

Agency Coordination

Comment # Comment

- 0020-003 Stop all habitat manipulation for fish and wildlife. This is not Forest Service responsibility, it is Alaska Fish & Game.
- 0020-005 Water quality is the responsibility of State of Alaska.
- 0037-001 Manage the Chugach Forest for fish and wildlife. Cooperate with the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Wildlife in protecting fish habitat and managing wildlife.
- 0144-001 As you proceed through your planning process, I feel it is extremely important that you recognize and integrate the Chugach plan with other land plans on adjacent and intermingled lands. In the Cooper Landing area these include: 1. Kenai River Special Management Area Plan, State Parks 2. Kenai Area Plan, State DNR 3. Upper Kenai River Plan, USFS, State Parks, Fish & Wildlife 4. Kenai Borough Land Plan, Cooperlanding Advisory Planning Commission Activities such as Timber Harvest, Recreation, Track & Roads, Fish and Game Management, and resource protection are not confined to one ownership, but must be coordinated with adjacent land managers.
- 0178-004 3. It is increasingly important for there to be cooperative management agreements and cooperation between the Forest Service and the various Native corporations whose lands are adjacent to Forest Service lands. Provision should be made for coordinated planning for access and development where appropriate, as well as expedited property exchanges and use permits.
- 0178-007 - cooperative planning with both the State of Alaska and private landowners should be a priority of this
- 0179-003 3. It is increasingly important for there to be cooperative management agreements and cooperation between the Forest Service and the various Native corporations whose lands are adjacent to Forest Service lands. Provisions should be made for coordinated planning for access and development where appropriate, as well as expedited property exchanges and use permits.
- 0201-005 Whittier Has very little Land, with AKRR./D.O.T. etc. . . we have a lot issues on our land improvements too many
- 0220-001 Pay more attention to the unbiased (i.e. those not employed by a special industry) scientists on land use, planning, habitat, wildlife decisions etc. Agencies often have good scientists who know the areas/habitat very well. All too often their knowledge is disregarded in favor of an industry specialist who is paid to profess concepts/plans approaches that primarily benefit the industry needs.
- 0227-005 Perhaps coordination with agencies involved with regulation of marine waters and tidal lands. By coordinate with other agency research efforts in PWS cost would be fairly minimal. This would also enhance coordination among those working in PWS.
- 0238-001 Coordinate closely with state fisheries (wildlife and habitat managers) to incorporate the current understanding of issues (species) as well as coordinating future planning visions into the Forest Plan. This will allow managers from both federal and state to work together in planning and set a foundation for future issues resolution. Within this
- 0238-002 Fisheries and Fisheries management and activities that would affect fish habitat, access & mgt. I am the area biologist for sport fish division of ADF&G. In that capacity I need to be aware of activities and plans that may affect the major sport fish species. This will influence my decision and recommendations regarding research projects and management decisions. Logging -> habitat degradation Road building -> habitat concerns & increased (ILLEGIBLE) on specific population. Water quality. Tourism ("ECO") Access Motorized/nonmotorized Sport fishermen Guides & outfitter Logging industry Land owners/managers Floating lodges
- 0247-002 Duplication of govt. services in fish & wildlife.
- 0249-005 without considering existing public land allocations @ federal, state & borough levels, there is a high probability of over-allocating some land uses and under-allocating others; i.e., example: wilderness, parks, wildlife refuges, if we already have a surplus, what are the legitimate reasons why more public land should be restricted to single,
- 0251-003 Convene a working group of institutions - state government, native corporations, Coast Guard, etc. who have interests in PWS so as to coordinate/plan impacts on PWS
- 0253-001 Chugach Nat'l Forest, State of Alaska (DNR & DOTPF & DFG) and Kenai Peninsula Borough should sign the Seward Highway Scenic Byway-Corridor Partnership Plan. This plan establishes oversight committee to maintain certain scenic values, recreation opportunities, and land use patterns along the highway corridor.
- 0253-002 Similar regional coordination for access, settlement, & visitor services in Prince William Sound.

