

**Yukon Tanana Area Plan Public Review Draft
Issue Response Summary for the Final Plan
September 2013**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
LAND USE DESIGNATIONS			
Agriculture	Unit K-32 is located in the area where the proposed Nenana River Bridge will be built. The state should ensure that the land is available for sale to the public prior to or immediately after the bridge is built because the “new” ease of access to that area will make it very desirable.	The Division of Agriculture intends to have the land offered for disposal concurrently with the development of the bridge. The Division of Agriculture agrees that it will be important for that land to be available for the public.	No change.
	Too much land is being designated in for Agriculture in the YTAP. Some of the areas don’t have the proper soils for agriculture. Several units are located in improper places such as very close to the Trans-Alaska pipeline.	Less land is designated for Agriculture in the 2012 Yukon Tanana Area Plan (YTAP) than in the 1991 Tanana Basin Area Plan (TBAP). Most of the YTAP made up the western half of the TBAP. The YTAP designates approximately 195,500 acres for Agriculture, whereby over 200,000 acres of land in the western half of TBAP were designated for Agriculture or co-designated as Agriculture and Settlement. A table depicting the differences in acreages between the TBAP and YTAP is attached to this document as Appendix A. The land that has been recommended for Agriculture classification is based on topographical studies and knowledge of location desirability. The land is likely to sell in part due to access. The areas near the pipeline are desirable because they have already been cleared.	No change.
	Agricultural sales should be prioritized for sale to Alaskan Residents and that the products should be prioritized for sale within Alaska, rather than purchased and exported by a multi-national corporation.	The state is not allowed to prioritize sale to state residents. They are also not allowed to limit the exportation of crops. The state legislature specifically rescinded a law several years ago that had limited sales to state residents and US citizens.	No change.
	The plan states that the planning area in general is not a good place for agriculture, but designates new areas for agriculture. If the area is not ideal for agriculture, then no agricultural land should be designated.	The plan does not state that the planning area is unsuitable for agriculture. A section for the management of agriculture operations within the planning area is provided in Chapter 2 and a number of specific management units are designated Agriculture in Chapter 3. The YTAP has designated approximately 194,000 acres for Agriculture, which is 1% of the entire planning area. The plan would not have included agriculture as a resource to manage in the planning area if state land was unsuitable for that purpose. In the areas where soils have not yet been analyzed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service the University of Fairbanks was consulted to ensure the land was suitable for agriculture prior to the designation.	No change.
Settlement	There is no need for an increase in settlement land in the YTAP area.	The amount of land designated Settlement in the 2012 YTAP is not significantly greater than the amount designated in the 1991 TBAP.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		<p>Both plans have less than 5% of the planning area designated for Settlement. Although the gross acreage is somewhat greater (620,000 in 2012 compared to 567,000 acres) the former amount includes areas that have already been developed, so the effective total of land allocated to settlement is not substantially greater than the original plan and the YTAP encompasses over 2 million acres of land that were not included in the 1991 TBAP planning area. The state is required by statute to classify state owned land (AS 38.05.300).</p> <p>Settlement designations in this area are also considered to be necessary and appropriate because natural resource development, mining operations and oil and gas exploration and associated infrastructure are anticipated throughout the life of the YTAP. Land that is designated for settlement will be available for potential residential properties and associated commercial infrastructure to accommodate an increase in population due to job creation.</p>	
	<p>The state should not be selling land that has been traditionally used by Native people.</p>	<p>The YTAP only applies to State owned land; it does not apply to lands owned or administered by tribal and native entities. State land use plans must follow the requirements of both the state Constitution and Alaska Statute. The constitution states: “It is the policy of the State to encourage the settlement of its land and the development of its resources by making them available for maximum use consistent with the public interest.” As such, plan designations must be consistent with the principle of classifying land for the maximum prudent use expressed in AS 38.04.010 and multiple uses expressed in AS 38.04.065. In certain instances the recommendations of these plans provide for various forms of development. The benefits and impacts to all Alaskans may accrue from such development and it is unreasonable to favor one group over another by precluding development in one area to shelter them from potential development at the expense of other groups. The state develops its lands for the benefit for all people of the state as a whole.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>SVC opposes designations for Settlement and Agriculture that are located in or surrounding their traditional use lands. Opening up lands to additional settlement within or near SVC traditional lands will increase the potential for trespass or other inappropriate land uses, and will increase pressure on the region’s diminishing subsistence resources. Such a designation could result in harm to the health, social and economic welfare of Tribal members, and as such is contrary to the interests of the Tribe.</p>	<p>Although these lands may be traditionally used by Stevens Village, the YTAP pertains to lands that are state owned or state selected (still under Federal ownership.) The land is thereby open to public use of all Alaskans, including the residents of Stevens Village. It is state policy to provide for maximum use of state land consistent with the public interest, and it is the policy of the State of Alaska to plan and manage state-owned land to establish a balanced combination of land available for both public and private purposes (AS 38.04.005).</p> <p>The YTAP recommends the Settlement land near the Yukon River for low density settlement, remote recreation and small scale commercial operations. If an area is designated for Settlement or Agriculture, it</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		<p>does not necessarily mean that the land will ever be sold. If that land is offered for competitive sale in the future, public noticing will occur. The SVC, in addition to all Alaskans, is qualified to purchase the state land when it is offered. As part of the standard authorization process, all potentially affected entities will be contacted prior to the issuance of the Final Finding and Decision about and disposal.</p> <p>Natural resource development, mining operations and oil and gas exploration and associated infrastructure are anticipated throughout the life of the YTAP both within and north of the planning area. Mining operations are expected to increase in the Livengood area. Oil and Gas exploration conducted by Doyon, Inc has begun north of the Yukon River. If these developments result in job creation, there will be a need for settlement areas and supporting commercial infrastructure.</p>	
	<p>Does all of the land that is designated for settlement and agriculture go on sale as soon as the plan is adopted? Some of the settlement and agriculture management units are large. The plan should not recommend selling large areas of state land. They could be purchased by large developers and turned into strip malls.</p>	<p>No. The entirety of the land does not automatically go on sale after the plan is adopted. The land is available for disposal, but may never actually be sold or promoted for sale. The designation is an indication of how the land is supposed to be managed; it does not necessarily mean the land will be sold.</p> <p>When land is offered for disposal, it is typically in parcels or individual lots, not the entirety of a management unit. Settlement areas are studied prior to offering to determine what type of use would be best suited for the land; remote recreation, subdivisions, or commercial uses. Land use plans do not necessarily detail the only type of sale that can occur due to the length of the plan.</p> <p>When and if the land is offered for disposal to the public, there will be an additional public notice and comment period during the authorization process. This provides another opportunity for effected parties to provide input either in support or in opposition to individual land sales. If parties are opposed to the sale, they can provide input that may affect the Final Finding and Decision related to the specific land offering at that time.</p> <p>More information related to Settlement designations is provided in Chapter 2 of the plan.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Settlement Designations on Land with Mineral Potential.</p>	<p>Although the plan states there is little correspondence between settlement areas and mineral lands, surface conflicts are likely in settlement areas that are believed to have high mineral or coal potential. Settlement land near Livengood and Healy may become problematic.</p>	<p>There are areas throughout the state where surface owners have opposed subsurface exploration and development. DNR distributes information about the attributes, including whether mineral potential exists, during the authorization process and at the time of sale to the public. Typically, land sale areas are closed to mineral entry during the authorization process. In reference to the units of concern, all of the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	DNR should make known to potential buyers that mining or coal development could occur in these areas. Units of particular concern are: T-48, T-78, and T-79 in the Lower Tanana Region and P-35, P-52 and P-78 in the Parks Highway & West Alaska Range Region.	units listed were either fully or partially designated for Settlement in the 1991 TBAP. Several of the units are affected by existing Mineral Closing Orders. Those not now affected by a closing order will be subject by a leasehold location order with the adoption of the 2012 YTAP.	
Forestry	Strong public support for the expansion of the Tanana Valley State Forest.	The state appreciates the public support for the expansion to the Tanana Valley State Forest.	No change.
	Areas of public harvest of trees should be identified within the Tanana Valley State Forest and on lands designated for Forestry.	A Forestry permit is required for public harvest within the Tanana Valley State Forest. The Division of Forestry will be able to identify those areas and any restrictions during the permitting processes.	No change.
	Regulations should be changed to allow people to use dead and downed trees on public land for personal use at home.	The use of dead and downed trees for personal firewood is allowed on site under the Generally Allowed Use regulation 11 AAC 96.020. We have recommended a revision to the administrative regulations to allow for offsite personal use of dead and downed trees. However, it is beyond the scope of this plan to include this recommended revision since the change that needs to occur is relative to the aforementioned Administrative regulation.	No change.
General Use	SVC opposes the General Use designation because it is too non-specific to adequately protect traditional lands this area, especially with the language in the YTAP regarding the potential for future mineral development within this unit.	The use of the General Use designation will, in fact, be quite effective in precluding some forms of development on state land traditionally used by native people. This land is to be retained in state ownership. However, neither this designation nor any other land use designation will preclude mineral or coal development. State land is open to mineral entry until closed by a mineral order. (AS 38.05.300). A closure of over 640 acres requires legislative approval and this is not considered a practicable action, particularly since state land and resources are intended to be utilized.	No change.
	The Tribes are concerned with the designations for General Use with no guiding principles. Almost 27% of the land in the YTAP is designated for General Use and that may invite inadvertent trespassing. Are there any real, future management considerations to guide management decisions on these lands? With assurances, the YTAP should include more specific planning for these general use areas. It is evident the State does not have a plan in mind for a large portion of the land for general use within the planning area.	The General Use designation is used when no primary surface use can be determined. Lands affected by this designation are typically inaccessible, remote, and not likely or intended to be developed during the planning period and are to be retained by the state. This designation is used as a type of holding zone; it is not intended for development during the planning period. But if development were to occur, it would be affected by the management guidelines within Chapter 2 that guide specific forms of resource development.	No change.
Heritage Resources	The Old Minto Village (Mentee) should be recognized as a historic place. It is an important area to the Mentee people. The land is located in	The Old Minto Village is located within the Minto Flats State Game Refuge (Unit L-02). A historical description of the Old Minto Village will be identified within the Heritage Resources section of Chapter 2.	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	unit L-02 which is recommended for designation of Habitat and Dispersed Recreation.		
Heritage Resources	There are burial sites and other sacred areas within the YTAP that need to be avoided.	The Office of History and Archeology (OHA) is consulted during the authorization process for projects that might affect cultural resources of the type mentioned. The YTAP indicates that there are cultural sites within a unit where the state has knowledge of for adjudication purposes, but does not divulge the location or type of sites to the public. Projects are required to follow the requirements of the Cultural Section in Chapter of 2 YTAP, which requires the involvement of OHA in the review of projects potentially affecting cultural resources.	No change.
	The Tribes possess intrinsic knowledge of the cultural heritage sites in the planning process, including fish camps, hunting camps, traplines, berry picking areas, burial sites, cemeteries and historic and prehistoric archeological sites. DNR needs to work with the Tribes and TCC to identify these areas for appropriate land planning and management decision-making procedures. The State has not conducted cultural resources surveys on past land disposal programs and has minimally conducted tribal consultations about important cultural sites used by local residents.	DNR invites the participation of the native communities in the planning process and is open to learning about the locations of these sites to allow for better management of state land. As stated above, the Office of History and Archaeology (OHA) is consulted during the authorization process. We agree that not all state owned land has been archaeologically surveyed.	No change.
Mineral	The Alaska Mining Association was concerned that the plan text that seemed to indicate that mining operations on lands designated Public Facilities, Settlement, or Water Resources were generally inappropriate.	Agree. The plan text has been amended to clarify that mining operations are an allowable use on such land but will require the use of mitigation stipulations.	Revise. See response.
Public Recreation Livengood Creek Designation and Navigability	Reconsider the Public Recreation Designation in table 3-1 for Livengood Creek should be removed. The recreation designation specifies retention in its undisturbed, natural state. The main stem of the creek has significant historic and ongoing disturbance due to placer mining. Given the amount of disturbance occurring on Livengood Creek, it should also be considered non-navigable.	Agree. Upon further review, it is appropriate to remove Livengood Creek from Table 3-1. Livengood Creek will not be recommended for public recreation designation.	Revise. See response.
	The Nenana River should be recommended for designation as a State Recreation River. Units P-98, P-56, P-63, P-64, and P-65 should be included as part of the Recreation River designation.	The plan recommends that the Nenana River be designated as a State Recreation River (SRR). Management Unit P-98 contains the Nenana River and many of its adjacent riverine areas, and subunits P-98.2-4 are specifically recommended for designation as a SRR. Subunit P-98.1 occupies an area north of the main area of popular recreation use and is not, therefore, recommended for designation.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		The focus of a SRR is the river itself and its adjacent riverine areas. With few exceptions in the one area that has state recreation rives (Susitna Valley), large adjacent areas are not included. Management units P-56, P-63, P-64, and P-65 are large upland units that are situated a substantial distance away from the riverine areas of the Nenana River and therefore are not appropriate for designation as SRRs.	
Transportation Corridor	The Tanana River should be identified as a Transportation Corridor in addition to Recreation and Habitat.	Agree in part. Although the Tanana River is used for transportation, it is not appropriate to identify it as a “transportation corridor”. For the purpose of this plan, a transportation corridor refers to a developed facility, such as a railroad or road system, not a waterbody. The Tanana River is identified in the Lower Tanana Region as management unit T-98, which provides for the protection of public access to and across the river.” The management intent will be revised to include the following statement: “This river is used as a transportation corridor by the public. Maintain public access on trails and easements that provide access...”	Revise. See response.
Utility Corridor	A land designation for utility corridors needs to be designated to parallel and encompass the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.	A designation for a utility corridor along the pipeline is not necessary as that area is already protected through an easement which provides a right of way.	No change.
Water Resources	Land located within F008N004W and F009N004W should not be designated for Water Resources. The few small ponds contain permafrost lowlands and are not unique to the region and thereby do not warrant special status.	Upon further review of the management unit, a General Use designation is more appropriate. The unit is remote, generally inaccessible, and is not expected to be developed during the planning period. Unit T-71 will be redesignated for General Use.	Revise. See response.
	The classification “water resources land” includes “hydro power sites”, which is a use that conflicts the other two uses “water supply and watershed protection.”	The classification ‘Water Resources’ includes ‘hydro power sites’ in its definition. This, we agree, is to a certain degree inconsistent with the other uses of this classification. However, the definition of Water Resources is contained in Alaska Administrative Code (11 AAC 55.222) and it is beyond the scope of plan to alter the definitions of land classifications in administrative regulation.	No change.
