to prepare a letter requesting clarification of this portion of the proposed regulations. At the time of this report, no response clarifying the potential effects of the regulations on other subsistence activities has been received.

The Commission's resolution was presented to the Board of Game at its November meeting. The Board subsequently enacted regulations prohibiting same-day airborne hunting of wolves in the national preserves, except by qualified subsistence hunters. The NPS has deferred any action on its regulations until state and federal officials meet in late January, 1990 to discuss the issue.

Despite action by the Alaska Board of Game, the Citizens' Advisory Commission on Federal Areas recognizes that the federal government may still have justified concerns over the issue of same-day airborne wolf hunting.

Mining in the National Parks

In Spring, 1989 the NPS released three draft environmental impact statements (DEIS) for Denali National Park and Preserve, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve and Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve. The agency was directed by the federal courts in 1985 to prepare these studies in order to determine the cumulative impacts of mining activities on the resources of these three park units.

Commission staff reviewed the three DEIS's and identified a number of significant deficiencies which bring into question the objectivity and utility of these documents. The primary deficiency staff found in the studies was the methodology used to identify and assess the cumulative impacts of past mining activity within the park units.

The cumulative impact methodology developed by the National Park Service utilized a predetermined percentage of habitat acreage for certain target resources as the basis to assess impacts. Staff identified several problems with this approach.

First, rather than considering each of the units in their entirety, the NPS chose to delineate "study areas" within the three parks. By analyzing only the "study areas", which actually constitute a small percentage of the units in question, staff was concerned that the documents tended to magnify the perception of impacts from past mining, as well as potential impacts from future activities.

Secondly, prohibitively excessive resource protection goals for the study areas were established. The resource protection goals are a predetermined percentage of habitat acreage for targeted resources, which must be met before future mining activity will be allowed. In most instances the proposed resource protection goals have already been exceeded and it appears unlikely that future mining plans of operation will be approved.

Finally, analysis of the three documents found that they lacked adequate geological and economics data. In addition, there appeared to be insufficient biological data on the selected target species within either the identified study areas or the park units as a whole. The absence of adequate data to support the findings in these documents brings into question their utility to objectively assess impacts from past mining activities on unit resources or future levels of adverse impacts if mining is allowed to continue.

In another mining related issue, the National Park Service proposed changes in the regulations governing mining and mining claims within the national parks. The current regulations contain language regarding the use of water for mining operations that could prove to be a "catch-22" for mine claimants. One interpretation of the regulations requires that the mine claimant have a perfected water right before they can use water for their mining operation; however, to secure a perfected water right, the claimant must first use water.

The proposed change would allow claimants to follow state law regarding the use of water in connection with mineral development within a national park unit. At its June 23 meeting the Commission endorsed the proposed regulatory change, with the understanding that the proposal would eliminate possible complications regarding the appropriation and use of water for mining activities and provide adequate protection for any federal reserved water right that may exist within a park unit.

Interim Hunting Guide Permitting Program

In early 1989, in response to the Owsichek decision which eliminated the state system used to assign exclusive guide areas for big game hunting guides, the NPS implemented an interim program for permitting guide activities within the national preserve units. The interim program was implemented because of concerns that the elimination of the exclusive guide area system could result in a significant increase in the number of hunting guides operating within the preserves.

The interim program, which uses a concession permit system, allows the agency to limit the number of guides permitted to operate within a given area. The previously used system of commercial use permits does not allow for these types of limits. The effect of the interim program allows the NPS to maintain the number of guides operating within a preserve unit at the pre-Owsichek level. In the event that a guide chose not to apply for the new concession permit, that area would not be assigned to another guide during the interim. Failure of a guide to apply for a permit under the interim program would not affect their ability to apply for a concession permit in the future. The NPS has indicated that the interim program will remain in place until December, 1990 or until the state develops an acceptable program for allocating guide areas throughout the state. If the state is unable to develop an acceptable system, the concession permit system will become permanent, with guide areas assigned using a competitive bid process.