Comment # Comment

- 0253-004 Best way to ensure a full spectrum of uses is to look at the entire public land base, at all levels of government.
- 0256-008 Wildlife - evaluate habitat needs, identify what is required for protection of habitat, especially for critical areas to specific species, then set limits that will protect the areas. Would have to work with private landholders & other agencies proactively to develop plans that are integrated to achieve mutual goals.
- 0256-011
- 0256-013 3. A. Wildlife - FS should work w/ fish & wildlife, fish & game & other agencies to develop a plan that integrates w/ plans of others & extends throughout the state to lower 48 & Canada. For birds we're talking worldwide integration.
- 0259-005 4. A. THE STATE OF ALASKA AND C.N.F. WORKING TOGETHER ON A PROJECT. THIS COULD BE OVERCOME BY THE CREATION OF A JOINT COMMITTEE TO IRON OUT THE DETAILS OF THE PROJECT AND TO ALLOCATE FUNDS FOR ITS COMPLETION.
- 0263-005 3. A. ALL OF IT. other groups, organizations, citizens, gvt. agencies. laws. science. forest plan. FS needs to accept other entities as partners in the planning process. Other entities must respect FS legal mandates & others' opinions. Management must be coordinated across ownership lines.
- 0265-011 coordinating and cooperating with other management efforts on adjacent lands;
- 0294-001 Address cumulative impacts in all areas of the forest land use plan and take into account what is happening on adjacent and proximal lands to the forest.
- 0348-001 Don't stop managing at the forest boundary. USFS needs to take a watershed approach
- 0348-004 As population pressure increases the U.S.F.S. should try to limit float houses in PWS and not build any more cabins. People are looking for a wilderness experience and cabins & float houses detract from that. Currently float houses are administered by the state. But they impact U.S.F.S. land. Lack of communication between agencies, i.e. state and federal Float houses are taking over all the bays in PWS. People can't put motor homes in campgrounds all season, why should they be able to park float
- 0357-001 The Forest service should make a point of explaining differences between them and (illegible) & government (federal & state) management areas at every opportunity - public meetings & media contacts. 2. A. If people have an understanding, hopefully there will be more support. 3. A. Forest Service can implement - with no funding required.
- 0368-008 4. A. ANCSA corporations native groups not necessarily same Govt. entities user groups conservation groups outdoor rec. groups hunter fishers business non-local (this is a National forest)
- 0370-005 Borough, Community, State (ILLEGIBLE) expansion 4) Seward/Storlig Hwy. (ILLEGIBLE) scenic protection 5) Working with USFNS, State ... with Peninsula and Anch. AK as a whole
- 0370-013 Take tonight's process to the other agencies, 99% of the USFS employees are sharp as a whip, use that intellect and resource to follow through on main direction.
- 0377-005 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. see above
- 0384-008 1. A. Work with ADEC water quality protection programs to adopt policies to protect habitat (F&G, DNR too), especially where increased development expected. Learn policies and provide oversight. 2. A. State funds have never been adequate to provide state resource agencies with field staff for PWS/Copper River Delta. 3. A. DEC to train forestry staff who get out in field. 4. A. Communication. Probably need more field staff for both fed & state agencies. Can the revised plan address forest service staffing?
- 0397-007 3. A. Budget money to create a fire organization on SRD. Contract with State Division of Forestry for initial attack of wildfire in critical & full fire protection areas. Use SRD personnel for developing and implementing prescribed fire
- 0400-003 The Forest Service should adopt an ecosystem perspective and not focus solely on lands inside National Forest boundaries. The plan should consider the cumulative impact of activities on nearby lands (both public and private) and plan uses of National Forest lands accordingly. In general, Forest Service lands should be managed for a higher degree of environmental protection than is occurring on nearby private, state and local lands, to help mitigate the impacts of development activities on those lands. - The Chugach forest plan should coordinate with management plans that nearby public landowners have in the works -- the State of Alaska's Kenai area plan, the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge use plan, and the Prince William Sound transportation plan. -
- 0400-006 All alternatives in the draft plan must include provisions to ensure the survival of brown bear populations on the Kenai Peninsula. The Forest Service should initiate an inter-agency task force to protect the brown bear on the