Wildlife Habitat	A lot of land within the planning area used to be classified for Wildlife Habitat and is now recommended for classification as Water Resources. Why isn’t the land being recognized for wildlife habitat?	The land that has been designated for water resources consists of wetlands, riverine and lake areas. Although habitat is generally associated with those areas, state regulation 11 AAC 55.230 requires that land classified wildlife habitat be primarily for fish and wildlife resource production, whether existing or through habitat manipulation, to supply sufficient numbers or a diversity of species to support commercial, recreational, or traditional uses on an optimum sustained yield basis; or a unique or rare assemblage of a single or multiple species of regional, state, or national significance. If the presence of behavior or need for habitat in those areas do not meet the regulation criteria, the land is not designated for wildlife habitat.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		However, the recognition of the hydraulic values of the land is still recognized through a water resources designation. State land designated Water Resources requires the highest level of management control and therefore habitat resources will be automatically protected through the use of this designation. Water Resources Land is retained state land.	
	Retention of the Hess Creek in its natural state is not reasonable. The existing Hess Reservoir bisected and diverted flow from the drainage for historically for mining activity in the Livengood valley. Future mining developments in the Livengood area may warrant reconsideration of this water supply.	The plan recommends that the Hess Creek be retained in its natural state during the life of this plan. Although development has occurred on the creek in the past, future significant development is not anticipated in the area. Much of the land in the vicinity of Hess Creek has been recommended for classifications of Water Resources and Wildlife Habitat. Although development in that area is not anticipated, if development should occur in that area, stipulations to mitigate adverse impacts on the Hess Creek will be decided upon during the authorization process	No change.
	Reconsider the management intent for Hess Creek. Hess Creek has been disturbed through mining activity and may be important for future mining operations.	Although Hess Creek has historical mining use, there are also important wildlife habitat values. Mining and other future development are not prohibited in that area but would be subject to mitigation requirements. If development should occur in that area, stipulations to mitigate adverse impacts on the Hess Creek will be decided upon during the authorization process.	No change.
	Anadromous Fish are not discussed adequately in the plan.	Disagree. There is already extensive treatment of anadromous waterbodies in the plan. The presence of anadromous waterbodies is identified within the Description part of a management unit in the Resource Allocation Tables. The term ‘anadromous’ is defined in the Glossary. Further, management guidance regarding anadromous streams can be found within the Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Shorelands and Stream Corridors sections of Chapter 2. Guidance is provided regarding the siting and width of riparian buffers adjacent to anadromous waterbodies in the aforementioned sections and in the Table that identifies specific management requirements for riparian areas in Chapter 2. For a list of Anadromous Waterbodies in Alaska, please consult the Department of Fish and Game.	No change.
	Small raptors and small furbearers should be included as one of the possible criteria’s for a habitat designation.	Disagree. Small raptors and small furbearers are not generally considered as a determining factor when designating land for wildlife and habitat. They are important however. It is not necessary to designate land for habitat in order to protect wildlife. Impacts to wildlife habitat are considered during the authorization process. Additionally, regardless of the land designation, DMLW manages the land consistent with the state and federal Endangered Species Acts, as stated in Management Guideline ‘I’ of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		section of Chapter 2.	
	All land designated for Habitat in the 1991 plan should be retained as Habitat land.	Disagree. The information provided by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game demonstrated that there have been significant changes to the distribution of wildlife within the western side of the Tanana Basin Area planning area, which is now included within the YTAP. The lands identified for wildlife habitat in the YTAP are based on more current information provided by ADF&G and are consistent with 11 AAC 55.230. It would not be prudent to retain the habitat designations from the 1991 plan since the data those designations were based on is over 20 years old.	No change.
	The land that borders the White Mountains National Recreation Area should be redesignated for Habitat, not General Use, in order to provide a buffer for the recreation area.	Disagree. DNR is not authorized to designate land as Habitat unless the wildlife and habitat of that given area meet the criteria for the identification of sensitive habitat areas in Chapter 2. Moreover, as a matter of policy and practice, DNR does not provide such buffers adjacent to areas of this type. It is the state's position that sufficient buffer area is provided within federal conservation units themselves.	No change.
	The Tatalina River should be designated for Habitat and Recreation Dispersed because of high moose density. It is an important area for fall hunting.	Disagree. The Tatalina River is located within multiple management units, which vary in land use designations. The river is identified within each of those management units. Given the multiple use nature of the lands surrounding the Tatalina River and the size of the river, it would not be accurate to designate the entire river for habitat and recreation.	No change.
	The Fish Lake area is a moose calving area and should be protected from mining in the creeks that run into Fish Lake. Over the last 40 plus years Fish Lake has been filling in with sediments from the mining activity in the area.	The state only has management authority over state land. The state does not own the land surrounding the Fish Lake so the YTAP does not apply to that land. Within the area, ownership consists of native allotments and native corporation land. If illegal practices are occurring on non-state land then the incidents should be reported to law enforcement officials. The Fish Lake is situated within the Tofty Mining District. Water quality standards affect the mining operations that occur on state land and water within that mining district and it is unclear why the area has been filled in.	No change.
Protection of Zitziana Dunes	The area of the Zitziana Dunes should be protected.	Concur. Create a new management unit that occupies the area of 3J4 in the 1985 TBAP. (This will require the extraction of this area from a portion of YTAP unit K-20). This unit would be co-designated Public Recreation and Habitat. This area would be retained by the state. Development within this area would not be authorized.	Revise. See response.
LAND CLASSIFICATIONS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE PLAN			
Changes in the way land is classified.	The YTAP does not include secondary designations. Without primary and secondary uses, the management of the land cannot be prioritized.	It is correct that the state is authorized to identify to both primary and secondary uses under 11 AAC 55.404(c). An authorization is not a requirement though. The state manages land based on plan designations, management intent and management guidelines specific to	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	<p>In the 1991 plan, there were primary and secondary designations which established a priority for the uses in each management unit. Page 1-5 in the 1991 plan states: “Surface uses are designated primary if they are major surface uses. A secondary use is permitted when its occurrence will not adversely affect achieving the objectives for primary uses.”</p>	<p>a given unit of land. Land use classifications reflect plan designations and are intended to identify the primary use of state land, which is the prioritized use of the land.</p> <p>All state land is available for multiple use and the purpose of secondary designations is to indicate the other uses that could occur on a given unit. However, the use of secondary designations has complicated DNR land management and the application of classifications. The use of these designations does not add clarity as to how state land is to be managed. DNR has found that it is preferable to identify a primary designation (or complementary co-designations) and then to indicate that all other uses are to be compatible with the primary designation(s).</p> <p>It is important to realize that although secondary uses in the 1991 TBAP were formatted in a list; those uses did not prohibit other uses from occurring or being authorized on that land. 11 AAC 55.040(c) also allows the department to authorize other uses if they do not conflict with plan. The conflict determination is based on the land classification, not a secondary use, both in the 1991 plan and the YTAP.</p>	
	<p>Why is land Co-Classified for Mineral and Wildlife Habitat and Coal and Wildlife Habitat? These are not compatible uses of the land.</p>	<p>Alaska Statute (AS 38.05.185) and State Regulation 11 AAC 86.135, both explain that public land is open to mineral location unless it is closed to such entry, unless the commissioner makes a finding through the authorization process that location would conflict with significant surface uses of the land.</p> <p>The co-designations of Coal or Minerals with Habitat is discussed in Chapter 2 within the Subsurface Resources section (pages 2-52 and 53). If this co-designation is used, it means there are either high mineral or coal value in addition to high habitat values within the management unit. It is further explained in chapter 3, on page 3-8, that except where state land is closed to mineral entry or coal leasing, DNR will treat mining or coal extraction as a use that may be compatible use with the surface use.</p> <p>In the instances where a management unit has both a significant mineral or coal value and habitat, the determination of whether those uses are incompatible will be made during the authorization process. There may be instances where the uses are not necessarily compatible but the stipulations will be required in order to mitigate adverse impacts against the surface use. There may also be instances where the adverse impacts to surface uses are so significant that the use may not be allowed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	<p>A table was available at the public meeting which identified the differences in acreage distribution.</p>	<p>A table depicting the comparison of the acreage distribution of land classifications between the 1991 TBAP and the 2012 YTAP will be</p>	<p>Revise. See response.</p>

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	That information should also be provided in the plan.	included in the plan. The table will be attached as an appendix to this document.	
	The plan should clarify how it will manage the subsurface estate (minerals, oil and gas resources, and coal) of lands managed for Agriculture and Settlement both prior to the and after the land is sold.	The YTAP has recommended a Leasehold Location Order for the management of subsurface resources on lands that are designated for Settlement. It is included in the draft plan as Appendix C (LLO 33). The leasehold location order does not close the land to mineral entry or coal extraction. Rather, it requires the miner to go through the leasing process rather than The processes associated with a mining claim. The Division of Agriculture has, at the time of sale of agricultural or proceeding it, the option of closing the affected area to mineral entry or applying a leasehold location order, similar to that used for Settlement.	No change.
	The revised plan should be organized in the same way as the 1991 plan for ease of comparison.	The YTAP is organized consistent with other area plans that have been written since the year 2000. Although it is not organized in the same way, the same basic information is presented. For ease of comparison, the 1991 plan designations and management unit numbers will be reflected on the Resource Allocation Tables for the planning regions.	Revise. See response.
ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION			
Navigable Water	Livengood Creek should not be listed as navigable water. Previous disturbance, small flows, and beaver activity together preclude any transportation along the creek.	Livengood Creek has been determined to be navigable by the State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources, Public Access Assertion and Defense Unit. Beaver activity occurs throughout Alaska and their dams are not considered to be a permanent blockage of the waterway and are not criteria in the determination of a navigable waterbody.	No change.
RS 2477 Trails	Many of the RS 2477 Trails included in the plan have not been used in decades and can't be found on the ground. Why are they still listed as historic trails if they aren't used?	The RS 2477 Trails are recorded historical trails. The Department of Natural Resources Public Access Assertion and Defense Unit is in the process of ground proofing all RS 2477 routes. Each route is kept on record until it is determined by the department that it is not a valid route.	No change.
Road to Nome	The Road to Nome is not under construction and the exact route is not yet known.	Agree. The road to Nome is not yet under construction. However, it is a potential major undertaking that has been proposed by the state and will likely occur throughout the life of this plan. It is important to document development projects that will likely occur in the future when known. See also the response to the Alaska Department of Transportation below.	No change.
Road from Manley Hot Springs to Tanana	The route for the Manley Hot Springs to Tanana Road is not finalized. It should be depicted on the maps as "proposed", not as an existing road.	Agree. The route from Manley Hot Springs is not finalized. It is not depicted on the maps as a road. However, the RS 2477 (RST 152), that will likely be followed by the road, is depicted on the maps. Should the data for a finalized route be made available prior to the publication of this plan, it will be included on the plan maps.	No change.
Road to Tanana	Information about access to Tanana from an unimproved road needs to be removed.	Agree. This information will be removed from the final plan.	Revise. See response.
Road to Tanana and Road to Nome	The plan needs to distinguish between the road to Tanana and the Road to Nome.	Agree. The information will be revised in the final plan.	Revise. See response.
BIOMASS			

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Forestry Practices	State forestry practices need to change to use trees that are identified for controlled burns and forest thinning as biomass fuel so that it can be used as an energy resource by the public and private entities, rather than wasted on site.	The Division of Forestry has been refining its processes and has begun to research and conduct biomass projects. The decision of how to dispose of downed trees, whether onsite, or in controlled burns, is made by the Division of Forestry. Given the impetus in the state to utilize forestry resources as biomass, it is likely that byproducts of forestry practices will be used for biomass, rather than disposed of onsite in the future. However, until this process has been developed and approved by the Division of Forestry, it is premature to state a policy in the area plan.	No change.
Land Disposals and Biomass Resources	Trees that are cleared for settlement and agricultural lands should be used for Biomass fuel.	The Division of Forestry, Land Sales and Agriculture work together on this issue. At this time, decisions on how trees are disposed of depend on whether the trees were cleared before or after the land was disposed of. If the trees are cleared prior to the sale of the land, the decision is made by the state entities. If the trees are cleared after that land has been disposed of, the property owner decides how they want the trees to be disposed of. Language will be added to the Forestry Goals section of Chapter 2 to indicate that the byproducts of forestry practices and land clearing to be utilized for biomass wherever feasible and practical. See additional language recommendations from the Forestry Division below.	Revise. See response.
Forestry Land Classifications for Biomass	Should Settlement and Agriculture lands be Co-Classified with Forestry to ensure that the wood can be used for Biomass?	Disagree. Forestry is an incompatible use with Settlement and Agriculture.	No change.
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS			
Community Development Plans	The YTAP does not account for potential expansion in the Nenana and Minto Flats areas from agriculture land, bridge over the Nenana River and natural gas exploration. The Totochaket project will likely result in increased access and demand for Settlement and Agriculture land within that area and particularly within unit K-32.	The plan provides for both settlement and agricultural development within the Kantishna region, should a bridge over the Nenana River be constructed near Nenana. Specifically, the plan provides areas for both agricultural development (within the very large K-32, at 148,000 acres) and settlement within units K-25, K-35, and K-65, all of which are situated near the area of possible expansion. Settlement associated with development is provided for in K-32, where most of this demand is likely to occur. In the event that these areas are insufficient for actual demand, the plan can be modified in the future when the actual demand levels and locations are known with better certainty.	No change.
Denali Borough Airport	Correspondence from the Denali Borough recommends the development of a regional airport / industrial area. The area that is identified for this use by the borough is occupied by unit P-71, which is co-designated Habitat and Public Recreation.	It is beyond the authority of an area plan to make a recommendation for the establishment of a regional airport at a particular location. The state agency charged with the authority to make such determinations is the ADOT/PF. This agency should be consulted in order to initiate the initial feasibility study of such a facility and to undertake the necessary siting studies. This plan can, however, identify that the area of P-71 has been recommended by the Denali Borough for the establishment of a	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		regional airport/industrial area and indicate that feasibility and siting studies, or other pertinent studies, will be required in order to make a determination that this unit is appropriate for a regional airport. This unit is already recommended to be retained in state ownership, unless required for another public use. The aforementioned concepts will be included in the final plan.	
Denali Borough Airport	The plan should recommend that the state should work with the Alaska Railroad and Denali Borough to establish an airport in the region.	See above response. We have informed ADOT/PF of the interest of the Denali Borough in developing an airport.	No change.
Stevens Village Land use Plan, Ethnography of Ancestral Lands	The state needs to review the 1999 Stevens Village Land use Plan, Ethnography of Ancestral Lands and take it into consideration in this plan.	The state requested a copy of this plan on 12/03/2012. The SVC representative responded that the plan was undergoing review and they generally don't provide copies of the old plan. The 1991 plan, "A Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Traditional Lands of Stevens Village" was reviewed during the planning process.	No change.
Expansion of the planning scope.	YTAP lacks comparative literature to really understand the intent and consequences of the YTAP. The YTAP plan would be more inclusive of public concerns if it included a section on other long-term planning processes already conducted in the YTAP area. Most notable is the Stevens Village land-use plan that established local policies on land use, resource development, infrastructure improvements and cultural preservation issues not unlike the YTAP document.	DNR reviews historic documents and land use plans of local communities and other government entities during the planning processes to learn about the issues affecting the planning area. However, the documents are only referenced if they pertain to the management of state owned land. It is not necessary to provide an extensive review of documents that do not apply on state land. As stated above, DNR has not yet been given a copy of the Stevens Village Land Use Plan.	No change.
