

Potential Conflicts with Goals or Objectives of Other Agencies and Landowners
--

The Forest has coordinated with various agencies the development of goals, objectives, standards and guidelines, formulation of alternatives and other important aspects of the revision process. Consultations include Native Alaskan tribes; Alaskan Native corporations; the Bureau of Land Management; U. S. Geological Survey; Environmental Protection Agency; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Alaska Departments of Fish and Game, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Public Facilities; and, other local, state, and federal agencies. Many of these agencies and corporations participated in the open Interdisciplinary Team meetings throughout the process. The administrative record, located at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Anchorage, Alaska, contains proceedings of each of the coordination efforts.

The alternatives, associated effects, Forestwide standards and guidelines, and management area prescriptions are generally compatible and complement the goals and objectives of land management agencies and land owners within or adjacent to the Forest. The following summary is provided to help define areas of potential differences between the Forest Service policies, management, and responsibilities and those of other agencies.

- Mitigating effects from mining activities could result in conflicts with federal mining laws. The U.S. Mining Laws predate all other laws that govern Forest Service activities. Conflicts could arise between the mining activities allowed under the act and other resources, such as scenery, natural quiet, water, sensitive plants and animals, or recreation.
- The USDI expressed a concern that management area prescriptions along the Kenai National Wildlife refuge adjacent to the Minimal Management and Wilderness Zone boundaries be changed to Recommended Wilderness and Primitive Management Area prescriptions. This was not done. Management area prescriptions under the Revised Forest Plan include:

132 – Wild Rivers

210 – Backcountry

242 – Brown Bear Core Area

244 – Fish and Wildlife Conservation Area

312 – Fish, Wildlife, and Recreation

314 – Forest Restoration

521 – Minerals (mining claims with approved Plans of
Operations)

- The State of Alaska was concerned with any reference to tideland areas, which are owned by the state (see Chapter 6, Lands).
- The Forest worked with the State of Alaska Department of Parks and Recreation to coordinate planning efforts in Prince William Sound concerning State Marine Parks and location of float lodges. Efforts were made to coordinate management of the uplands with the marine environment. There could be continuing conflicts with respect to motorized recreation and float lodges.
- Access to private inholdings within the Chugach National Forest by Alaska Native regional and village corporations will be affected by management area prescriptions. Concerns were expressed that areas recommended for Wilderness designation would block access to private land. The Forest carefully reviewed all areas recommended for Wilderness to insure that nonwilderness access was provided to all private lands. Concerns were expressed that rivers recommended for classification under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act could prevent access to private lands. The application of the Scenic or Recreational River Prescription would require additional analysis/permitting in the future, however they would not prevent or deny access. The application of the Wild River classification could prevent access across the designated river corridor. Access is not prevented or denied in the Preferred Alternative, however additional analysis and permitting steps would be required.
- The use of helicopters would be affected by application of the Recommended Wilderness Management Area prescription. This will require the use of the “minimum tool concept” and may prevent certain types of inventory work from being done with helicopters and would be required to be done on foot. This could affect some future wildlife inventory work by the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
- The State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities plan to improve the Sterling Highway (State Highway 5). Their project includes a controversial relocation alternative along Juneau Creek.

RESOURCE COMMITMENTS

Energy Requirements for Implementing the Alternatives

- Energy consumed in timber harvesting is the amount required for felling, bucking, skidding, loading, hauling, for performing road maintenance, and for the industrial traffic associated with harvest activities.

- Energy consumption related to recreation is based on the estimated number of dispersed and developed recreation visitor days, estimated trip lengths, and facility construction.
- Energy consumed in road construction and reconstruction activities is that used by contractors in completing road development.
- Energy consumed by Forest Service administrative activities includes vehicle use, lighting, heating of buildings, and fuel used in such equipment as small engines and propane burners.

Unavoidable Adverse Effects

The application of Forestwide standards and guidelines and resource protection measures would limit the extent and duration of any adverse environmental effects. Nevertheless, some adverse effects are unavoidable. For detailed disclosure of all effects, including unavoidable adverse effects, see the preceding Environmental Consequences discussions for each resource area (air, biological diversity, recreation, minerals, etc.).

Hazardous Materials

The use of motor vehicles and the transport of hazardous material such as gasoline, other fuels, and building materials on roads and highways carry the potential for accidental spills.

Relationship Between Short-term Uses of the Environment and Long-term Productivity

Short-term uses are those expected to occur on the Forest over the next ten years. These uses include, but are not limited to, recreation use, mineral development, timber harvest, and prescribed burning. Long-term productivity refers to the capability of the land to provide resource outputs for a period of time beyond the next ten years.

The minimum management requirement established by regulation (36 CFR 219.27) provides for the maintenance of long-term productivity of the land. Minimum management requirements prescribed by the Forestwide standards and guidelines will be met under all alternatives. Minimum requirements assure that long-term productivity of the land will not be impaired by short-term uses.

Although all alternatives were designed to maintain long-term productivity, there are differences among alternatives in the long-term availability or condition of resources. There may also be differences among alternatives in long-term expenditures necessary to maintain desired conditions. These types of differences among the alternatives are described in the FEIS, Chapters 2 and 3.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources is defined as follows in Forest Service Handbook 1909.15 (2/21/95):

The irreversible commitment of resources means that nonrenewable resources are consumed or destroyed. Examples include mineral extraction, which consumes nonrenewable minerals and potential destruction of such things as heritage resources by other management activities. These consumptions or destructions are only renewable over extremely long periods of time.

The irretrievable commitments of resources represent trade-offs (opportunities foregone) in the use and management of forest resources. Irretrievable commitment of resources can include the expenditure of funds, loss of production, or restrictions on resource use.

Decisions made in a forest plan do not represent actual irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources. A forest plan determines what kind and levels of activities are appropriate on the Forest; it does not make site-specific or project decisions. The decision to irreversibly or irretrievably commit resources occurs:

1. When the Forest Service makes a project or site-specific decision.
2. At the time Congress acts on a recommendation to establish a new Wilderness or to include a river in the Wild and Scenic River System.

The Oil and Gas Leasing Analysis determined that certain lands of the Forest would be made available for oil and gas leasing. Essentially, this analysis allows the Bureau of Land Management to conditionally authorize certain National Forest System lands for oil and gas exploration and production (36 CFR 228.102(e)). Although surface disturbance cannot occur on leased land without further analysis and decision-making, issuance of a lease confers certain rights on the lessee and therefore represents a commitment of resources.

Lands in Zones 1, 2, 3, and 4 were analyzed in the Revised Forest Plan. Little potential for development exists on Zone 4 lands. The effects of the exploratory and developmental wells were analyzed and disclosed for all alternatives.

Examples of irretrievable resource commitments associated with Revised Forest Plan decisions are as follows:

Commodity outputs and uses (such as motorized recreation) would be curtailed or eliminated in areas recommended for and subsequently designated as Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Research Natural Areas.

Opportunities for nonmotorized recreation, solitude, and primitive or wilderness experiences would be foregone if portions of the Forest

are not allocated or recommended for and subsequently designated for these purposes.

Timber volume outputs would be foregone on lands determined as not suitable for harvest.

Commodity outputs would be reduced or foregone on areas allocated to specific uses or purposes, such as developed recreation sites, old growth habitat, or botanical areas.

Noncommodity values, including scenic resources, may be reduced or foregone in areas allocated to commodity uses.

To the degree that an alternative preserves or encourages the development of mature and old-growth habitat, opportunities to develop early successional habitat are reduced.