Comment # Comment

- 0401-002 The future management of the Kenai Peninsula, and the Chugach National Forest will become much more complex with the coming millennium. The answers won't be as easy as in the past. In some ways though, your issues will be easier than those of the managers on the western Kenai. It's important though, for the USFS to work with the USFWS, NPS, State of Alaska, Kenai Peninsula Borough. Native people, and local communities both on the western Kenai and to the north of Turnagain and Prince William Sound.
- 0401-004 The issues of roading are in my mind probably of the greatest concern. With the construction of new roading on State, Borough, Native, and Private lands, I feel the USFS should move with caution on new roading projects. On the existing Seward/Sterling Highway Corridor I strongly recommend following the guidelines in the 1998 Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan. This plan was developed under the four theses that: (1) Tourism to Alaska will continue to increase (2) The Seward Highway is composed of four distinct regions (3) The Seward Highway is a multi-purpose corridor serving resident and visitor, and commerce and the environment. (4) The successful management of the Seward Highway is dependent on the cooperation of existing institutions, resource managers and committed individuals. From these came three Keynote Ideas 1) The Seward Highway should provide a safe, aesthetic and world-class driving experience 2) Effective visitor management is necessary to ensure long term economic development and tourism. 3) Haphazard development poses the greatest threat to the highway's ability to attract visitors and quality development. I would urge the USFS to commit staff and time to the Seward Highway Partnership Board, and to integrate the above theses and keynotes into the Chugach Plan Revision. The Partnership Document can be a wonderful forum for development of the Eastern Kenai!
- 0441-001 The Forest Revision November flyer and comments page reminded me of an item which should be addressed within this revision. If it hasn't been mentioned yet communication services on NF lands deserves some detailed planning and direction. Currently we administer numerous state and private permits for a variety of communication services on NF administered lands. We also have our own communications equipment. Typically these communication sites are located at key "high point" locations. The problem is that there is very little in the way of cooperative planning between FS, State, BLM, law enforcement, private, Coast Guard (or whatever). The result is a mish mash of comm. sites in a type of "urban sprawl" on these mountain tops.....and there is an ever increasing demand for more and more. How much is enough? How can we work together with other agencies and private organizations to meet all needs with a minimum of impact? Where should we continue to allow site expansion? Where not? Are there locations which should be added? There's a lot more to it than I've indicated but this is a start.
- 0443-003 The main thing we want out of the forest plan revision is a guarantee that ecologically significant portions of the national forest will be protected for the long term. We think of ecological significance in terms of sufficient diversity of native flora and fauna, and sufficient quantity of land to maintain healthy populations in the face of human pressures, non-human cycles/disturbances, and the likelihood of global climate change. We want these protected areas to include low elevation native forest-- we are not satisfied with what has become a standard "protect the rocks, ice, and tundra" scenario. We assume that protection on an ecological level, rather than merely a scenic level, would require protecting entire watersheds, which in many cases would require cooperation between the USFS and other land owners. We would like the USFS to use the revision process to initiate this kind of cooperation, recognizing that national lands are often the last refuge for wide ranging wildlife and mature native forests.
- 0447-003 There are complex land ownership patterns within the Chugach National Forest Coordination and cooperation with all land owners (including private, state, and other federal lands) will be necessary for the Forest Service to effectively plan for the future. Coordinated efforts like the Kenai River Special Management Area can help to protect ecosystems and/or watersheds where there are different land owners and management agencies. The cumulative impacts from adjacent landowners' activities on Chugach lands must be considered as well.
- 0462-009 Cooperative efforts with other agencies such as DNK and local land use planning advisory committees is critical.
- 0463-011 The proposed management of non forest land should be shown on base maps and considered during the alternative analysis. Identification of land ownership and management patterns will provide a more comprehensive overview of the regional resources. For example, the 1995 Alaska State Marine Park Management Plan outlines a substantial increase in developed recreational facilities. In order to prevent duplication and excessive growth in facilities, the Forest Plan must incorporate the State Park Plan as part of the access picture.
- 0469-002 The state's Prince William Sound area plan (DNR 1987) reached the conclusion that the large majority of new development within PWS was best accommodated on these private lands. In light of the likely magnitude of development on state. Native Corporation and other non-National forest lands, I think this is also a reasonable
- 0469-004 Ultimately, as has been shown on the Kenai River, some form of local government land use authority will be needed to guide development on non-forest lands.
- 0469-006 The Plan update also needs to investigate ways to manage recreation use, both private and commercial, on public waters. This will take an active cooperative effort with the Coast Guard, the state, and other parties.
- 0469-011 Fortunately, as a result of the EVOS process, a great start has been made at assembling information about the natural and cultural history of much of the Forest. The plan update should dovetail with this effort.