Management Units	The State defined game units should be recognized as management areas in the general discussion in the YTAP plan and discussed accordingly. Perhaps using game units as a measure of analysis for the recreational use will be more meaningful.	The management units of state land use plans are specifically designated for a primary surface use. The size of these management units may vary according to factors such as land status and topography. State game management units are not appropriate for the purpose of adjudication of authorizations; they are used for game management.	No change.
Economic Planning for Tribal Governments and Villages	The participation of the tribal governments in the YTAP planning process has been minimal, partly due to the lack of funding for tribal staff to participate more comprehensively. Tribal governments are in need of funds for Natural Resource planning and management. The Tribes suggest that a portion of the resource royalties from development in the YTAP planning area be shared with Tribes in order to work more collaboratively with State government	The participation of the tribal governments in the YTAP planning process was limited, which is of concern to DNR. DNR did not receive communication during the planning process that indicated the native community did not engage in the planning process because they were concerned about the funding related to plan review and meeting attendance. It would have greatly benefited the development of the YTAP if the Native community had brought their concerns to the attention of DNR earlier in the planning process. The state provides education about the planning process and natural resource management freely to the public, including the native	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	<p>on policies such as long-term resource and land planning.</p> <p>Furthermore, the State should coordinate with local communities and with ANCSA corporations about contracting opportunities for joint projects, including the process of developing land-use plans and mineral development projects involving timber, precious metals and minerals.</p>	<p>communities, during the planning process through the use of public notices and public meetings where planners and staff are available for questions. They are also available via telephone and email. Communities are not required to pay for these employee services. These services were provided during the development of the YTAP.</p> <p>The issue of contracting is beyond the scope of this plan.</p>	
MAPPING			
Map Colors	The maps were difficult to read because of the solid colors.	The solid colors were used to distinguish the management unit designations. Other than basic hydrology, topographical features were intentionally obscured. The colors of the management designations in the final plan will be reflected with a level of transparency.	Revise. See response.
River and Topography	Rivers and topography should be depicted on the maps to give the public a geographical orientation.	These maps are intended for state adjudicator purposes. Maps included townships for location orientation. Most area plan maps do not depict detailed topographical data because it occludes the boundaries of management units. The YTAP has abundant hydrology and it will not be possible to depict all waterbodies on the maps due to the scale of the maps. However, major rivers will be depicted on the final maps.	Revise. See response.
Unit Depiction Comparison	A map of the 1991 classifications should be provided for comparison with the revised classifications.	It is inappropriate to include a map of the 1991 land use classifications. The plan supersedes these classifications. However, we agree that such a map would be useful during the plan development phase (which is what we are in) and will include it on the DNR planning website.	No change.
Unit Designation Reference	A “key” should be on the maps to identify the conversion of Land Classifications and Designations.	There is a table included in the plan that identifies the conversion of Land Classifications and Designations for reference. It is in Chapter 4 on page 4-5, entitled “Land Designations – Conversion to Classifications”. It is not necessary to include a key on each map.	No change.
Land Status	Land status on the maps is outdated.	Land status changes on a daily basis. In order to finalize the management unit boundaries a “snap shot” of land status had to be used. The maps are dated for March, 2012. The land status on the final maps will be more current.	Revise. See response.
GIS Resources	The State should have all GIS data available online for the public to review.	The maps developed for the plan are for graphic representation purposes. Upon finalization of the plan, the state will integrate the management unit classifications into their statewide mapping software (Alaska Mapper), which allows the public to turn layers on and off.	No change.
MINERALS AND SUBSURFACE DEVELOPMENT			
Mineral Entry Closures	There are no lands within the YTAP that are being recommended for closure to mineral entry. More of the land in the planning area should be closed to mineral entry to protect habitat values.	The requirement for a mineral closure is that there be a ‘finding that mining would be incompatible with significant surface uses on state land.’ AS 38.05.185(a). This has been interpreted to apply to areas designated Settlement and to areas with very important anadromous streams. Other than these areas, DNR cannot conclude at this time that	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		the potential for incompatibility exists in other areas with other designations. Moreover, DNR can only impose a mineral closing order on small areas of state land (areas of up to 640 acres); closures of areas greater than this require legislative action and approval, which is beyond the scope of this plan.	
Leasehold Location Order	Why does the Leasehold Location Order in YTAP only include Settlement Land? Shouldn't Agriculture Lands also be included in the Leasehold Location Order?	It is difficult to make the determination required under AS 328.05.185(a) since agricultural disposals can occupy large areas and it is not clear that incompatibility with surface uses would, in fact, occur. However, the Division of Agriculture is not precluded from preparing a leasehold location order for agricultural areas if it so chooses, but it must find that an incompatibility of the type mentioned above exists.	No change.
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, NOTICE AND STANDING			
Public Comment Period for PRD	The comment period was not long enough and was timed badly. People in Alaska are not available for plan review during the summer because they are enjoying the outdoors.	The public noticing provided during the preparation of YTAP exceeded 60 days; the normal public noticing period under AS 38.05.945 is 30 days. A longer period was provided for review to ensure an adequate opportunity for public comment. The timing of this review was during the summer but did not conflict with the fall hunting season.	No change.
Public Comment Period for Intent to Adopt	Thirty days for a public comment period on plan and Issue Response Summary is not enough time. Not everyone has time to review and comment on long technical documents.	Notification of the Public Review Draft began in June 2012. The comment period on the Public Review Draft ended on August 31 st . Thereafter, the Intent to Adopt version was prepared and distributed to the public; the comment deadline for this ended on November 2. This comment period was further extended by the Commissioner to December 3, 2012. In total, the public was able to review and comment on this document for over a five month period.	No change.
Public Notice	Residents throughout the planning area should have been individually notified of the public comment period. They should not have to read a newspaper or see a flyer at the Post Office to find out about a public comment period.	It is impractical for DNR to contact each property owner in a planning area of over 12 million acres. Such noticing is only done for projects affecting a small area, like 50 acres. Rather, DNR uses area and local newspapers, posting at post offices and other sites where people gather locally, as well as other outreach methods – including going to each community that might be affected by the recommendations of the plan within the planning area. This outreach meets (and greatly exceeds) the requirements under AS 38.05.945 for public noticing.	No change.
Public Standing	If a comment is submitted after the deadline, will it still be considered during the review process?	Yes. It is standard practice in the development of area plans to consider all comments, even those submitted after a specific comment deadline.	No change.
Public Noticing and Meetings with Native Communities	Native tribes of Alaska should have been consulted about the plan on a government to government basis. They should not have had to find out about the plan through letters, emails, fliers and newspapers.	The state followed statutory requirements for public noticing under AS 38.05.945. Native Corporations, village and tribal councils within and surrounding the planning area were notified according to statute via the same methods used to notify municipalities, boroughs, federal agencies and the general public. The state held meetings throughout planning area in cities and villages during the scoping and Public Review Draft phases of the planning process that accepted the offer by the state to host them.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	There was a lack of coordination between the state and the Native nations during the development of the plan. The state is required to conduct government to government relations per the Millennium Agreement. The state committed to holding scoping meetings in the YTAP area, including Stevens Village, but no meeting took place in Stevens Village.	The state conducted statewide and plan specific notification to all Alaskans, including Native Communities, in and surrounding the plan area (such as Stevens Village) in compliance with statute (AS 38.05.945). Native communities were notified in the same manner as borough, municipal and federal governments. The state held 8 Public Scoping Meetings in early 2009. Although numerous attempts were made to hold meetings in Tanana, Rampart and Stevens Village, the communities rescheduled the meetings multiple times and ultimately cancelled them. The state would have welcomed the opportunity to host meetings in those communities had the offer to host those meetings been accepted.	No change.
	The state should record all meetings and transcribe them.	The state typically does not record discussions at stakeholder meetings, which tend to be quite informal. However, the state typically does record testimony at public hearings. No public hearings took place during this plan development.	No change.
	Meetings weren't publicized enough. When there are meetings, the state should make sure they are advertised so people know they are taking place.	The state utilizes multiple resources in an effort to ensure that all potentially affected Alaskans are reached. The state followed and exceeded the statutory requirements for public noticing in AS 38.05.945. Meetings were announced via the DNR online public notice system, media releases, public service announcements, web page announcements, fliers in libraries and post offices, letters, emails and display ads in the Fairbanks Daily News Miner. Additionally, DNR notifies local community representatives, government entities, native corporations and tribal councils in writing to ensure they are aware of the planning process.	No change.
	Since the 1985 Tanana Basin Area Plan (TBAP) was issued, changes in the capacity of Tribal governments and ANCSA corporations warrant a more thorough review on how those planning processes merge with the current YTAP process. Joint planning efforts at the local level need to be considered in the YTAP process to, at the minimum, gauge plausible consequences of policy decisions and other activities administered by the State of Alaska during the life of the document.	DNR invites the general public, local communities and other government entities to participate in the planning process. The state followed and exceeded the statutory requirements for public noticing in AS 38.05.945. DNR contacts communities in the planning area, including Native councils and corporations, and offers to hold public meetings and stake holder meetings. DNR holds meetings in all communities who respond to those invitations and are able to attend such meetings.	No change.
	Local residents should be provided the opportunity to change their perspectives on the YTAP plan as the plan is better understood through further meetings and discussions.	Previously addressed. See above.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	Land planning should be conducted in open consultations and involve other State, federal and tribal agencies which are tasked with addressing the legal and social concerns of the YTAP area.	Previously addressed. See above.	No change.
	The State should coordinate with local communities and with ANCSA corporations about contracting opportunities for joint projects, including the process of developing land-use plans and mineral development projects involving timber, precious metals and minerals.	The state does not provide direct resource royalties to the public for development that occurs on state owned land. The state discourages providing preference to any specific community or government entity in business ventures in order to ensure that opportunities are equally available for competitive bidding and participation by all Alaskans.	No change.
	Tribal governments are often the only local governments for rural Alaska communities and Alaska Native villages. DNR and other State agencies should develop a formal consultation plan to ensure Alaskan law is followed specifically the requirement that DNR provide for meaningful participation in the planning process by affected local governments. The YTAP needs to be strengthened in the area of meaningful participation with rural governments.	The development of a formal consultation plan is beyond the scope of this land management plan. As stated above, DNR invited the participation of the native community throughout the planning process and will continue to do so in the future.	No change.
Review Meetings	DNR may want to explore a process of convening annual meetings that would provide a forum for the exchange of management issues that guide the YTAP through its intended 20 year period.	DNR does not typically have annual meetings regarding land use plans. DNR develops area plans for the management, development, disposal or retention of state owned lands and only revises those plans when necessary, which is usually when a plan is outdated (15-20 years). However, DMLW would be interested in further dialog with the native community on how to best to communicate on land management issues.	No change.
RECREATION			
Stampede Area (Wolf Townships)	The land located within management units P80-P86 should be recommended for legislative designation of a State Recreation Site, consistent with the proposal drafted by the Denali Borough currently debated in HB 113 and SB 60. The land surrounding 8 Mile Lake should be managed intensely.	<p>Agree in part. This area has been discussed as a potential State Recreation Area (SRA) for many years and legislation has been introduced to create the SRA.</p> <p>This issue was discussed within DNR and our position is that the promotion of a SRA (or some other administrative entity to manage this area) is really a local matter and that the recommendation its creation should, more properly, come from the local community and its state legislative representatives. However, it is appropriate for the plan to acknowledge that these efforts have occurred and that an entity of the type that has been previously introduced in legislation is compatible with the land use designations and management intent of the units in the Wolf Townships (or some portion of this area) and is considered appropriate for establishment in this area. A new section will be added under the regional Management Summary (p. 3-97) that expresses these concepts.</p>	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	The land located within units P-80-86 should be identified as a Special Use Area through state regulations as the Stampede Special Use Area.	Disagree. It is inappropriate to identify this area as a Special Use Area at this time. The creation of a State Recreation Area will, if it occurs, obviate the need for a special use area. Only if the community is unsuccessful in its efforts to establish a SRA should a management technique of this type be considered. A special use area can be established through an administrative act by DNR and its development is not dependent on the recommendations of this plan.	No change.
	A step-down management plan for the proposed Stampede State Recreation Site should be developed to ensure proper management of the area.	Disagree. It is inappropriate to identify the need for a step-down plan in this plan. The legislation that would establish a SRA would typically require the development of a management plan. This management plan will constitute the step-down plan. However, if an administrative approach involving regulations is considered appropriate, then this recommendation may be appropriate, but at this time the community supports the creation of a SRA.	No change
	Motorized recreational access should be prohibited and allowed only through permit in the Stampede area.	This is an extremely contentious issue and resolution of an issue of this type is the subject of a special use area and it's implementing regulations. This plan is of a general nature and covers over 12 million acres; it is inappropriate for area plans to attempt to resolve land use management issues at the local scale.	No change
Legislative Designation for a Stampede Recreational Area - Support	Why doesn't the plan recommend a State Recreation Area Legislatively Designation for the Stampede Area (Wolf Townships)? The Denali Borough passed a resolution (PC 12-02) supporting the inclusion of the recommendation for this designation in the plan during the previous comment period. However, the plan does not include a recommendation for recreation area and does not reference the potential for it in the "Legislatively Designated Area" section of Chapter 4.	This issue was addressed on Page 11 of the Issue Response Summary. The Department of Natural Resources prefers that local government and their state representatives develop what they believe is the correct management approach for the Stampede Townships area and advance that approach legislatively. The department is not certain as to which form of LDA is appropriate in the area and defers to the aforementioned entities on that aspect. We did agree in the Issue Response Summary, however, to acknowledge that some form of a recreational or public use LDA would be compatible with the land designations of the units that might be affected by an LDA.	Revise. See previous response in the Issue Response Summary.
	The land located within management units P80-P86 should be recommended for legislative designation of a State Recreation Site, consistent with the proposal drafted by the Denali Borough currently debated in HB 113 and SB 60. The land surrounding 8 Mile Lake should be managed intensely. The Issue Response Summary agreement to add information about the potential State Recreation Area to the Regional Management Summary is not adequate. The plan should support the creation of a State Recreation Area and recognize	Agree in part. DNR continues to maintain that the determination of the type of LDA that is appropriate for the Wolf Townships is best determined through the state legislative process, but did agree that the plan would acknowledge that some form of recreation oriented LDA would be consistent with the management intent for this area within YTAP. See previous response. That said, we will also agree to include language that describes the possible formation of a LDA in the Stampede Townships in Chapter 4. This revision will mirror what is said above and in the previous IRS but will also note the various types of LDAs that may be appropriate in this area, which would include a State Recreation Area.	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	the potential for legislative designation within the management intent for each management unit and in chapter 4 in the Legislatively Designated Area section.		