When the interim program was first implemented, several guides contacted Commission staff to express concerns about some of the elements in the program. Additionally, staff was contacted by several legislative offices as well as personnel from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game who had heard similar concerns. Staff decided to conduct a survey of hunting

guides operating on the national preserves to identify specific concerns and potential problems with the interim program.

Some of the concerns that were identified included: 1) An increase in fees from an average of \$100 per year to \$500 for 1989 and \$1000 for 1990. Future fees, if the program is adopted permanently by the NPS, would likely be a percentage of gross revenues. 2) Limits on the number of clients that a guide may take into an area. The limit is based upon the average number of clients over the last 3 years. 3) A significant increase in reporting requirements for each guide operation. The concession permit system requires that all income and expenditures be reported in detail. 4) All rates and prices charged for services are subject to regulation and approval by the NPS. 5) A number of additional permit stipulations, such as requiring a list of employees and advance notification and approval of the locations of hunting camps.

Even though a number of the guides indicated some concerns about the interim program, they were generally pleased that the interim program maintained the status quo within the preserve units for at least the next two years. Several guides, however, indicated concern about the competitive bid process which would be utilized to award concession permits and assign areas if the interim program is adopted on a permanent basis.

Commission staff presented the concerns identified to that point to the Legislative Task Force on Guiding and Game at its October 5 meeting. Subsequent contact with other guides indicates similar concerns. It should be pointed out that the NPS has been flexible in modifying a number of the permit stipulations for individual guides and has demonstrated a willingness to make the interim program fair and equitable. Although the Commission has not developed any recommendations to address the problems or concerns with the NPS interim program identified by various guides, staff will continue to work with guides and the National Park Service to identify and help correct any additional problems which may arise.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Tongass National Forest

Begun in 1987, revision of the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP) continued throughout 1989. The U.S. Forest Service planning team has developed 24 draft management area prescriptions and standards and guidelines which will be used in the revised plan. Management area prescriptions define what management will be emphasized on specific areas of the Tongass. The standards and guidelines provide specific management direction for an area and define what activities are permitted or not permitted and how those activities will be carried out. The management area prescriptions will replace the four Land Use Designations (LUD's) utilized in the current TLMP.

At the Commission's January 28 meeting, members were briefed by Forest Service personnel on the draft management area prescriptions being developed for the revision. Commission members were concerned that there was not a management area prescription developed for subsistence and, as a result, thought subsistence activities might not receive adequate protection. Subsequently, at the Commission's June 2 meeting when consideration was given to requesting the Forest Service develop a separate management prescription for subsistence, Commission members were assured that subsistence was a priority use on all federal lands in Alaska and would be given full protection. In addition, it was recognized that the state, not the Forest Service manages subsistence activities on forest lands and it was not necessary for the agency to develop a separate management prescription.

The Forest Service planning team has recently completed the Analysis of the Management Situation for the Tongass. Now that this analysis is complete, the next step is the development of alternatives which will then be evaluated in the draft environmental impact statement for the TLMP revision. The draft EIS is scheduled to be released for public review and comment in June, 1990. The Commission will continue to monitor the progress of the TLMP revision. In keeping with our stated goals for the coming year, we will try to ensure that the public is involved in the planning process at every possible step, by encouraging the agency to continue to solicit comments and input from the public and to hold public meetings in each community in Southeastern Alaska.

Proposed Federal Legislation

During 1989, work continued on a number of bills in Congress designed to amend certain sections of ANILCA which guide the management of the Tongass National Forest. At present the forest is managed under the provisions of the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP), the National Forest Management Act, and ANILCA. Section 705(a) of ANILCA established an annual \$40 million Tongass Timber Supply Fund and directed the U.S. Forest Service to offer for sale 450 million board feet of timber per year. The Timber Supply Fund was intended to help maintain the timber supply from the Tongass to dependent industry at the rate of 4.5 billion board feet per decade, or an average of 450 million board feet per year.