Comment # Comment

- 0479-036 Finally, we encourage the Forest Service to participate in an inter-agency Brown Bear Task Force to identify and protect critical habitat for the long term viability of this population. We would like for information from the Task Force to be incorporated in the planning process for the forest.
- 0479-039 In addition, we would like the Forest Service to work with other agencies and private landowners to incorporate a broader understanding of impacts to and from lands adjacent to Forest Service land, thereby accurately determining the cumulative impacts of Forest Service and other actions on the forest.
- 0479-040 This is especially important on the Kenai Peninsula where there has already been a recognized 70% reduction in brown bear habitat capabilities. Singular actions taken by the Forest Service, which may not appear at face value to have significant impacts, may in fact tip the balance for the brown bear population on the Kenai because of ever-increasing developments and road building on other lands on the Kenai.
- 0479-051 In addition, we want the Forest Service to work with the state and other agencies on the Prince William Sound Regional Transportation Plan so that the Forest Service can gain control over the level of projected use on the Forest, the impacts of that use and how the Forest Service intends to mitigate impacts of that use.
- 0654-005 Please work with Kenai Peninsula borough officials, state Dept. of Fish & Game, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge personnel, and private landowners on the Kenai to make a Brown Bear Conservation Plan for the Kenai an official section of this forest plan. The CNF has GJS data and the best resources to make this happen.
- 0671-001 Activities on adjacent State & private lands need to be tracked & given full consideration during the planning process. At present "the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing"--this adversely impacts ecosystems which cross boundaries created by man.
- 0777-001 CAC owns or has valid selection rights to over 625,000 acres of surface estate, subsurface estate and oil and gas rights within the Chugach National Forest, making CAC by far the largest private landowner within the national forest boundaries. Most of CAC's economically viable land is adjacent to or surrounded by federal lands administered by the Chugach National Forest. The attached Land Holdings map dated March 1997 shows the extent of the intermingling of CAC and Chugach National Forest lands. Because of the considerable impact that Chugach National Forest actions may have on CAC's ability to realize the economic benefits of its ANCSA lands, particularly the potential of the Forest Plan revisions to frustrate the intent and purpose of ANCSA, ANILCA, and the 1982 CNI Settlement Agreement, CAC seeks the maximum participation it is entitled to in this Forest Plan revision process.
- 0777-002 we address our concern that the Chugach National Forest, while revising its forest management plan, does not alter the fundamental balance struck by Congress with its passage of ANILCA. Second, we address our concern that the revision process has thus far not satisfied the mandatory participation requirements of 36 CFR section 219.
- 0777-004 ANILCA Represents a Lasting Balance Between Conservation and Development Needs that Should Not Be Upset by Revisions to the Forest Plan ANILCA was the most significant single land conservation action in United States history. It resolved years of debate and uncertainty regarding federal land status in Alaska, thereby providing adjacent landowners and inholders with the means to successfully plan for the use and enjoyment of their land and resources. By authorizing protective designations for approximately 105 million acres of federal land in Alaska, Congress struck a lasting balance between the competing needs for economic development and conservation of
- 0777-005 Section 101(d) of ANILCA makes clear that Congress was satisfied with the conservation system units established under the Act, that they afforded "sufficient protection" for the national interest in conservation values, and that "the need for future legislation designating new conservation system units, new national conservation areas, or new national recreation areas, has been obviated thereby." Consistent with this clear congressional intent is the section 1326(b) prohibition against "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" absent express congressional authorization. Accordingly, any revisions to the Forest Plan must be consistent with ANILCA's mandate and should not disturb the lasting balance Congress sought to