	A contingent recommendation for the development of a step-down plan for the Stampede/Wolf Townships Recreation Area should be included in the Legislatively Designated Area section of Chapter 4.	If a Legislative Designated Area (like a State Recreation Area) is designated by act of the Legislature, the statutory language for such entities includes the development of a management plan to guide the use and management of the recreation area. This is a typical legislative action and there is no need to mandate the development of a step-down management plan when this action will, if a state recreation area is created, be included in the statutory language.	No change.
Stampede State Recreation Area / “Wolf Townships” - Disapprove	<p>Although the plan does not recommend the state recreation area, it does state that the designation would be consistent with the YTAP. If the area is created according to HB 113 and SB 60, the area would be closed to mineral entry.</p> <p>The assertion that the designation is consistent with the plan is in effect a recommendation for a mineral entry closure. There should not be any new mineral entry closures in the planning area.</p> <p>The agreement to the addition of such a statement to Chapter 3 of the plan provided in the Issue Response Summary should be rescinded.</p>	The Issue Response Summary only states that the development of a LDA is compatible with plan designations for the area encompassed by the Wolf Townships; it does not recommend the closure to mineral entry if one is created. The Legislature, when/if it deals with the creation of a LDA for this area, will confront the issue of mineral closure at that time. It is possible for the Legislature to determine that this area should be closed to mineral entry/development, leave it open to entry/development, or allow some form of use of the Mineral Estate but not all forms. This plan does not affect the legislative process.	No change.
GENERAL			
Global Climate Change	The plan should discuss the potential effects of global climate change on the planning area and how it may impact the management of state land and resources.	It is beyond the scope of this plan to identify the effects of climate change. This issue is of statewide scope and is being addressed through other processes at the state and federal levels. Once those processes are completed, it may be possible for the effects of climate change to be identified, but until that occur DNR is unable to respond to requests of this type.	No change.
Hunting Regulation Enforcement	SVC does not want management of intensive land uses within their traditional lands. The increased hunting, fishing and gathering in the area is pressuring the Tribes subsistence resources.	This is an issue for Alaska Department of Fish and Game. DMLW does not manage hunting and fishing.	No change.
Land Classification Responsibilities	Why does the Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mining, Land and Water classify state land? Land should be classified by the state legislature.	<p>The Alaska State Legislature has delegated its authority to classify state land to the Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources in the Alaska Land Act, section AS 38.05.300.</p> <p>Decisions about significant use areas, such as state recreation site, state forest, or a critical habitat area, are deferred to the state legislature and are beyond the scope of this plan.</p>	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Law and Regulation Enforcement	<p>SVC asserts that the state does not prioritize funding for enforcement of agency regulations or trespass in rural areas. Trespass is occurring on private lands, including ANCSA Corporation Lands and Native Allotments. SVC has concurrent territorial jurisdiction on individual Native allotments as Indian Country, and retains concurrent jurisdiction on public lands and non-allotment private lands within our ancestral boundaries. However, due to ANCSA removing SVC Tribal lands as a primary source of potential revenue, SVC does not have the discretionary funds necessary to conduct adequate enforcement of trespass or Tribal law over our traditional lands. The lack of consistent enforcement by either State or Tribal regulatory personnel means that any proposed actions which would increase non-local land use or result in increased access to or pressure on our subsistence resources is generally contrary to the health, social, and economic well-being of Stevens Village Tribal members, and is therefore unacceptable to the Stevens Village Council as a Native Sovereign Nation.</p>	<p>A discussion about this issue is beyond the scope of this area plan and would be inappropriate. Issues pertaining to ANCSA and public law enforcement are under the authority of the Federal Government and the Alaska Department of Public Safety.</p>	No change.
	<p>The State of Alaska does not appropriate adequate resources to address the trespass and safety issues and, therefore, the State should avoid creating additional trespass concerns by making available more land for settlement that would very likely increase trespassing.</p> <p>Minimally funded law enforcement creates a safety risk for local village residents and urban-based non-residents alike. In addition to the harm to subsistence resources and land resources, including those owned by the State, the built environment (camps, buildings and structures) on Native allotments seems to universally attract uninvited trespass by recreational users. Non-local residents using State land disregard posted "no trespassing" signs on Native allotment lands and often remove the signs with malicious intent.</p>	<p>DMLW land use plans are not pertinent to the funding allocations for law enforcement by the Department of Public Safety or the Department of Fish and Game. It would be advisable to contact those agencies with concerns about enforcement. A further discussion about this issue is beyond the scope of this area plan and would be inappropriate.</p>	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	The State should take action to educate the public about private lands and step-up law enforcement activities in the area, especially during hunting season when the trespassing problem peaks.		
Municipal Entitlement	The city of Nenana is evaluating the feasibility of becoming a borough. If so, what areas within the planning area would they be able to select for conveyance? The areas of potential interest are: K-32 an Agriculture unit and K-64, a General Use unit.	A borough of the type envisaged would be allocated a certain amount of state land that it can select in fulfillment of its entitlement. AS 29.65.130 identifies the land classification that are ‘conveyable’ classifications. That is, land can be selected from lands that are either unclassified or are affected by the classifications identified in this section of statute. Both parcels are within conveyable classifications, but the determination of whether it is in the state’s best interest to convey these parcels to a borough would be the subject of a subsequent municipal entitlement decision.	No change.
	In the October 2012 Issue Response Summary, it is suggested that P-88 is affected by a municipal selection. The draft plan’s unit descriptions states that the “easternmost subunit is affected by a municipal selection (ADL 415589).” The ADL appears to be incorrect.	ADL number that was provided in the Resource Allocation Table for Unit P-88 contained a typo. The correct ADL reference is: 415809. This will be corrected in the final plan.	No change.
	There is a remaining municipal entitlement of approximately 9,000 acres due the Denali Borough. While it is likely that the adjudication of their remaining entitlement will follow the recommendations of the YTAP plan, this is not a certainty. It is therefore appropriate to identify a municipal entitlement selection area that can be used in the event that there is a short fall in the amount of state land that can be used to fulfill the borough’s entitlement. This parcel occupies sections 1, 12, and 13 within FM T10SR04W, and is now designated Settlement but has been recommended to be re-designated to Minerals and Habitat in the revised 2012 plan.	It is appropriate to identify this area as a new parcel that can be used, if necessary, to fulfill the Denali Borough’s municipal entitlement if it is determined that at the end of the forthcoming adjudication of the remaining borough selections that additional state land is owed them. The current designation of Minerals would continue to apply but would convert to the designation of Settlement if the DNR adjudication determines that this parcel is necessary to fulfill the borough’s entitlement and if conveyance of this parcel to the borough is appropriate under AS 29.65.	Revise. See response.
Native Allotments	The State should be cautious of designating settlement areas on or near application areas of Native allotments. The long, ongoing conflict regarding State top-claims over allotment land should be explicitly avoided. We also strongly recommend that the State expeditiously settle all outstanding Native allotment claims in the YTAP area, including Aguilar, or title recovery cases. The YTAP plan should set a goal to exhaust all Native allotment claims in a timely manner,	The state only has management authority over state land. Issues pertaining to the conveyance and/or legal settlements of Native allotments and federal land selections are beyond the scope of this area plan. A discussion about these issues would be inappropriate.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	including Native veteran applications.		
Population Growth Projections	Population is expanding throughout the state of Alaska. The plan does not recognize the increased population of McKinley Village and its impact on the region.	Disagree. The plan recognizes that a larger range of services and infrastructure will be needed in the future if development continues at McKinley Village. The land at this location is, however, private and is therefore beyond the authority of this plan. It is the responsibility of the Denali Borough, or another local entity, under their land use authorities, to properly zone (or use other management techniques) for potential growth and provide necessary services in this area.	No change.
Recognition of Subsistence Uses	The plan does not adequately discuss Subsistence use and does not offer any adequate protection for subsistence resources and access to those resources.	Subsistence use is important. It can occur on all state lands and is considered to be a “Generally Allowed Use” under state regulation 11 AAC 96.020, in compliance with applicable state and federal statutes regarding the taking of fish and game. See also above response.	No change.
Recognition of Traditional Uses	The plan did not adequately discuss the historic and traditional uses of the land. More information should be included.	Concur in part. The plan focuses on the classification of the surface uses of state land. Although the historical and traditional uses of the land are important, they are not the primary focus of this plan. It is also inappropriate to depict culturally sensitive sites on area plan maps for the public. For further information about the history and traditional uses of the State of Alaska, please consult the Division of History and Archaeology. However, we do agree that the plan should contain a section on traditional uses, including subsistence. This description would describe the widespread distribution of these uses, indicate their importance, and that the plan recognizes this importance and will take the maintenance of traditional and subsistence uses into consideration in adjudication decisions. It is likely that this section will be included in the Fish and Wildlife section of Chapter 2. By including it in Chapter 2, these criteria will apply throughout the planning region.	Revise. See response.
TBAP Version Revision	The plan states in some areas that it is the 1985 TBAP that is being revised, but says it is the 1991 revision in others. The Issue Response Summary only refers to the 1991 Plan. What plan is being revised?	The plan that is being revised is the 1985 Tanana Basin Area Plan as updated in 1991. Reference to it as the 1991 plan is a technical error and it will be updated throughout the plan.	Revise. See response.
Traditional Use Lands	The planning area affects the SVC traditional use areas. These areas include: Ray River and Isom Creek in the west to Lost Creek and Purgatory in the east, and from the Rodgers Creek Hills in the south to the foothills of the Brooks Range to the north. Our traditional territory north of the Yukon River includes the watersheds of the Ray, Dall and Little Dall Rivers as well as Woodcamp Creek and the headwaters of the Hodzana River. Traditional lands to the south of the Yukon River	Although these lands may be traditionally used by Stevens Village, the lands are state owned or state selected (still under Federal ownership.) The land is thereby open to public use of all Alaskans, including the residents of Stevens Village. The commissioner is required by statute to classify and manage state lands (AS 38.04.065 and AS 38.05.300). The YTAP was developed in accordance with those statutes.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	include the watersheds of Isom Creek, Waldron Creek, Rogers Creek, Alfred Creek, and Old Lost Creek		
	The tribal traditional lands of Stevens Village, Rampart, Tanana, Manley, Minto and Nenana include most of the land within the YTAP. Current traditional activities including hunting, fishing, and gathering occur on lands extending as far out as 80 miles or more from the villages and often overlap each other on the borders. The tribal members and other village residents use the land surrounding the villages to sustain their economy, food security, religion, culture and overall wellbeing. It would be a great detriment to the Alaska Native people and other rural residents who continue to reside in rural areas to ignore the social factors affecting their way-of-life. The residents living within the affected rural communities depend on the ability to continue traditional practices which are contingent on the principles of sustainable yield of fish and wildlife resources and to preserve access to those historically important camps, trails and subsistence areas.	DNR recognizes that residents in rural parts of the state, native and non-native, rely in part on subsistence activities for food and as a means of continuing a traditional and important lifestyle. DNR is required, under the Constitution to make maximum (but prudent) use of state resources and to do so in a manner that provides for the full array of possible uses on state land. In much of the planning area that is described in this comment, state land is to be retained and managed for its intrinsic values of habitat, recreation and subsistence. Areas designated General Use and Habitat fit this mold. However, it is also appropriate where valuable state resources exist to make them available for possible use and to make certain areas of state land available for settlement and agricultural use in response to the Legislative mandate to make state land to all citizens of the state. DNR recognizes that this is, essentially, a balancing of interests and we attempt to achieve a balance that is equitable and fair to all residents, native and non-native. It is never perfect.	No change.
	The State of Alaska doesn't own land north of the PYK line according to the Statehood Act	The state both owns land and has selected land north of the PYK Line (Porcupine, Yukon and Kuskokwim rivers). The PYK line was drafted prior to statehood and is referenced in section 6(b) of the Alaska Statehood Act and Presidential approval of land selection north and west of the line described in section 10 of such Act "shall not apply to any conveyance of land to the State pursuant to subsections (c), (d), and (g) of this section but shall apply to future State selections." The land north and west of the line was included in the new state, but Section 10 gave the president emergency powers to take direct federal control of those areas, The law still exists but has not been exercised to date. A further discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this area plan and would be inappropriate.	No change.
	ANCSA is subject to valid existing rights, the Native People of Alaska have never agreed to this deal we have the valid existing rights to this land.	A discussion about this issue is beyond the scope of this area plan and would be inappropriate.	No change.
Utility Definition	"Utilities" are referred to often in the plan but are not defined in the glossary. Include a definition of "Utilities" in the plan.	Concur. A definition of Utilities will be added to the plan as follows: In the context of this plan, "utilities" refer to public utilities such as light, power, water, and communication, as provided by either a public utility service or private entity, and any equipment or facilities that are	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		necessary to provide or maintain such a service.	

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
MANAGEMENT UNIT SPECIFIC CONCERNS			
Kantishna Region			
Unit K-18 Settlement Designation	It is great to see that more land is being offered for settlement in the YTAP. The land located in and surrounding Unit K-18 in the Kantishna area is ideal for remote recreation staking.	Agree.	No change.
Units K-62 and K-67 General Use Designation	The General Use state land adjacent to the Toklat and Sushana Rivers in units K-62 and K-67 should indicate that the land will be retained by the state in the management intent for those units.	Areas adjacent to the Toklat and Sushana Rivers are contained within two very large management units – K-54 and K-61. The more sensitive habitat areas are included in these two units, and there is no reason to require the retention of state land within unit K-62, which is situated between units K-54 and K-68. State land within K-54 and K-68 are to be retained in state ownership. However, to be clear, add the phrase ‘Retain in state ownership’ to K-54.	Revise. See response.
	The Toklat Springs an area that is critical to habitat. The land in Unit K-67 should be should be managed for habitat values, not general use.	Disagree. The area of the Toklat Springs is not situated within K-67. It is situated in unit K-68; this unit is designated Habitat with the requirement that DNR manage this area for its hydrologic, fish and wildlife, and habitat values. K-67 is a large upland unit situated in excess of six miles from the area of the Toklat Springs and has no relationship or connection to that unit.	No change.
Unit K-68 Tanana Chum Salmon	Unit K-68 should be designated as a Critical Habitat Area to protect Tanana Chum Salmon which is a vital subsistence species.	Concur. K-68 is designated Habitat and is to be managed for its hydrologic, fish and wildlife, and habitat values. The management intent for this unit indicates that the unit is to be retained in state ownership and it is recommended for designation as a state Critical Habitat Area. See above response as well.	No change.
Unit K-69 Settlement Designation	The size of management unit K-69 should be reduced to exclude the lands adjacent to the Toklat River to provide protection of the habitat corridors in that area.	The lands adjacent to the Toklat River, including its riparian area, are situated within units K-61 and K-68, both of which are designated Habitat and Public Recreation-Dispersed. The two units therefore provide protection to river and its riverine areas, and it is not necessary to reduce the size of unit K-69. Further, the existing management intent language for this unit requires the avoidance of wetland and riverine areas.	No change.