In recent years the special provisions in ANILCA and management of the Tongass have come under increasing scrutiny by both the public and lawmakers. Opponents view the ANILCA provisions as unnecessary and wasteful, primarily due to deficit timber sales in the mid-1980's. They also believe that timber harvest levels are excessive and jeopardize the other resources of the forest. Supporters of the provisions maintain that they are necessary to offset the loss of available timber in designated wilderness areas on the forest and to maintain a viable timber industry in Southeastern Alaska. Supporters also maintain that the Tongass is able

to sustain current harvest levels without detriment to the other resources.

The major bills debated in Congress during 1989 were H.R. 987- "Tongass Timber Reform Act", introduced by Congressman Robert Mrazek; S. 346, also entitled "Tongass Timber Reform Act", introduced by Senator Tim Wirth; and S. 237- "A bill to reform the Tongass Timber Supply Fund", introduced by Senator Frank Murkowski. Each of these bills, as proposed, would amend the ANILCA and change management of the Tongass National Forest to varying degrees.

H.R. 987 (Mrazek), which passed the House of Representatives in July, 1989 would change management of the Tongass in a number of ways. The House bill would amend ANILCA by eliminating the annual \$40 million timber supply fund and the mandated 4.5 billion board feet per decade harvest level. It would also cancel the 50 year contracts with the two largest timber companies in Southeastern Alaska and designate 23 wilderness areas totalling approximately 1.8 million acres. There are presently 5.4 million acres of designated wilderness on the Tongass.

S. 346 (Wirth) contains essentially the same provisions as H.R. 987, with one significant exception. The Senate bill, rather than designating the 23 additional wilderness areas, would place a moratorium on timber sales and harvest in these areas, pending completion of the TLMP revision.

S. 237 (Murkowski) would eliminate the annual \$40 million Tongass Timber Supply Fund established under ANILCA 705(a). It would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a management program that would ensure the "availability of a sufficient supply of timber to achieve an allowable sale quantity of 4.5 billion board feet per decade." The bill further directs the Secretary to offer for sale or release timber volumes based upon an estimate of the annual demand of dependent industry and the sustained yield capacity of the forest.

The Commission monitored the progress of the various bills considered in Congress during 1989. At its June 23 meeting Commission members, in debating the merits of the various bills, chose not to endorse or support any specific bill. Rather, members decided that the proposal developed by the Southeast Conference should be endorsed by the Commission and recommended for serious consideration by Congress. Commission members felt that the policy position of the Southeast Conference, developed through numerous public meetings and workshops, represented a compromise for management of the Tongass which came closest to satisfying the concerns of a majority of affected Alaskans, while also addressing the national interest concerns about management of the forest. In its action, the Commission joined Governor Cowper in supporting the Southeast Conference policy on the Tongass.

In letters to the Chairmen of the House Rules Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Commission urged Congress to adopt Tongass legislation which most closely followed the policy position of the Southeast Conference. That policy is designed to accomplish the following:

--Clarify the mission of the U.S Forest Service in the Tongass to include an allowable harvest of up to 4.5 billion board feet per decade, depending upon market conditions and subject to multiple use values of the Tongass National Forest.

--Establish a specific intensive management fund to ensure that the Forest Service is able to make marginal timber stands viable sales for the industry and sustain other values.

--Set aside 12 areas from logging due to the high values of fish and wildlife production in those areas.

--Establish an economic diversification fund of grants and loans to provide opportunities to strengthen the Southeast economy.

--Provide for renegotiation of the two long-term timber sale contracts as necessary to ensure employment stabilization; fair and reasonable competition within the timber industry; full consistency with the Tongass Land Use Management Plan, as periodically revised; fair and reasonable compensation to contract holders for any taking; consideration of the interests of the diverse communities in Southeast Alaska; definition and commitment of timber available to the contract holders through the remaining contract period in the revised forest plan; and clarification of the authority and responsibility of the Forest Service to protect fish and wildlife resources and habitat.

Shortly after the Commission's recommendations were provided to Congress, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 987. The Senate, however, passed no bill on the Tongass during 1989, although public hearings were held in Ketchikan and Sitka to discuss the proposed legislation. In past years the Commission had encouraged Congress to hold hearings in Alaska prior to making any changes to the ANILCA.