Comment # Comment

- 0777-016 The Chugach National Forest Has Failed to Satisfy Mandatory Regulatory Participation requirements with Respect to Local Communities, Village Corporations, and Chugach Alaska Corporation The management policies instituted by the Chugach National Forest have a profound and often negative impact on communities, inholders and adjacent landowners in the proximity of the Chugach National Forest. For this reason, there must be adequate opportunities for affected local communities to develop those portions of the Forest Plan that directly affect them. All communities and villages in the region need to be deeply involved in developing the policies and objectives of the Forest Plan. There is a need for a community-by-community and alternative-by-alternative socioeconomic analysis of the Forest Plan. The National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning regulations address this need by providing, in addition to the general public participation process, heightened participation opportunities for those landowners that will be most affected by the revisions. Pursuant to 36 CFR section 219.6(k), forest planning activities are to be coordinated with "owners of lands that are intermingled with, or dependent for access upon, National Forest System lands." Pursuant to 36 CFR section 219.7, the Forest Service must specifically notify those Alaska Native leaders whose lands are expected to be impacted, review their planning and land use policies, note their objectives, impacts and where they conflict with Forest Service planning, respond to those impacts, and devise alternatives for resolving any conflicts. As Native corporations with substantial land holdings intermingled with and dependent for access upon Chugach National Forest lands, Chugach Alaska Corporation, Chenega Corporation, Eyak Corporation, and Tatitlek Corporation are entitled to the coordination provided for in the Forest Plan Revision process under each of these provisions. Accordingly, we do not view our participation in the public process as sufficient to satisfy the Forest Service's obligation to coordinate its planning activities with ours. The revised Chugach National Forest Land and Resources Management Plan cannot be responsibly implemented if it has not recognized, reviewed and accommodated our land and resource management plans. To date, the Forest Planning Team has not recognized our special status under either of these regulatory provisions. The Forest Planning Team must ensure, pursuant to these coordination requirements, that it has the concerns, plans and recommendations of CAC and the village corporations before it and that they are given careful consideration in the Forest Plan revision process. At a minimum, we expect that such coordination will consist of contacting and meeting with CAC to (1) discuss the potential impacts that the Forest Plan revisions will have on CAC's land; (2) review CAC's plans for the use and enjoyment of its lands; (3) discuss the objectives of both the Forest Plan and CAC's land plans; (4) analyze how the plans impact one another; (5) identify where the plans conflict with one another; and (6) create alternatives in the Forest Plan to resolve any conflicts with CAC land plans, including the development of land exchange
- 0777-036 Wit the first draft of the revised Forest Plan scheduled for early 1998, it is important that the Forest Planning Team meet with CAC as soon as possible to start coordinating our respective land an resources management plans and
- 0781-022 Of special concern to ACE is the ongoing fragmentation of Kenai Peninsula wildlands, especially as they affect brown bear habitat. ACE would like to see the Forest Service participate (and perhaps play the lead agency due to the timing of this revision) in a Brown Bear Task Force that leads to the creation of a conservation/protection plan. Due to the particular concerns expressed by inter-agency biologists about these bears losing habitat on the western Peninsula, ACE believes that managing the forest with habitat viability as a priority is critical. We would like the Forest Service to consider potential impacts to brown bears in management alternatives, with particular attention paid to the negative impacts, associated with additional road building.
- 0781-005 ACE encourages the Forest Service to use the planning process as an opportunity for coordinating with other agency plans currently in the works, such as the Kenai Area Plan, Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge use plan, and the Prince William Sound transportation plan. In addition, ACE would like the Forest Service to take a lead role in coordinating a conservation plan for brown bear habitat. The Forest Service has indicated its desire to work with vegetative mapping to better understand on a cumulative level what the lands in and
- 0802-006 Conserve Brown Bear Habitat: Brown Bears on the Kenai Peninsula are being threatened due to declining habitat. Because bears are considered an "indicator species", the Forest Service needs to make habitat protection a priority in its plan. Please participate in any task force that is created and initiate a Brown Bear Protection Plan on the Kenai
- 0807-004 4) We have worked with ADF&G and the Board to conserve Dolly Varden and to initiate biological studies of dollies in the Upper Kenai River Drainage. Some has started but much more needs to be done.
- 0813-006 3. The USFS should tap into the expertise of other agencies and organizations such as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and hunting/guides. Detailed information on fish and wildlife resources and their use should be included in the GIS inventory system. Cultural resources and geological artifacts should also be documented. This type of information will further identify important areas for tourism and recreation and identify other resources such as minerals and timber important to fulfill the multiple use management mandate. Sea bird colonies (including nesting sites for semi-palmated plover, arctic terns, etc.), waterfowl and migratory bird resting and staging areas, harbor seal pupping beaches, harbor seal, sea otter and sea lion haul out areas, or killer whale rubbing beaches should be identified and protected, as needed. By ensuring the comprehensive collection of the best data available, the plan will more accurately estimate the affects of various alternatives, build greater consensus among all