	Land disposals surrounding the Toklat River in Unit K-69 should require consultation with ADF&G. Wildlife corridors on either side of the river should be retained.	Wildlife corridors adjacent to the Toklat River are retained already in units K-61 and K-68.	No change.
Unit K-72 Personal Firewood Harvest	Comments received at the aforementioned community meeting in Lake Minchumina indicated that the northeast part of K-72 within T013S0R025W is used extensively for personal wood harvest and that this area should be managed for this purpose.	Concur. Revise the Description section for this unit to indicate that personal wood harvest occurs in this area and revise the management intent section to indicate that the area within T013S0R025W should be managed to permit this form of harvest.	Revise: See response.
Unit K-69	From the map, it appears that unit K-69 is	The maps of the regions are at a very large scale (1:375,000). The	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Boundary	immediately adjacent to and encompasses portions of the Toklat River. Yet in the Issue Response Summary, it was stated that actual development is expected to occur six miles east. If this is the case, the boundary should be shifted east to reflect the actual anticipated development of that unit.	Toklat River Corridor is included in Unit K-61 and is designated for Habitat and land sales are not recommended within that unit. The uplands east of K-61 (in K-69) are designated for Settlement. However, the actual area where land sales are anticipated is further east than the boundary of the management unit. Additionally, any development near the river will be subject to riverine buffers provided in Chapter 2, in Table 2-2 of the plan beginning on page 2-49.	
Parks Highway and West Alaska Range Region			
Unit P-13 Settlement	The land located near Teklanika River, including unit P-13 should be closed to any additional settlement. Settlement density is already too high in that area and it is causing public conflicts and overuse of the area which has resulted in the degradation of the environment. The language for this management unit should be revised to preclude future settlement.	DNR is unaware of the impacts that are described in the comment. Access to this area is good, both winter and summer, the firewood supply is more than adequate, and tracts in this parcel are at least 5 acres in size. In any future disposal DNR must consider the restrictions imposed in previous offerings (nominal 5 acres with a maximum width with 1000' of the Teklanika River, woodlots, and retained land. However, DNR concurs that adding 'settlement density' in the list of items to be considered in future disposals is appropriate. Revise the management intent accordingly, ..." Any future offering must consider the restrictions imposed on previous offerings (nominal 5 acres maximum within 1000' of the Teklanika River, woodlots, settlement density , and retained lands.)	Revise. See response.
Units P45 and P-78 ADF&G Consultation	Land disposals bordering the Parks Highway and Nenana River Corridor (Units P-45 and P-78), should require consultation with ADF&G prior to sale.	Concur. Add 'Consult with ADF&G prior to undertaking land disposals bordering the Nenana River Corridor' to the management intent language of P-45 and P-68.	Revise. See response.
Unit P-60 General Use Designation	Unit P-60 should be retained as a habitat area. It is unclear why the designation was revised to General Use.	Concur. Comments from the public substantiated the use of this area for recreation, particularly for hunting, and review of habitat data indicated the presence of sensitive moose habitat. The designation will be changed to Habitat and Public Recreation – Dispersed. Language will also be included to indicate that the parcel will be retained in state ownership and is to be managed for its public recreation and habitat values and uses.	Revise. See response.
Unit P-60 Habitat Designation	Unit P-60 should be retained in state ownership. It should also retain the existing designation of Ha, Rd.	Concur. Staff has reviewed habitat information and has determined that significant portions of this unit provide important habitat for moose wintering, rutting, and calving. Public comments have indicated that there is widespread use of this unit for public recreation purposes, primarily for hunting. Based on this reevaluation DMLW concurs that this unit should be co-designated Habitat and Public Recreation. Management intent should indicate that the unit is to be managed for its habitat and public recreation values and that the unit is to be retained in state ownership. The designation will be changed to Habitat and Public Recreation.	Revise. See response.
Unit P-87	Unit P-87 contains the Panguingue Subdivision, but also contains six parcels outside of the subdivision	Unit P-87 is designated for Recreation and the tracts in this subdivision are to be retained in state ownership and this is stated already.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Remnant Parcels in land newly designated recreation areas.	which remain on state land. Will these six parcels outside the subdivision also revert to settlement? Or is that meant only to be for the subdivision itself.		
Units P-88 and P-99 Habitat Concern	Portions of units P-88 and P-89 should be designated for Habitat and Recreation –Dispersed. The terrain in the detached western section of P-88 is mostly tundra. The area near Panguingue Creek is abundant with wildlife. The western two sections of P-89 are on the north slope of a ridge and unsuited for settlement.	<p>P-89 is affected by a current decision (ADL 229606) which stipulates that this land will go to the Mental Health Trust unless the state’s responsibility to compensate the Trust can be secured through the conveyance of other state land (than this). The conditions of conveyance have already been identified in this decision and no additional requirements can be added. P-88 is affected by a municipal selection and the establishment of specific requirements prior to the adjudication of this parcel is inappropriate. This is more properly dealt with in the adjudication decision. However, it is appropriate to include in the Description portion of the Resource Allocation Table the factual information that is identified in this comment.</p> <p>P-88: Add: ‘The westernmost parcel consists mostly of tundra and the area near Panguingue Creek is an important habitat area.’</p> <p>P-89: Add: ‘The westernmost area of this unit is situated on the north slope of a ridge.’</p>	Revise. See response.
Lower Tanana Region			
Unit T-25 & T26 Mineral Designation near Fish Lake	The Tribes disagree with the Mineral use designation for the areas to the North and East of T-25. Fish Lake is a recognized sensitive area for fish, wildlife, and water resources and has been already impacted from near-by mining activities. However, the Tribes agree to Mineral designations for those lands directly north of Manley.	<p>The Minerals and Habitat designations for Unit T-26 are appropriate for the unit. The area has a strong habitat presence and is located within the Tofty Mining District, which is highly mineralized and has a large number of active mining claims. Mineral operations are required to follow quality standards to minimize adverse effects on the surface of the land, water quality, and habitat activities. Even if the area were not designated for mineral use, mineral use would not be precluded from occurring in that area. Any mineral entry closure over 640 acres requires legislative approval, which is unlikely for the Tofty Mining District AS 38.05.300).</p> <p>The land located immediately surrounding the Fish Lake is Native owned and is not managed by the state. The state land that surrounds Fish Lake, at a minimum of 2 miles is designated for Habitat and/or Water Resources.</p>	No change.
Unit T-56 General Use Designation	The northernmost parcel of management unit T-56 traverses the boundary of SVC traditional lands at the Isom Creek watershed (T11N, R10W, FM) and is surrounded predominately by Habitat management units. This area is close to the individual Native Allotments of Tribal members as well as being important lands for subsistence hunting and fishing.	Unit T-56 is a large unit (over 200,000 acres), that is designated for General Use, which is considered to be the most appropriate designation for this unit. Based on existing habitat data, the land in unit T-56 does not meet the requirements under 11 AAC 55.230, for Wildlife Habitat classification. But even if reclassified that does not mean that mining or other forms of development could not occur there. All state land is multiple use and open to mineral entry unless closed	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	<p>The YTAP identifies T-56 as being managed for multiple uses and states that development is inappropriate in this unit, but the goes on to identify that there is a possibility that mineral potential may be discovered in the future.</p> <p>The general use category is too non-specific to adequately protect traditional lands this area, especially with the language in the YTAP regarding the potential for future mineral development within this unit. SVC calls for the northernmost parcel of T-56 to be converted to a Habitat management designation and merged with the adjoining T-63 management unit.</p>	<p>(AS 38.05. 195). See Subsurface Resource section of Chapter 2 in the Public Review Draft, beginning on page 2-50 for further information.</p>	
<p>Unit T-61 Settlement Designation</p>	<p>This management unit is located outside but in close proximity to Stevens Village traditional lands. Opening up lands to additional settlement within or near SVC traditional lands will increase the potential for trespass or other inappropriate land uses, and will increase pressure on the region’s diminishing subsistence resources. Such a designation could result in harm to the health, social and economic welfare of Tribal members, and as such is contrary to the interests of the Tribe.</p> <p><i>SVC requests that this unit be reclassified. Our preference would be to combine the unit with the T-60 management unit to the immediate south, however reclassification to General Use and inclusion in the T-56 management unit to the west would be acceptable.</i></p>	<p>The unit is about 15 miles northwest of Livengood and is 25 miles south of Stevens Village and outside the traditional use area of this village, according to the map provided by the Stevens Village Council and stated in their comment letter submitted on December 3, 2012.</p> <p>Settlement is considered the appropriate designation for this unit. Interior Alaska does not have an abundant of Settlement land. Land considered appropriate for settlement are those areas that have existing road and/or water access, topography favorable for construction of shelters and/or homes, access to hunting and fishing areas, and desirable natural features, including scenic views. This unit has these attributes, and is considered appropriate for settlement.</p> <p>The unit is not appropriate for a General Use designation. Land designations identify the primary use on the land. The General Use designation is utilized for areas that either have more than two or more resources or no dominant resource can be determined. In this instance, a predominant land use (Settlement) exists.</p> <p>The unit is not appropriate for either a Habitat or General Use designation. Although there is wildlife on the land, it is varied and does not meet the requirements under 11 AAC 55.230, to be classified for Wildlife Habitat which focus on areas with critical life cycles concentrations.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Unit T-64 Riparian Buffers</p>	<p>The riparian buffers along the Yukon River in management unit T-64 should be extended to at least 1,000’ to accommodate for wildlife habitat that use and migrate along the river.</p>	<p>Agree in part. The riparian buffer along the Yukon River of Unit T-64 will be increased to 300’. Discussions with ADF&G have indicated that a 300’ buffer would be considered the width necessary to accommodate for the wildlife habitat that use and migrate along the river.</p>	<p>Revise. See response.</p>

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Unit T-64 Settlement Designation	<p>This management unit consists of three parcels, two of which are located on the south bank of the Yukon River near the Dalton Highway bridge, and one which is located near the mouth of Isom Creek. All three parcels are located within Stevens Village traditional lands, and are situated near the individual Native Allotments of Stevens Village Tribal members. Opening up lands to additional settlement within SVC traditional lands will increase the potential for trespass or other inappropriate land uses, and will increase pressure on the region's diminishing subsistence resources. Such a designation could result in harm to the health, social and economic welfare of Tribal members, and as such is contrary to the interests of the Tribe.</p> <p><i>SVC calls for all three parcels to be reclassified to Habitat and combined with the adjacent T-63 management units.</i></p>	<p>Although these lands may be traditionally used by Stevens Village, the YTAP pertains to lands that are state owned or state selected (still under Federal ownership.) Most of the land within this unit was previously unclassified. DNR is required by statute to classify the surface uses of state land (AS 38.05.300). It is state policy to provide for maximum use of state land consistent with the public interest, and it is the policy of the State of Alaska to plan and manage state-owned land to establish a balanced combination of land available for both public and private purposes (AS 38.04.005).</p> <p>State land is open to use for all Alaskans, including the residents of Stevens Village. When state land is offered for competitive sale, all Alaskans, including the residents of Stevens Village, are encouraged to participate in the sale.</p> <p>Settlement is the appropriate designation for this unit. Land considered appropriate for settlement are those that have access to an existing road and/or water access, topography favorable for construction of shelters and/or homes, access to hunting and fishing areas, and desirable natural features, including scenic views. This unit has these attributes, and is considered appropriate for settlement.</p> <p>Although the YTAP anticipates the Settlement land in Unit T-64 near the Yukon River will be used for low density settlement and small scale commercial operations, the public demand for settlement land may increase. Natural resource development, mineral operations, and oil and gas development within and north of the planning area are anticipated over life of the plan (20 years).</p> <p>Because of concerns expressed about this unit, however DNR has determined to separate it into three units with more specific Management Intent for each of the units. These units are: T-64a, T-64b, and T-64c. The boundaries for each unit have been reconfigured to adhere more closely with topography. This adjustment has resulted in a decrease in the acreage of land designated for Settlement in the YTAP by 3,500 acres.</p>	Revise. See response.
Unit T-64a Settlement Designation	See Issue for Unit T-64	<p>Unit T-64a is comprised of the two western parcels of the PRD T-64. The portions of southern parcel located in Sections 13,24 and 35 of 11N 11W, FM will be designated for General Use and included in Unit T-56. The remainder of the unit will remain designated for Settlement but the Management Intent for Unit T-64a will read:</p> <p>Land disposals are appropriate during the planning period and are to</p>	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		<p>follow the requirements of the Remote Recreational Cabin Site program (AS 38.05.600). Within the two subunits that constitute this unit parcels should range from 5 to 20 acres in size. It is intended that up to 140 parcels or 2,800 acres be conveyed. At least 80% of the area of these subunits should remain as open space; current vegetation is to be retained in the areas of open space. This state land is to be retained for the purpose of supporting the State’s land disposal program.</p> <p>The following stipulations apply: 1) A 300’ vegetative buffer applies to the Yukon River. Except for access, this buffer shall be maintained in current vegetated condition, 2) access is to be maintained on trails within the unit that have provided traditional means of access for the public, 3) prior to or concurrent with the preparation of a Preliminary Decision, impacts to habitat and traditional use patterns are to be evaluated, and 4) disposals should avoid moose wintering areas if present; consult with ADF&G.</p> <p>See Chapter 2 for specific development guidelines. Unit is affected by Leasehold Location Order #33.”</p>	
Unit T-64b	See Issue for Unit T-64	<p>Unit T-64b is comprised of the northeastern parcel of the PRD Unit T-64. Section 23 and a portion of Section 14 of 12N 10W FM will be incorporated into Unit T-63 and redesignated for Habitat. The remainder of T-64b will remain designated for Settlement and the Management Intent for Unit T-64b will read:</p> <p>“Land disposals (subdivision or pre-surveyed lots) are appropriate during the planning period. Within this unit, parcel size should range from approximately 5 to 20 acres in size. It is intended that no more than 160 parcels (lots) or 1,600 acres be offered. At least 30% and preferably up to 43% of the unit shall remain as open space; current vegetation should be retained in the areas of open space. This state land is to be retained for the purpose of supporting the State’s land disposal program.</p> <p>The following stipulations apply: 1) A 300’ vegetative buffer applies to the Yukon River. Except for access, this buffer shall be maintained in current vegetated condition, 2) access is to be maintained on trails within the unit that have provided traditional means of access for the public, 3) prior to or concurrent with the preparation of a Preliminary Decision, impacts to habitat and traditional use patterns are to be evaluated, and 4) disposals should avoid moose wintering areas if present; consult with ADF&G.</p>	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		See Chapter 2 for specific development guidelines. Unit is affected by Leasehold Location Order #33.”	
T-64c	See Issue for Unit T-64	<p>Unit T-64c is a new unit, formed from a portion of the northcentral parcel of PRD Unit T-64. The land within the unit has been redesignated for Settlement-Commercial. The Management Intent for Unit T-64c will read:</p> <p>“Development of this unit as a commercial node is intended during the planning period.</p> <p>The following stipulations apply: 1) A 300’ vegetative buffer applies to the Yukon River. Except for access, this buffer should be maintained in the current vegetated condition, 2) access is to be maintained on trails within the unit that have provided traditional means of access for the public, 3) prior to or concurrent with the preparation of a Preliminary Decision, impacts to habitat and traditional use patterns are to be evaluated, and 4) disposals are to avoid moose wintering areas if present.</p> <p>See Chapter 2 for specific development guidelines. Unit is affected by Leasehold Location Order #33.”</p>	Revise. See response.