Although extensive negotiations occurred between members of the two houses in the closing days of the congressional session, no agreement could be reached on a compromise bill. Work toward this end will undoubtedly continue in 1990. The Commission will continue to monitor the progress of any federal legislation affecting the Tongass.

U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE

In late 1988, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service published draft regulations which would prohibit the taking of sea otters by Alaska Natives for use

in the creation of authentic handicrafts. Initially, there was a 60 day public comment period for review of the proposed regulations, but no public meetings were scheduled. The Commission joined the State of Alaska and various Native groups in requesting an extension of the comment period and that public meetings in affected areas be scheduled. The comment period was subsequently extended until November 30, 1989 and public meetings held in ten Alaska communities during October, 1989.

The regulations were proposed by the Fish & Wildlife Service in response to a recent decision in the U.S. District Court in Alaska which called for a thorough administrative review of the taking of sea otters. The Service made the finding that sea otters were not being taken for the purpose of creating clothing or handicrafts at the time of passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). The agency further maintained that the clear intent of Congress in passing the MMPA was to preserve existing Native use of marine mammals rather than to promote the expansion of Alaskan arts and crafts industries or the creation of new industries. As a result, the Service determined that because the use of sea otters for clothing and handicrafts did not occur at the time of passage of the MMPA, the provisions of the act and existing regulations prohibited the taking of sea otters by Alaska Natives for these uses. The proposed regulations were designed to "clarify" the provisions of the statute and existing regulations.

During the public review period it became clear that many individuals and organizations felt that the Fish & Wildlife Service had misinterpreted both the MMPA and congressional intent in preparing its proposed regulations. It was also argued that the agency had ignored a considerable body of evidence and documentation which demonstrates an historical use of sea otters for these purposes.

Commission members considered the proposed regulations at the October 27 meeting in Anchorage. Testimony was given by representatives from the Alaska Sea Otter Commission, the North Pacific Rim, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. In addition to their testimony outlining opposition to the draft regulations, the Alaska Sea Otter Commission asked for our Commission's support of their proposal to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for development of a comprehensive sea otter management plan in cooperation with the Sea Otter Commission and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The Citizens' Advisory Commission members passed a resolution opposing the Service's proposed rules prohibiting the use of sea otters by Alaska Natives for the purpose of creating handicrafts and clothing. The resolution also encouraged the agency to agree to develop a comprehensive sea otter management plan in cooperation with the ADF&G and the Sea Otter Commission. In addition the Commission staff submitted detailed comments to the agency on the proposed regulations. The U.S. Fish &

Wildlife Service has not yet made a final determination on the proposed regulations or the development of a comprehensive management plan.

Federal agency planning documents or regulations reviewed by the Commission during 1989 included:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Draft Environmental Impact Statements- Cumulative Impacts of Mining:
Denali National Park and Preserve
Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve
Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve

Proposed Regulations:

- 36 CFR Part 9- Mining and Mining Claims (Water Rights)
- 36 CFR Part 13- Hunting in Alaska Park Units (Prohibition on Same-day Airborne Wolf Hunting)

Final Regulations:

- 36 CFR Part 13- Fishing Regulations-Katmai National Park & Preserve

U.S. World Heritage Nomination Process; Calendar Year 1989

U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE

Draft Environmental Impact Statement- Management of the National Wildlife Refuges
Draft Fisheries Management Plan- Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge
Draft Fisheries Management Plan- Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge
Revised Draft Policy for Cabin Management on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska

Proposed Regulations:

- 50 CFR Part 18- Marine Mammals- Native Exemptions (Sea Otters)

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Final Environmental Impact Statements:

- 1989-94 Operating Period- Ketchikan Pulp Co. Long Term Sale Area
- Big Islands Management Area- Chugach National Forest

Proposed Regulations:

- 36 CFR Part 241- Copper River/Rude River & Controller Bay Areas- Chugach National Forest

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Final Environmental Impact Statement & Proposed Resource Management
Plan- Pipeline Utility Corridor
ANILCA Section 1001 Report- Findings and Recommendations