Comment # Comment

- 0817-001 Alaska Audubon is dedicated to the conservation of Alaska's natural ecosystems focusing on birds, other wildlife, and their habitats for the benefit and enjoyment of current and future generations. We are submitting this letter on behalf of over 550,000 members of the National Audubon Society, our 2,200 Alaska members, and approximately 1,500 Anchorage Audubon members. SCOPING ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE CHUGACH PLAN REVISION
Adjacent Land Management and Inter-agency Cooperation The Chugach Plan Revision must look beyond agency boundaries. Many of the resources and issues at risk in southcentral Alaska transcend agency jurisdictions (e.g., large carnivore conservation, bark beetle infestation, transportation infrastructure, etc.). Therefore, it is necessary that the Forest Service work cooperatively with other state, federal, and borough management agencies to identify issues and resources on adjacent lands which may substantially influence management on the Chugach.
- 0817-002 Clearly, conservation of the Kenai Peninsula population of brown bears will require this kind of cooperation. A great opportunity currently exists to coordinate with the State Division of Forestry in their Kenai Area Planning and the Kenai Refuge with their refuge planning.
- 0820-008 ACE encourages the Forest Service to use the planning process as an opportunity for coordinating with other agency plans currently in the works, such as the Kenai Area Plan, Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge use plan, and the Prince William Sound transportation plan.
- 0820-036 ACE would like the Forest Service to work cooperatively with agencies compiling other transportation plans in order to be pro-active with the expected traffic increases in and through the forest. ACE urges the Forest Service to gain a level of control over Prince William Sound projected use by participating in the Prince William Sound Regional
- 0821-006 Sierra Club strongly endorses the idea of an inter-agency task force to examine the viability of brown bear and wolf populations on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 0821-003 In addition, we urge the Forest Service to become informed and involved in the land planning and management decisions and actions of adjacent landowners, particularly the State of Alaska's and borough/municipal planning processes. As you know, cumulative impacts of development activities do not recognize boundaries of land ownership. This recognition of the impact of activities on adjacent lands is particularly important on the Kenai Peninsula and Copper River Delta. On the Kenai, logging on state and private lands must be addressed when making decisions on fish and wildlife management, specifically brown bear and wolf.
- 0828-004 4) The Kenai Peninsula brown bears are being threatened due to declining habitat. Because bears are an "indicator species," the Forest Service needs to make habitat protection a priority in its plan. We encourage the Service to participate in any Brown Bear Task Force that is created on the Kenai Peninsula and to work with land owners to address cumulative impacts for brown bears, and other species, as well as watershed issues.
- 0832-010 Please participate in any task force that is created and initiate a Brown Bear Protection Plan on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 0837-006 Land Management/Planning There are several issues that are important to DNR in the revision of the CNFP: Most importantly, there is the need for coordinated management of adjacent state and federal lands and state waters. This will require a generally similar management approach for an area. There may be opportunities for shared, joint, or assigned management for an area(s) that may be advantageous to both agencies. In the Kenai Peninsula, significant areas of state land occur at Moose Pass, along the Seward Highway between Canyon Creek and the Seward-Kenai Peninsula 'Y', and Seward.
- 0837-007 Within PWS, state land (as well as state tidelands and submerged lands) occupy numerous sites throughout the CNF planning area Issues effecting the management of an area will reflect, in large part, its location:
- 0837-008 In the Seward and Moose Pass areas, the focus for state land is upland recreation issues. It may also be necessary to coordinate forest management activities in these areas given the problems of insect infestation and use of previous timber harvest roads. State lands along the Seward Highway are intended for development, to support highway related needs and the recreation oriented demands. A coordinated approach to the provision of land for commercial and related services is appropriate.
- 0837-009 DNR is nearing the completion of the Kenai Area Plan (KAP). State area plans determine appropriate uses (allowed and prohibited) and lands to be retained by the state (and therefore not available for selection under the municipal entitlement program. The KAP provides recommendations on state land that adjoins the CNF and, again, there is the need for coordination between the two agencies.