Unit T-65 Agriculture Designation	<p>This management unit consists of two parcels, one of which is located within Stevens Village traditional lands near the Yukon River Bridge, and one parcel located adjacent to the Dalton Highway crossing of Hess Creek, which outside of but very near the southern boundary of our traditional lands. The description of the management unit in the YTAP indicates the speculative nature of the agricultural potential of the parcel, while at the same time pointing out that the unit is valuable as a moose wintering area.</p> <p>Agricultural production in these areas is not compatible with the Stevens Village Land Use Plan. Additionally, opening up lands to additional settlement within SVC traditional lands will increase the potential for trespass or other inappropriate land uses, and will increase pressure on the region’s diminishing subsistence resources. Such a designation could result in harm to the health, social and economic welfare of Tribal members, and as such is contrary to the interests of the Tribe.</p>	<p>Land that is appropriate for Agriculture is not abundant in the Lower Tanana Region of the YTAP, which is why there are only three units designated for Agriculture in the region. Both parcels of this unit are considered to be desirable areas for Agriculture because the soils have been preliminarily identified as appropriate for growing crops and there is existing road access, both of which are very important attributes to consider for agricultural land sales.</p> <p>Based on the concern expressed about the state’s management intent for this management unit, DNR reviewed the appropriateness of this designation. Upon further review, DNR has determined to reduce the size of the unit to adhere more closely with topographical features and to avoid the Trans-Alaska Pipeline (TAPS). The boundary shift has resulted in a reduction of the size of this unit by 200 acres.</p> <p>The western boundary of the northern parcel of this management unit will be shifted east and border the TAPS. Additionally, land that is located in the northeast portion of section 19, land located southeastern portion of section 22, eastern half of section 27 will be removed and managed within Unit T-66 . The southern parcel of this unit will not be revised.</p>	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	<p>SVC calls for the northern parcel near the Yukon River Bridge to be reclassified to Habitat and combined with the adjacent T-63 management unit.</p> <p>SVC requests that the southern parcel near Hess Creek be reclassified as Habitat and combined with the adjacent T-63 management unit.</p>	<p>The Management Intent for this Unit will be revised to read:</p> <p>“Manage for agricultural values and resources. Detailed soils data is incomplete; prior to a determination to proceed with an agricultural land disposal, better soils data must be prepared and the feasibility of agricultural development, more specifically determined. If not determined to be feasible, this unit converts to the classification of Resource Management Land. The Agriculture classification is retained until this decision is made. If found feasible, the Agriculture classification is retained.</p> <p>Within this unit, the average parcel size should be no less than 40 acres and, preferably, have an average size of 60 acres. It is intended that 20 parcels may be offered and in no case may more than 40 parcels be offered. At least 50 % of the unit should remain as open space; current vegetation is to be retained in the areas of open space. This state land is to be retained for the purpose of supporting the State’s agricultural land disposal program.</p> <p>The following stipulations apply: 1) A 100’ building setback applies to parcels located along the Dalton Highway. Except for access, the setback should be maintained in current vegetated condition, 2) access is to be maintained on trails within the unit that have provided traditional means of access for the public, 3) prior to or concurrent with the preparation of a Preliminary Decision, impacts to habitat and traditional use patterns are to be evaluated, and 4) disposals are to avoid moose wintering areas and the TAPS right of way.”</p>	
<p>Unit T-67 General Use Designation</p>	<p>The northernmost parcel of management unit T-67 traverses the boundary of Stevens Village traditional lands within the Waldon Creek and Rogers Creek watersheds. The area is surrounded on all sides by lands managed primarily for habitat values. These lands also contain valuable habitat, and the general use category is too non-specific to adequately protect traditional lands in this area.</p> <p>SVC calls for the northernmost parcel of T-67 to be converted to a Habitat management designation and merged with the adjacent T-68 management unit.</p>	<p>Unit T-67 is a large unit with a retained General Use designation from the TBAP. Based on existing habitat data, the land in unit T-67 does not meet the requirements under 11 AAC 55.230, for Wildlife Habitat classification. But even if reclassified that does not mean that mining or other forms of development could not occur there. All state land is multiple use and open to mineral entry unless closed (AS 38.05.195). See Subsurface Resource section of Chapter 2 in the Public Review Draft, beginning on page 2-50 for further information.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Unit T-89 General Use Designation</p>	<p>Unit T-89: This management unit located on the north side of the Yukon River, and consists of three parcels, all three of which are located within Stevens Village traditional lands. The YTAP identifies the</p>	<p>Unit T-89 consists of unclassified land that was determined to be appropriate for a General Use designation which is now within selection status. The parcels are priority state selections for a variety of reasons, including their proximity to the James Dalton Legislatively</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	<p>presence of coal deposits within this unit and identifies that area as a high priority for state selection, presumably to promote coal development. Given the identification of coal resources and potential development within these units, their management regime is of extreme concern to the Tribe.</p> <p>Two of the T-89 parcels are located west of the Dalton Highway and are divided by management unit T-91. The southwest parcel is located adjacent to two habitat designated management units, T-87 and T-90. Management Unit T-90 contains individual Native Allotments owned by members of the Native Village of Stevens. Given the potential for coal resource development in this area, the general use designation is too non-specific to adequately protect the health, social, and economic welfare of Tribal members in this adjacent parcel.</p> <p>SVC calls for the southwest parcel of T-89 to be converted to a Habitat management designation and merged with either management unit T-87 or T-90.</p>	<p>Designated Area. As stated in the Public Review Draft (Page 3-53), the presence of coal referred to one township only (12N, 12W, FM), not the entirety of the unit. Land classification by itself does not preclude land or mineral development. All state land is open to mineral entry until closed by a mineral order. (AS 38.05.300). A closure of over 640 acres requires legislative approval and this is not considered a practicable action, particularly since state land and resources are intended to be utilized. The plan cannot preclude such development. Further, based on existing habitat data, the land in unit T-89 does not meet the requirements under 11 AAC 55.230, for Wildlife Habitat classification.</p>	
	<p>The Tribes disagree with the Mineral use designation for the areas to the North and East of T-25. Fish Lake is a recognized sensitive area for fish, wildlife, and water resources and has been already impacted from near-by mining activities. However, the Tribes agree to Mineral designations for those lands directly north of Manley.</p>	<p>The Minerals and Habitat designations for Unit T-26 are appropriate for the unit. The area has a strong habitat presence and is located within the Tofty Mining District, which is highly mineralized and has a large number of active mining claims. Mineral operations are required to follow quality standards to minimize adverse effects on the surface of the land, water quality, and habitat activities. Even if the area were not designated for mineral use, mineral use would not be precluded from occurring in that area. Any mineral entry closure over 640 acres requires legislative approval, which is unlikely for the Tofty Mining District AS 38.05.300).</p> <p>The land located immediately surrounding the Fish Lake is Native owned and is not managed by the state. The state land that surrounds Fish Lake, at a minimum of 2 miles is designated for Habitat and/or Water Resources.</p>	No change.
Unit T-98 Transportation Corridor	The Tanana River should be identified as a Transportation Corridor in addition to Recreation and Habitat.	Agree in part. Although the Tanana River is used for transportation, it is not appropriate to identify it as a “transportation corridor”. For the purpose of this plan, a transportation corridor refers to a developed facility, such as a railroad or road system, not a waterbody.	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		The Tanana River is identified in the Lower Tanana Region as management unit T-98, which provides for the protection of public access to and across the river.” The management intent will be revised to include the following statement: “This river is used as a transportation corridor by the public. Maintain public access on trails and easements that provide access...”	

AGENCY COMMENTS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME			
Riparian Buffers	<p>ADF&G does not support the reduction of the riparian buffers along anadromous streams from 150 feet to 100 feet. The 1985/1991 TBAP states that a standard buffer of 200 feet should be established and a reduction could be decreased on a case by case basis.</p> <p>In contrast, the YTAP language states that the standard buffer is 100 feet, but could be increased to 300 feet after consultation with ADF&G. It is highly unlikely that DNR will ever agree to increase a buffer.</p> <p>ADF&G requests that DNR provide for a minimum of 150 feet buffer and building setback adjacent to anadromous streams and important resident fish bearing streams.</p> <p>More development is expected to occur throughout the life of this plan and it is important to ensure these buffers are in place.</p>	<p>The width that DNR uses to establish the appropriate widths for riparian areas is derived from the widths identified in the Forest Resource Practices Act. For the interior areas of the state it is 100'. The Agency Review Draft erroneously identified this width as 150'. The actual applicable width is 100' for this part of Alaska.</p> <p>There is the ability in the management guideline I in the Shorelands and Stream Corridors section of Chapter 2 to increase the width of the riparian buffer if necessary, and based on comments received by ADF&G on both the ARD and PRD we have increased the riparian buffer widths on specific streams based on recommendations.</p>	No change.
Lower Tanana Region			
Unit T-04	Language should be reworded to state: "Although no specific fish or wildlife life stage concentrations are known to occur..."	Concur. Language will be revised as recommended to state: "Although no specific fish or wildlife stage concentrations are known to occur..."	Revise. See response.
Unit T-12	Due to the significance of this are for moose and other wildlife and fishery resources, no disposal should occur within 200 feet of the confluence of the Chitanana and Tanana Rivers.	Concur. Buffer will be increased to 200 feet.	Revise. See response.
Unit T-46	It is incorrect to say Wood Bison are present in the area. They have not yet been reintroduced into the area.	Concur. Information about Wood Bison in Unit T-46 will be stricken from the plan.	Revise. See response.
Kantishna Region			
Unit K-16	ADF&G should be consulted prior to any decision to offer land for disposal around Mooseheart Lake to ensure adequate protection of the riparian habitat and resources there.	Concur. Include under management intent: 'ADF&G should be consulted prior to any decision to offer land for disposal around Mooseheart Lake to ensure adequate protection of riparian habitats and resources'.	Revise. See response.
Unit K-24	ADF&G should be consulted prior to any decision to offer land for disposal around Kindanina and	Concur. Include under management intent: 'ADF&G should be consulted be consulted prior to any decision to offer land for disposal	Revise: See Response

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	Geskakmina Lakes to ensure adequate protection of the riparian habitat and resources there.	around Kindanina and Geskakmina Lakes to ensure adequate protection of riparian habitats and resources.’	
Unit K-37	ADF&G should be consulted prior to any forestry projects to ensure protection of fish and wildlife resources.	Concur. Include under management intent: ‘ADF&G should be consulted prior to any forestry projects to ensure protection of fish and wildlife resources.’	Revise. See response.
Unit K-46	Northern Pike are found in Wein Lake and provide sport fishing opportunities for the public. Public access to the lake should be maintained to and around the lake. ADF&G recommends the establishment of a Public Use Site at the lake to ensure the access. There is also a landing strip at the north end of the lake which should be referenced in the description of the unit. The land on the eastern portion of Wein lake is wet and is not appropriate for settlement.	Concur in part. Add: under management intent, ‘Public access should be maintained to and along the lake to the extent feasible. A public use site, as described in Chapter 2, should be reserved or established in order to ensure access.’ Add, under Description, ‘There is also a landing strip at the north end of Wein Lake’.	Revise. See response.
Unit K-65	ADF&G stocks Dune Lake. Public access should be maintained and a public use site should be established or reserved to ensure the access.	Add: under management intent, ‘Access should be maintained to and along the lake and a public use site established or reserved to ensure public access.’	Revise. See response.
Unit K-76	Based on comments received at the public meeting held in Lake Minchumina in August, 2012, the community does not use this area for personal wood harvest, and believes that this unit has the characteristics of and should managed in a manner similar to K-72, which is designated General Use.	Concur. Delete unit K-76 and merge this area with K-72. (Note: This unit is also addressed in the public comments analysis)	Revise. See response.
Unit K-72	Comments received at the aforementioned community meeting in Lake Minchumina indicated that the northeast part of K-72 within T013S0R025W is used extensively for personal wood harvest and that this area should be managed for this purpose.	Concur. Revise the Description section for this unit to indicate that personal wood harvest occurs in this area and revise the management intent section to indicate that the area within T013S0R025W should be managed to permit this form of harvest.	Revise. See response.
Parks Highway and West Alaska Range Region			
Unit P-01	Although there are no Caribou present in the unit at this time, this could change throughout the life of the plan. Information regarding Caribou should be removed from this unit description.	Concur. Delete reference to caribou.	Revise. See response.
Unit P-38	The riparian buffer adjacent to Wood River should be 150 – 200 feet in order to protect this important fish and wildlife resource.	Concur. Revise recommendation to state that the riparian buffer width is 150’.	Revise. See response.
Unit P-39	ADF&G does not find this unit to be appropriate for additional land disposals because the area is fire prone and there is limited access to the area. There is no access in the summer and winter access is only provided on the Rex Trail, which is restricted by DNR due to due to trail damage.	Agree in part. While DNR does not believe it appropriate to prohibit additional land disposals in this unit, we acknowledge that the unit is in a fire prone area and that a substantial fire risk exists. Add to management intent: ‘During project development, the wild land fire risk will be evaluated and, if necessary, areas may be restricted, or excluded from, development within the proposed development area.’	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
P-41	ADF&G should be consulted prior to any forestry projects to ensure protection of fish and wildlife resources.	Concur. Add to management intent: 'ADF&G should be consulted prior to any forestry projects to ensure protection of fish and wildlife resources.'	Revise. See response.
P-42	A 150 feet riparian buffer should be reserved adjacent to the Little Delta River prior to land disposal to protect habitat and water quality.	Concur. Revise recommendation to state that the riparian buffer width is 150'.	Revise. See response.
P-44	DNR should retain some land around the lakes to ensure public access. Access should be determined prior to land disposal and included within this plan.	This issue is dealt with at length under various of the management guidelines in the Settlement section of Chapter 2. No change is warranted.	No change.
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE			
Grazing	DAG recommends adding a section to the plan to outline the management intent for "Grazing". Suggested language will be provided by DAG consistent with other recent Area Plans.	Concur: Add a new subsection (grazing) under the Agricultural section of Chapter 2. See attachment for specific wording.	Revise. See response.
Agriculture Section of Chapter 2	DAG identified a number of issues that require change to the current wording of this section. Under line 10 add 'and its distribution' after 'production; under B. line 1, indicate that units less than 40 acres may be sold if, in the opinion of the Division, this is in the best interest of the state; and on line 11, p. 2-6, indicate that agricultural land cannot be used for other purposes that would, if authorized, preclude its eventual use for agriculture.	Concur. Revise: Under line 10, p. 2-5, add 'and its distribution' after the word 'production; under B. line 1, p. 2-6, indicate that units less than 40 acres may be sold if, in the opinion of the Division, this is in the best interest of the state; and on line 11, p. 2-6, indicate that agricultural land cannot be used for other purposes that would preclude its eventual use for agriculture.	Revise. See response.