OTHER

Alaska Submerged Lands Act of 1988 Report
Recommendations of the Fire Management Policy Team
ANILCA 1201 Report- Alaska Land Use Council

* * * * *

In the nine years since the passage of ANILCA, scores of management plans, policies and regulations have been proposed or implemented. The impacts to the citizens of this state have been considerable. As the federal agencies continue their implementation and planning efforts, impacts will also continue. A review of the proposed planning schedules for the federal land management agencies strongly indicates the need for continued monitoring and citizen participation in the process. Now that most of the general or conceptual plans for the conservation system units are essentially complete, more specific resource management plans and unit specific regulations are being prepared.

In 1990 the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service are continuing their development of resource management or "step-down" management plans. For example, the Fish & Wildlife Service is currently developing public use management plans for the Togiak, Kodiak, Alaska Peninsula, Becharof and Tetlin National Wildlife Refuges. The Service is also developing fisheries management plans, river plans, furbearer and big game management plans for these and several other refuges. In addition, the agency is preparing a regional seabird plan.

The National Park Service, in consultation with state agencies has developed a resource management plan for the Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve. In 1989 they also began the preparation of a similar plan for Gates of the Arctic National Park & Preserve. In February, 1990 preliminary scoping work on management plans for the Noatak National Preserve, Kobuk Valley National Park and Cape Krusenstern National Monument will begin.

As discussed above, the U.S Forest Service is continuing its work on the revision of the Tongass Land Management Plan. The recently completed Analysis of the Management Situation is currently undergoing public review and the draft environmental impact statement is scheduled for release in June, 1990. The agency is also conducting a midterm review and evaluation of the Chugach Forest Plan and is developing an implementation schedule for the remaining five years of the plan.

The Bureau of Land Management is currently preparing a resource management plan for 5.9 million acres under their management in Southcentral Alaska. The implementation of their management plan for the Pipeline Utility Corridor will also begin in 1990.

In the coming year, the Commission will continue to advocate for maximum levels of public involvement in the planning process for all the federal agencies and for the protection of customary and traditional uses of the federal lands in Alaska. As competition for resources increases, cooperation between user groups will be critical to successful management of these areas. At the same time, the federal agencies must recognize the importance of citizen participation in the process and provide the opportunities for that participation. The Commission will strive to work toward these goals during 1990.

Sincerely,

Lew Williams, Jr., Chairman
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON FEDERAL AREAS



By: Stan Leaphart
Executive Director

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON FEDERAL AREAS
250 CUSHMAN STREET, SUITE 4H
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

C O M M I S S I O N M E M B E R S

Mr. Del Ackels
P. O. Box 2151
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Mr. Andrew Hope III
4027 Delta Apt C
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Mr. Charles Cassidy
710 Mill Bay Road
Kodiak, Alaska 99615

Ms. Dorothy Jones
P.O. Box 689
Talkeetna, Alaska 99676

Senator Bettye Fahrenkamp
119 No. Cushman, Suite 201
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Mr. Henry Lancaster
P.O. Box 10-3461
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Representative Peter Goll
P.O. Box 581
Haines, Alaska 99827

Mr. Carl Marrs
2525 C Street, Suite 500
P.O. Box 93330
Anchorage, Alaska 99509

Mr. Ralph C. Gregory
P.O. Box 7011
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Ms. Thyas Shaub
217 Second St., Suite 201
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Mr. Bert Greist
3802 Telequana, #1
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Representative Kay Wallis
P.O. Box 267
Fort Yukon, Alaska 99740

Senator Rick Halford
3111 C St., Room 530
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

Mr. Lew M. Williams, Jr.
755 Grant Street
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Mr. Phil R. Holdsworth
326 Fourth St., #1009
Juneau, Alaska 99802

Mr. Ron Zobel
3431 Iliamna
Anchorage, Alaska 99517

NOTE - Legislator's session address: P. O. Box V, Juneau, Alaska 99811

(rev. 11/21/89)