Comment # Comment

- 0837-010 In the Kenai River corridor, there will be the need to coordinate both land and water recreation related activity. The recently adopted Kenai River Comprehensive Management Plan provides for a common management scheme for this area. A memorandum of understanding between the resource agencies having responsibility for the protection of the Kenai River is due to be signed in the next several months. The Forest Service is to be a signatory to this agreement. It will be especially important to monitor the amount of scenic float trips in the Upper River and to coordinate recreation facility development. It will also be necessary to integrate the Upper Kenai River Cooperative Plan, jointly developed by the state, USFS, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service for coordinating the management of the upper Kenai River, into components of the CNFP. And, more generally, it will be necessary for the CNF planning effort to integrate the recommendations of the Kenai River Comprehensive Management Plan into the Forest planning effort.
- 0837-011 In the PWS area, use of state land is established by the Prince William Sound Area Plan (PWSAP). Although this plan designates significant portions of the state uplands for recreation or assigns a protected status, there are numerous tracts that provide for various types of development related uses.
- 0837-012 The increasing demands placed on the western area of PWS through the improvement of access at Whittier will affect both state and federal recreation sites and these facilities will require improvement and increased management.
- 0837-013 The issue of coordinated recreation planning and management is particularly critical, and needs careful consideration throughout the planning process. The USFS is strongly encouraged to review these plans in the preparation of the CNFP. DNR will be especially concerned about designations in the CNFP that indirectly or directly affect the uses that are identified in the PWSAP or KAP. -
- 0837-014 The state is also concerned over the designation given upland parcels. These designations, to the extent practicable, should be sufficiently broad to allow flexibility in management and use. It can be expected that conditions will change over time and that the CNFP will not be able to anticipate all of these changes. In instances involving large tracts where use patterns cannot be determined with a reasonable level of confidence at the time of plan preparation, DNR, in its area plans, uses designations of a general type. These permit a number of uses, consistent with good land management practices. The actual blend of uses is determined in the future when development pressures are more apparent. The point here is that we would prefer that the CNFP use more general designations where use patterns may change over time, to accommodate the changing uses without the need for a difficult plan amendment process.
- 0837-015 The CNF Planning Team should give consideration to the establishment of an advisory council or group that consists of user and special interest groups, similar to that used by the Bureau of Land Management in the resolution of their land management and mining issues. When used by BLM, they have been found to be quite effective in brokering solutions to fairly intractable problems in an efficient and low-confrontation manner. These groups do not have to have "official" standing. They have been formed to deal with a particular issue and have a limited life.
- 0837-016 DNR suggests that the CNF Planning Team give consideration to the establishment of an inter-agency planning team. This group would meet regularly, on an as needed basis, to be kept abreast of the CNFP planning effort and of the planning/study activities of the agencies participating on the inter-agency planning team. Significant issues would be brought before this group for discussion prior to a position being set out in the plan. DNR uses an analogous inter-agency planning group in the development of its resource and land management plans.