General Use Units	DMLW notes that units designated General Use will frequently include the statement that the land affected by the designation is intended to be retained in state ownership, that it is unlikely that development will take place (owing to terrain and inaccessibility), and that only certain types of development are considered appropriate – especially those type of projects providing a public benefit. DMLW is concerned that the last requirement, which makes development difficult, is too encompassing and that there needs to be some flexibility to accommodate projects that are unexpected but may be appropriate at a particular site.	Concur. Recommend changing the management intent for those units of a General Use designation that include this language. Specifically, change to the following: "... except for certain types of utilities, communications facilities, roads and similar type of projects that provide a general public benefit" <u>or for other types of projects if it is determined that their authorization would be in the overall best interest of the state.</u> "	Revise. See response.
Preference Right Application (ADL 419356)	The applicant for a preference right (10 acres within SE1/4 of Section 15 and the NE1/4 of Section 22, T4N, R13W, FM) applied for and was granted a Land Use Permit (LAS 28411) but now wants to purchase the land. DMLW has begun adjudicating the case but will not be able to reach a decision until sometime after the approval of YTAP. Rather than	Concur. Change the management intent/guidelines for unit T-41 to stipulate that the classification of the preference right parcel will automatically change to Settlement if the preference right application is approved by the state. (If it is not approved, the classification of this 10-acres parcel retains its current classification (Forestry).	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	require the amendment of the plan shortly after it had been approved, it would be more practical to recognize this situation and provide for reclassification of the 10 acre parcel if the preference right adjudication determines that the application meets the requirements of statute and should be approved.		
DIVISION OF FORESTRY			
Biomass	DOF recommends adding a definition for “Woody Biomass” into the glossary of the plan, in place of those areas within the plan where only “biomass” is used in reference to forest derived fiber and other woody products, including timber and sawlogs. This definition is designed to meet our use of the term in Alaska for forest management, harvest and energy utilization. Insert the following definition: Woody Biomass refers to the aboveground and below ground portions of trees and woody plants.	Concur. Definition for “Woody Biomass” will be added to the glossary of the plan as recommended: “Woody Biomass refers to the aboveground and below ground portions of trees and woody plan.”	Revise. See response.
Chapter 2 Forestry Section, Page 2-21, lines 5-11	Refer to “biomass” as “woody biomass” and add in mention of black spruce and aspen as additional woody biomass sources in this opening paragraph in lines 8 and 9. Insert the following sentence after line 11: Black spruce and aspen are now recognized as an abundant source of woody biomass. Communities are beginning to utilize woody biomass for heating public schools.	Concur. “Woody biomass” will be added to lines 8 and 9. The recommended sentence will be added after line 11.	Revise. See response.
Forestry Goals	DOF recommends a revision to the text in the Forestry Section of Chapter 2 for the Forestry management goal: ‘Provision for Biomass for Public Purposes’ as follows: “DNR shall support actions to develop sustainable sources of energy for meeting community needs from renewable woody biomass obtained from state forest or other state lands.”	Concur. Text will be revised as recommended by DOF in the Forestry section management goal for ‘Provision of Biomass for Public Purposes’ as follows: “DNR shall support actions to develop sustainable sources of energy for meeting community needs from renewable woody biomass obtained from state forest or other state lands.”	Revise. See response.
Unit T-22	In second description. Revise last sentence to read: “The area is a likely source of woody biomass.”	Concur. Text will be revised.	Revise. See response.
Unit K-66	In first description, revise biomass sentence to read: “Pole timber and fire-killed timber exist and are suitable for woody biomass utilization through winter road access.”	Concur. Revise text as recommended.	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Unit K-70	In first description, revise biomass sentence to read: "Pole timber and fire-killed timber exist and are suitable for woody biomass utilization through winter road access."	Concur. Revise text as recommended.	Revise. See response.
Glossary Text Revisions	<p>Page A-1, line 37 - add an "s" to Land in ANILCA</p> <p>Page A- 4, line 24 – add "and" to "FRPA. See Forest Resources and Practices Act.</p> <p>Page A-12, line 40 – add new definition for 'woody biomass': Woody Biomass refers to the aboveground and belowground portions of trees and woody plants.</p>	<p>Concur. Text will be modified as recommended:</p> <p>Page A-1, line 37 - add an "s" to Land in ANILCA</p> <p>Page A- 4, line 24 – add "and" to "FRPA. See Forest Resources and Practices Act.</p> <p>Page A-12, line 40 – add new definition for 'woody biomass': Woody Biomass refers to the aboveground and belowground portions of trees and woody plants.</p>	Revise. See response.
DIVISION OF OIL & GAS			
Increased Interest in Oil and Gas Exploration in Interior Alaska	The YTAP does not reference the increasing interest in Oil & Gas exploration in the northern region. The state legislature has placed a 100 mile circle around Fairbanks for Oil & Gas exploration tax credits. Although this is a revenue issue, it is worth noting the interest.	<p>Correct. The plan will be revised to include language regarding the increasing interest in Oil and Gas development in the northern region. The area within YTAP that is affected by the 100 mile circle around Fairbanks is within the Parks Highway & West Alaska Range Region. This area includes portions of unit P-37. The Description section in the RAT for unit P-37 will be revised to include information about the state legislative interest in oil and gas development.</p> <p>The reminder of the land within that area of legislative interest is included in the Eastern Tanana Basin Area Plan, which is currently being drafted.</p>	Revise. See response.
Management Intent for Oil & Gas and Geothermal Resources	<p>The YTAP discussions about subsurface resources refer only to locatable minerals, such as mining. It is unclear in the plan as to the State's unified management and land use provisions for oil and gas and geothermal resources, leasing and development throughout the planning area.</p> <p>The plan needs to specifically discuss the management intent related to these resources to assure access, leasing, exploration and development of oil and gas and geothermal subsurface resources.</p>	<p>Agree in part. Although the language regarding Oil & Gas development could be expanded upon, DMLW does not have the statutory authority to be involved in recommendations, planning and decision making for Oil & Gas development.</p> <p>The planning and decision making process for Oil & Gas development occurs under AS 38.05.180, whereby DMLW land planning authority is derived from AS 38.04.065. DMLW thereby defers all decisions regarding the authorization process for Oil & Gas development. Information regarding the differing statutory authorities is provided in Chapter 2, Subsurface Resources section, Management Guideline 'G' on page 2-52.</p> <p>It is reasonable to include language to ensure that access should be reserved to areas being explored or developed for Oil & Gas in the plan. Oil & Gas and Geothermal resources will be specified in the Public Access section of Chapter 2 in Management Guideline 'E':</p>	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		“Access for Development”.	
	The plan appears to neither prohibit or support oil and gas exploration, geothermal, leasing and development. DOG supports adding a specific discussion about potential transportation access corridors and the potential for oil and gas and geothermal activities on State land, including forestry lands, on a case by case basis.	The plan is supportive of the development of natural resources throughout the planning area. Oil & Gas Development is not prohibited within the planning area and can occur throughout the planning area, including land that is closed to mineral entry, regardless of the surface classification. However, development of those resources within LDA’s is subject to the management plans that are specific for those areas. See above responses regarding recommendations for Oil & Gas development and the preservation of access to those resources.	No change.
	The Forestry section of Chapter 2 is silent about Oil & Gas exploration, leasing and development. There is a significant amount of land recommended for inclusion in the Tanana Valley State Forest. Language regarding oil and gas access and development needs to be included, consistent with the Tanana Valley State Forest Management Plan: “Generally, oil and gas exploration, development.	The resource sections in chapter 2 are written specifically within the context of each given resource. Management guidelines are provided separately for each resource. Oil & Gas development is addressed in the Sub-Surface Resources section. See above response regarding the allowance of Oil & Gas exploration throughout the planning area. Development of those resources must adhere to the management plan for each LDA that development is going to occur.	No change.
	The plan should discuss the current and future petroleum potential for the Nenana Basin. There is an existing exploration license for the area.	Concur. Information regarding the petroleum potential for the Nenana Basin will be added to the plan to the Subsurface Resources section of Chapter 2, in Management Guideline ‘G’. “The potential for petroleum reserves within the YTAP are believed to be high in the Nenana River Basin and exploration is underway (2012) in that area, within the Lower Tanana and Kantishna Regions, including land within the Minto Flats State Game Refuge.”	Revise. See response.
	Information regarding Geothermal energy needs to be added to the plan in areas of the plan that discuss energy development. Include “Geothermal” on pages 1-10, 2-52, 3-64, and 3-65. Insert this text on page 2-52: “ Geothermal Resources – The presence of geothermal resources, to support renewable energy development, may be likely within the planning area. Access and development of geothermal deposits at Chena Hot Springs, in the vicinity of Fairbanks, shows that there are known resources, and potential for location and use of geothermal resources for renewable energy in the area (Chena Hot Springs	Concur. “Geothermal Resources” as defined in AS 41.06.060 will be added to the glossary of the plan. Geothermal Resources will be referenced in each of the recommended sections of the plan as requested. The recommended language for a management goal for Geothermal Resources will be added to the Subsurface Resources section of the plan. However, the Chena Hot Springs will not be referenced in that language. Chena Hot Springs are not within YTAP. The Chena Hot Springs are located within the eastern side of the Tanana Basin Area Plan, not YTAP and it will be addressed in the Eastern Tanana Basin Area Plan which is currently under development. Manley Hot Springs will be inserted into the text in place of Chena Hot Springs. Manley Hot Springs is the corollary location to Chena Hot Springs within YTAP. Insert “The vicinity of the community of Manley is an active	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	<p>2012).</p> <p>The exploration and development of geothermal resources follows the planning processes under AS 41.06, and 38.05.181. The land use designations of the plan are multiple use in character and do not preclude geothermal leasing and resources development.</p> <p>The exploration and development of geothermal resources follows the planning process under AS.41.06 and 38.05.181. The land designations of the plan are multiple use in character and do not preclude geothermal leasing and resource development.”</p>	<p>geothermal area and it will be an appropriate area for the development of geothermal resources. This assertion is substantiated by a 2012 Special Report (66) written by the Alaska Department of Natural Resources Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys. Page 132 states: <i>“The community of Manley is essentially located at Manley Hot Springs, which includes a high enough flow rate of high-temperature water to warrant further consideration of the resource for local energy.”</i></p>	
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Road Development T-26	<p>The YTAP mentions a road from Fairbanks to Nome. Though DOT&PF currently isn’t funding a project that will connect Fairbanks and Nome, we <i>are</i> funding a project to complete a road between Manley Hot Springs and Tanana. The likely route of this new road, which will connect the end of the existing Tofty Road with Tanana, will cross T-26 (designated as Mi, Ha). The management intent for this unit number does not allow for “certain types of utilities, communication facilities, roads, and similar types of projects that provide a general public benefit.” For this reason, DOT&PF is requesting that the management intent for units T-26 and T-28 (which contains the existing portion of the Tofty Road) take into account the upgrade and extension of the Tofty Road that may impact areas within these units.</p>	<p>Concur. Management intent for T-26 will be revised to allow “certain types of utilities, communication facilities, roads, and similar types of projects that provide a general public benefit.” Text regarding future road development will be modified to focus on the road to Tanana, not the road to Nome.</p>	Revise. See response.
Access, Resources and uses of State Land section within the Lower Tanana Region of Chapter 3 – Road to Nome	<p>YTAP mentions the proposed route from Fairbanks to Nome by an extension of the Elliott Highway. This road is not under development yet. This should be made clear in the plan.</p>	<p>Disagree. Plan currently states :(page 3-18, Line 25): “The Elliott Highway is proposed for expansion as a land route to Nome.” No other information, including timelines for construction are included because the project has not begun.</p>	No change.
Access, Resources and uses of State Land section within the Lower Tanana Region	<p>YTAP does not mention the route that is currently being funded for construction by ADOT&PF from Manley Hot Springs to Tanana. It mentions an unimproved road, which is actually the current</p>	<p>Concur. The description of the route from Manley Hot Springs to Tanana as an unimproved road on page 3-18, line 24, is inaccurate and it will be revised to the following: “A road from Manley Hot Springs to Tanana has received funding from ADOT&PF. Current land access</p>	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
of Chapter 3 – Manley Hot Springs to Tanana Road	alignment for the road, not an actual public road.	to Tanana from that area is provided along RS 2477 routes.”	
Transportation Section Dropped from YTAP	Why was the Transportation section dropped from the YTAP? It had been included within the TBAP. Consider adding that section into the plan.	Transportation is no longer included as an individual section in the revised area plans. Transportation is an aspect discussed in the Public Access section of the plan. Road development and planning is the function of the Department of Transportation.	No change.
DMLW Management Intent for Other Agencies (P. 1-12)	The plan states that it does not provide management intent for prescribing actions and policies for agencies and governments other than DNR. Yet, this does not appear to be the case when it pertains to ADF&G in Chapter 2, in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section.	DMLW often works in consultation with other agencies and divisions during the permitting and leasing processes in an effort to minimize or avoid adverse impacts to state resources. ADF&G is consulted when there is potential for adverse impacts on habitat and fish and wildlife resources. Mitigation stipulations may be established during the permitting or leasing process. Consulting another agency is not the same as prescribing actions or policies for that agency. Rather, it is a method to ensure the responsible development of state resources.	No change.
Precedence of subsurface resources over surface resources.	The plan does not clarify that the development of subsurface resources may have a higher priority than the surface resources. Subsurface resources, such as material sites, have to be developed where they are found. As written, YTAP calls for avoidance or minimization of conflicts between users. It is difficult to appreciate how this will be adjudicated where you have both proposed subsurface development and the surface goals of “protection of the natural ecosystem”, or “maintain or enhance the quality of the natural environment,” “provide opportunities to view wildlife and the natural environment”, and “protect recreational resources including public access and visual resources.” These are all valid goals for the management of state lands, there just needs to be some acknowledgement that they may not apply everywhere. This should be standard language in every area plan.	<p>The management goals within this plan that refer to protection or minimization of adverse effects on the environment and the protection of public access to recreational areas are valid goals that can coexist with development. This is particularly true if the other agencies who manage fish and wildlife or recreational resources are consulted during the permitting or leasing process. (See above response.)</p> <p>In accordance with AS 38.05.300, the plan includes language in Chapter 2 explaining that subsurface resources are an allowable use on all land that is open to mineral entry. Subsurface uses may take precedence over surface resources and stipulations may be required during the authorization process to mitigate the impact on the surface uses. This information can be found in the Introduction section of Chapter 2, in framework D, on page 2-3. Further information is included in the Subsurface Resources section of Chapter 2, in Management Guideline B, on page 2-50. Both the Material Sites (p. 2-30-31) and Subsurface Resources sections (p. 2-50- 53) in Chapter 2 state that material s extraction and mineral development on state land can occur regardless of the surface classification. Material site development is only precluded if the plan prohibits such uses (it does not) and subsurface use is only prohibited if an area is closed to mineral entry.</p> <p>The plan recommends preferred locations for material sites and advises for avoidance of conflicts with surface uses, such as fish and wildlife and settlement areas, but does not state that they are prohibited from any given area. (See Material Sites Management Guidelines.)</p>	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
		The YTAP does not recommend any new mineral closures. Management Guideline B, Open to Mineral Entry, states the following: “By statute, all state lands are open to mineral location unless specifically closed. Where an area is open to mineral location, a miner has the right to stake a mining location regardless of the surface use designation or classification.”	
Material Sites	Include “material sites” on page 2-3, line 18 as follows: “Except in areas closed to mineral entry, subsurface uses, including material sites , are considered an allowable use but must take into consideration the effects upon surface uses”	Disagree. It is not accurate to include material sites in a statement regarding subsurface resources because material sites are considered a surface use. The statement regarding subsurface resources on page 2-3, line 18, is meant to be an overarching statement regarding subsurface uses. All state land is multiple use land. Unlike mineral development, material sites are not prohibited by Mineral Closing Orders. The siting of material sites is determined during the land disposal, road or facility development, and associated permitting processes.	No change.
Mitigation for adverse effects on wildlife and habitat.	Include “to the extent feasible and prudent” on page 2-13, line 3. Adverse effects on fish and wildlife and habitat should not be considered as a priority over resource development.	Disagree. Fish and Wildlife Habitat are also a state resource. One of many resources in fact, which need to be taken into consideration during the permitting or land disposal process. Decisions are based on the benefit to the public interest as discussed in footnote 4 on page 2-13, which states: “The types and amounts of mitigation requirements are determined through the balancing of potential impacts against the potential benefits of a given project, and DNR, though a written determination, may determine that the impacts that are associated with a project are likely and are adverse, but are acceptable in the determination of the state’s best interest. This does not preclude DNR from imposing those stipulations necessary to protect the public interest.” See also above response.	No change.
Waterfowl differentiation of Trumpeter Swans	Why are ‘Trumpeter Swans’ identified as a separate species from waterfowl? They should be included within that general category.	Trumpeter Swans are separated because their status as a species is tenuous. Although the Trumpeter Swan population has been recovering in the Alaska, they are endangered in many states and Canada and are afforded special protection. Because of this, they are identified as a species that requires strong consideration in the plan. DNR area plans for the past 20 years or more have identified this species as requiring special management attention.	No Change.
Allowing uses in Fish and Wildlife Habitats (Ha) Chapter 2, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Management Guideline ‘B’. Include reference to	Include a reference to guideline ‘R’ on page 2-15, in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section of chapter 2, guideline B ‘Allowing Uses in Fish and Wildlife’, states, “Uses not consistent with a plan designation or not authorized in management intent statement and that, if permitted would result in the degradation of the resource(s) within areas designated “Ha”, are to be considered incompatible and are not to be	Concur. Although the protection of Fish and Wildlife Habitat is the highest priority within areas that are designated for ‘Ha’, there may be cases when development is in the best interest for the public. In those instances, stipulations to mitigate adverse impacts against fish and wildlife habitat may be imposed. A reference to guideline ‘R’ will be included within guideline ‘B’ of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat area of chapter 2 as requested.	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Management Guideline ‘R’	authorized.” Guideline “R” on page 2-19, ‘Protection of Resources and Balancing of Impacts with Potential Development., states that development “Uses that are not compatible with these uses and resources are to be made compatible through the use of stipulations.		
Management Guideline ‘M’ of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat’ management guidelines of Chapter 2 are too restrictive.	Management Guideline ‘M’ is too restrictive. Stating that development and surface entry should not occur within one quarter mile of a Trumpeter Swan Nesting Area and particularly between April 1 st and August 31 st , is a strict prohibition that it is direct conflict with the construction season and is not in the best interest of the public.	Disagree. This management guideline is not a prohibition. Prohibitions are exemplified by “shall”, not “should” or “will”, See Appendix A for definitions of terminology. It is in the public’s best interest to advise adjudicators to work with both ADF&G and permit applicants to determine the appropriate stipulations for development, including the siting of facilities and surface entry, to mitigate adverse effects on habitat in Trumpeter Swan nesting areas. Establishing development stipulations to mitigate adverse effects on fish and wildlife habitat is advised throughout the plan. See guideline ‘R’ of the Fish and Wildlife section of the plan.	No change.
Material site development stipulations.	Mining and subsurface use development are referenced in guideline ‘R’ of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat area of the plan, but surface entry and material sites are not. Include ‘material sites’ and ‘surface entry’ development in management guideline ‘R’.	Concur. The last sentence in paragraph 2 of guideline ‘R’ of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat area will be revised to state: “It is also recognized that the development of specific subsurface resources may take precedence over surface uses. Material site development and construction access may also take precedence in certain instances. Establish siting stipulations where appropriate.”	Revise. See response.
Material Site Management Guidelines in Chapter 2	Most of the management guidelines for ‘Material Sites’ should be rewritten to better reflect the priorities of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. More information is needed to describe material sites. Re-write Management Guidelines A, B, and C for consistency with a DOTPF management approach.	Disagree. This purpose of this area plan is to provide guidance to adjudicators of the Department of Natural Resources. The management guidelines offer direction to adjudicators on the appropriate actions and considerations that must be made during the authorization process. Management guidelines are written based on the priorities of the Department of Natural Resources, not the Department of Transportation.	No change.
Material Site Description	Add an introduction section about Material Sites with the following wording: “Material resources include sand, gravel and rock used in construction and maintenance and infrastructure vital to the states’ economic development. Material sites occupy a small portion of the planning area and are generally located within/near transportation corridors.	Agree in part. Although ‘materials’ are defined in the glossary, ‘material sites’ are not. The following definition of material sites will be added to the plan. Additionally, this wording will be included in the introduction of this section. “Material Sites” are the sites where materials are developed. They are generally located within or near transportation corridors.”	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Management Guideline 'A'	Remove the statements: "Using materials from wetlands or lakes should be avoided unless no feasible public upland alternative exists." Because 'wetlands' can have various meanings; material sites mine often below the water table, creating ponds. This statement if interpreted strictly, would exclude many existing and future sites from consideration.	Disagree. It is within the public's best interest to avoid development in lakes and wetlands if a reasonable upland alternative exists. This guideline does not prohibit the use of existing material sites or preclude the development of future sites.	No change.
Management Guideline 'A'	Remove the statement: Material sites shall be maintained in public ownership unless the management intent language for a specific management unit indicates that it may be appropriate for alternative uses	Disagree. Generally, it is within the public's best interest to retain material sites in state ownership.	No change.
Management Guideline 'B'	Delete Management Guideline 'B'; Maintaining Other Uses and Resources When Siting, Operating or Closing Material Sites.	Disagree. It is imperative to provide guidance to DMLW adjudicators' regarding the issues that may arise during the authorization process as they pertain to material sites and inform them of considerations they should make for conflict resolution. Management guidelines are written based on the priorities of the Department of Natural Resources, not the Department of Transportation.	No change.
Management Guideline Addition	Add a Management Guideline regarding the Disposal of materials administered under AS 38.05.110, AS 05.120 and 11 AAC 71. Materials sites are subsurface resources that occur in specific geologic locations. It is recognized that the use and development of material resources will create some level and area of impact. Nonetheless, the state may determine that the development of material resources is appropriate, with appropriate stipulations. It is also recognized that the development of specific material resources may take precedence over surface uses.	Concur. A management guideline with the suggested wording will be added to the management guidelines for Material Sites, although this resource must be described as a surface resource. Add: Materials sites are surface resources that occur in specific geologic locations. It is recognized that the use and development of material resources will create some level and area of impact. Nonetheless, the state may determine that the development of material resources is appropriate, with appropriate stipulations. It is also recognized that the development of specific material resources may take precedence over surface uses.	Revise. See response.
Management Guideline 'H'.	How will the State determine if it is in the best interest of the state to retain and protect the "scenic areas of exceptional value"?	This determination will be made during the authorization process on a case by case basis.	No change.
Management Guideline 'G'	Add language regarding the effect of community comprehensive plans on page 2-36, lines 12-16 to management guideline 'G'.	Disagree. The relationship between local plans and the state area plans are adequately described in the Planning and Coordination section.	No change.
Material sites near Shorelands and Stream Corridors	Language should be added to allow for material sites similar to Management Guideline 'R' in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section of Chapter 2.	Disagree. This issue is addressed in the Material Sites section of Chapter 2, on page 2-31, in Management Guideline 'F', which refers the adjudicator to refer to DMLW on-line procedures pertinent to riparian buffers and Management Guidelines B, D, E an H in the "Shorelands and Stream Corridors" section of Chapter 2.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Public Access	Add “access corridors” to the public access goal.	Access corridors are addressed in the Public Access section of the plan. See the Public Access Section of Chapter 2, Section D, footnote 20 on page 2-57.	No change.
Public Access Management Guideline ‘E’	It is unacceptable to necessitate consultation with ADF&G to determine whether or not an access road will cause detriment to fish and wildlife habitat and populations.	Disagree. It is in the best interest of the public for adjudicators to consult with ADF&G to obtain fish and wildlife habitat information prior to issuing an authorization for an access road. It is important for adjudicators to be able to make informed decisions and develop the appropriate stipulations necessary to minimize adverse impacts on surface uses, which includes fish and wildlife habitat.	No change.
Public Access Management Guideline ‘F’; Alignment with Crossings	The way this guideline is written, it sounds like infrastructure must be designed to cross trails at right angles. Visibility and safety should be taken into consideration. This needs to be re-written or removed.	Concur. The language in this guideline will be revised as follows: “When it is necessary for power lines, pipelines or roads to cross trails, crossing should be at a 90-degree angle where possible, with consideration for visibility and public safety. Vegetative screening should be preserved at trail crossings.”	Revise. See response.
Land Use Designations and Co-Designations	Include a modified version of management guideline ‘R’ in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section of Chapter 2 after the discussions on Primary Designated Use and Co-Designated Use.	Disagree. The discussion is in reference to Land Use Designations for management units, not management guidelines. An explanation of Mineral and Coal Designations with Wildlife Habitat is in Chapter 3, on page 3-8. Additional information regarding the effects of subsurface development on fish and wildlife habitats is contained in the Fish and Wildlife Habitats section of Chapter 2, which begins on page 2-12. As stated above, material site development is considered a surface use, not a subsurface use.	No change.
Materials Designations	Include “silt” in the list of materials that can be extracted.	Concur. Silt will be added to this section and to the list of materials for extraction in the glossary.	Revise. See response.
Material Sites as an allowable and appropriate use in the Resource Allocation Tables.	The tables do not identify the types of uses, including material sites that might be appropriate within each management unit. This statement is inaccurate and should be stricken.	Agree in part. Every use that may be appropriate for a given unit is not outlined within the Resource Allocation Table. Rather the general management approach to surface or subsurface use is discussed in Chapter 2. Material sites are generally allowed unless they are identified as a use that is not allowed within the management intent for a given unit. (This is an infrequent occurrence.) However, it is important to understand that even if a use is generally allowed, it may be determined during the authorization process that the use is not appropriate within that unit or that stipulations for the mitigation of offsite impacts may be necessary.	No change.
Material Site inclusion as an allowable use in the descriptions of Land Use Designations for Habitat and Public	Material sites should be identified as an allowable facility in land designated for habitat and public recreation. The descriptions of these designations would preclude such use.	Disagree. See above response regarding the allowance of Material Sites in lands open to mineral entry. Material sites are considered a surface use and may be considered as appropriate on land that is closed to mineral entry.	No change.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Recreation Lands.		It is inappropriate and unnecessary to include a listing of allowed uses (which would include material sites) for each designation. Such a listing is appropriate for zoning ordinances, but inappropriate for plans of this scale. Additionally, other uses are allowed on state land if they do not conflict with the primary use or if stipulations can be imposed to mitigate potential impacts – even if the area is designated Habitat or Public Recreation.	
Material Site Allowance in Navigable Waterbodies	Material sites should be identified as an allowable use in navigable waterbodies on Table 3-1 because many include potential material resources.	Disagree. Material sites are an allowable surface use that is approved through the authorization process, including in navigable waters. The navigability determination of a waterbody does not preclude the development of a material site. Stipulations for the development a material sites within any waterbody, regardless of a navigability determination will likely be necessary, especially if the waterbody is anadromous.	No change.
Explain Materials Co-Designations	Material Sites should be included as an additional subsurface resources that should be included in the “Explanation of Mineral and Coal Designations”	Disagree. There are no management units that are co-designated with material sites within this plan, although the existence of and continued appropriateness of this type of use are often cited. With few exceptions, authorized material sites are identified as specific management units. See also response below.	No change.
Material site management units	Material sites are specified as individual management units. All material sites should be separate management units.	Disagree. Material sites are those areas that are classified specifically for material purposes. Material sites may be considered as an appropriate use within management units, and permitted through the authorization process. However, that land does not necessarily have to be designated or classified for material site development for that use to occur.	No change.
Material Sites Not Recognized in the Plan	ADOTPF noted material sites that were not listed on the Resource Allocation Tables within the management unit description. The ADL’s should be recognized.	Concur. The ADL Numbers as listed by ADOTPF will be added to the Resource Allocation Tables where appropriate.	Revise. See response.
Management Intent for Lakes and Rivers	The land use designations for Habitat and Public Recreation seem to preclude the issuance of authorizations for material sites on creeks, rivers and lakes. It is important that material sites be included as a type of utility that may occur with stipulations for mitigation of adverse impacts on habitat and recreation.	Disagree. Material sites are not precluded from Habitat and Public Recreation lands. Material sites will need to be evaluated through an authorization process, similar to other surface use developments. Stipulations for the mitigation of adverse impacts to other surface uses may be imposed.	No change.
Transportation Corridors	There should be mention of the need for additional material sites for future and ongoing road construction.	Concur. Paragraph one will include the following statement: “Material sites may be necessary and are considered appropriate for the construction and maintenance of roads.”	Revise. See response.
Manley Hot Springs to Tanana Road	The road from Manley Hot Springs to Tanana is currently underway. The need for material sites	Agree in part. A general statement regarding additional material sites will be added to paragraph one. It does not need to be identified for	Revise. See response.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Development and Potential Material Sites	along that road should be included in the Transportation Corridors section of Chapter 4.	each road development. However, a statement regarding the development of a road from Manley Hot Springs to Tanana is will be included in the Transportation Corridors section of Chapter 4.	
Road to Nome Development and Potential Material Sites	The proposed road to Nome and the eventual need for material sites for development along that road should be included in the Transportation Corridors section of Chapter 4.	Agree in part. A general statement regarding additional material sites will be added to paragraph one. It does not need to be identified for each road development. However, a statement regarding the potential development of a road expansion of the Elliot Highway to Nome will be included in the Transportation Corridors section of Chapter 4.	Revise. See response.