- 0837-019 The state has generally not supported the creation of new Conservation Systems Units in Alaska, as directed by Congress in Section 10 of ANILCA. Any designation must be carefully tailored to protect traditional uses, including mining and recreation. Because of our authority over the water column and fiduciary responsibilities to the citizens of the state, we believe that any recommendations developed under this Act must be carefully coordinated with DNR. Underlying our concerns is the need for the people of the state to use waters within the National Forest in a traditional
- 0837-020 Tidelands and Submerged Lands The state owns both the tidelands and submerged adjacent to the CNF. Use of these areas is designated in the PWSAP or KAP. An important issue to the state is the effect of the expected increasing recreational pressure in the western part of PWS on the tidelands and submerged lands. Anchorage's and use areas are now designated in the PWS area plan, but it may be necessary for DNR to modify these recommendations in order to accommodate the increased water use recreation pressure. The CNF planning team should work closely with DNR throughout the planning process, particularly during the period when the preferred alternative is under development. It may be appropriate for the CNFP to accommodate expected uses in appropriate USFS upland sites rather than forcing these uses onto state tidelands. Conversely, it may be necessary for DNR to modify the area plan to accommodate upland recreation recommendations of the CNFP. If inter-agency coordination is lacking, the CNFP upland planning recommendations are going to be of questionable utility because of the close connection between upland and tideland/submerged uses in this area. It will also be advisable for the CNF planning team to work with the South-central Region of the Division of Land on tidelands development planning. This unit of DNR manages the tidelands of PWS and has periodic applications for tideland uses adjacent to both state and federal uplands, and develop of a coordinated strategy is desirable. We suggest a work session with the CNF planning team on tideland issues in January.
- 0838-003 The focus of this conference was to develop a better understanding of the role the University of Alaska Fairbanks can play in support of the forest products industry in Alaska. Speakers for the conference came from several agencies and organizations both from within and outside Alaska.

Comment # Comment

- 0860-019 USFS works with State DNR to protect tidelands from monopolistic uses like float camps
- 0860-081 Cooperative product among Forest Service, Alaska State Parks, Native Corporations, and Native villages Budget sufficient to implement Include logging, mining, recreation, and protection
- 0862-018 What is future management direction and do we have tools/infrastructure funding and commitment, internal support SO/RO.
- Internal Collaboration – common game plan – good communication
- Need process for internal participation
- Updates
Form to provide
Go to districts before public with draft alternatives & have a working meeting
Be sure districts get content analysis
Timeline to districts, input needed by
Who is on IDT go to all employees
FLT
District liaison, someone who cares
IDT members – focus meetings at districts
- 0862-024 Coordinate with state to designate appropriate areas
- 0863-011 Consider supply and demand needs at larger scales i.e. Kenai Pen, south central AK, statewide. A collaborative process can improve allocation opportunities.
- A common planning period for cooperating agencies
- 0890-005 7) Coordinate with other ongoing planning processes such as the Kenai Area Plan. Consider development activities on adjacent non-national forest lands.