

CHAPTER 4

Implementation

Introduction.....	4-1
Overlapping Land Selections.....	4-1
Land Exchanges.....	4-1
Cooperative Management Agreements and Memorandums of Understanding.....	4-3
Coordination with Federal Land Management.....	4-3
Coastal Management Coordination.....	4-4
Land Use Classifications.....	4-4
Mineral Orders.....	4-6
Municipal Entitlement.....	4-6
Areas Proposed for Legislative Designation.....	4-7
Procedures for Plan Modification and Amendment.....	4-10



CHAPTER 4

IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

This chapter presents the actions necessary to implement the land use policies proposed by this plan. Included are exchanges and other land ownership issues; coastal management coordination; land use classifications; recom-

mendations for legislative designations; and procedures for plan modification and amendment. Selections and relinquishments are discussed in Chapter 5.

Overlapping Land Selections

Some existing state land selections have also been selected by various Native corporations under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). Chugach Alaska Corporation is the regional Native corporation formed under ANCSA in the planning area. The regional corporation and the three village Native corporations in the planning area, Chenega, Tatitlek, and Eyak, are entitled to approximately 316,000 acres of surface land under ANCSA. Approximately 10,000 acres of

Native-selected lands have also been selected by the state. Some of these selections will be conveyed to the Native corporations and some may become state owned. (Overlapping selections are noted in the maps in Chapter 3.) Overlapping state-Native selections are adjudicated by the federal Bureau of Land Management. The plan specifies how these lands will be managed if they are conveyed to the state.

Land Exchanges

Land or interests in land may be transferred by exchange. Under state law, DNR can trade state land for other land of equal appraised value when it is in the state's best interest to do so. Any exchange of unequal value requires legislative approval.

Land exchanges may be pursued for several reasons. One is to consolidate state land hold-

ings and create land ownership and use patterns that would result in more effective management of state land. Another would be to facilitate the objectives of state programs or other public purposes. For example, land exchanges can be pursued to improve access, make better land available for sale or development, or protect important natural resources. This section describes state lands that other

parties have expressed interest in acquiring or private lands that the state may wish to consider acquiring through exchange or some other method. In all cases, only the land that the state or another party wishes to acquire is mentioned; the reciprocal part of an exchange is not identified.

Lands suitable for exchange are not limited to those identified here; other state lands may be considered for exchanges. Any exchange would require public review and a determination that the exchange is in the state's best interest. These proposals are not mandates for exchanges. Individual exchanges require extensive negotiations between the concerned parties, who in the end may or may not agree to the exchange. The objectives of the state may also be achieved through cooperative agreements rather than land exchanges.

Lands Suitable for State-Federal Land Exchange

State-owned land near Serpentine Cove in Harriman Fiord, subunits 1B and 6B, is reserved for exchange to the USFS. Serpentine Cove is within the Forest Service wilderness area. Forest Service management would be similar to that proposed by the state. Thus, Forest Service ownership would meet state management objectives. In addition, the Forest Service has a nationwide policy of acquiring non-federal inholdings within wilderness areas. USFS land that the state may be interested in acquiring in exchange includes hatchery sites or other lands not selectable under the USFS interpretation of the NFCG selection criteria in the Statehood Act. In addition, after the state land ownership in Chugach National Forest is finalized in 1994, any boundary adjustments or additional land needed by the state may require a land exchange.

Potential hatchery sites on federal land include Cascade Creek (subunit 18F), Marsha Bay (subunit 16E), Falls Bay (subunit 10B), West Gable Cannery (subunit 8F), and Princeton Creek (subunit 12B). Existing state hatcheries on federal land include Cannery Creek (subunit 18D), and Main Bay (subunit 10A) which operate under a USFS special use permit. While no problems have been identified to date, it is generally state policy to own the land under a multi-million dollar state facility. Thus, these may be suitable lands for exchange, but state objectives may also be met by continued operation under USFS special use permits, by cooperative management agreements, or by other means.

Land Suitable for State-private Land Exchange

During the Chugach Region Study (1980), DNR, Chugach Alaska and the three village corporations in the Sound discussed land exchanges to return certain popular public recreation sites to public ownership. Because of the important public use and habitat values in these areas, the state should seek acquisition either by exchange or purchase. The sites include some or all private land in the following areas: Canoe Pass (especially land on the south shore of the passage that interrupts continuous state-owned shoreline in Section 3 of T16S R5W, and Section 33 of T15S R5W, CRM.), Eshamy Lagoon, Jackpot Bay, Beartrap Bay, Two Moon Bay, Snug Corner Cove, Hell's Hole, Comfort Cove, Emerald Cove, Galena Bay, Hartney Bay, Simpson Bay, Sheep Bay, and Bomb Point. Any exchange or purchase would require public review a determination that the exchange is in the state's best interest, and agreement with the current land owner.

Cooperative Management Agreements and Memorandums of Understanding

In many cases cooperative management agreements can achieve purposes similar to land exchanges. They can ensure compatible land management among various owners, or create efficiencies that increase the cost effectiveness of state management. Cooperative agreements concerning land management within the planning area include the Copper River Delta Fish and Wildlife Interagency Memorandum of Understanding (December 1986 between DNR, ADF&G, USFS, USF&WS, and BLM); the Bering River - Controller Bay Trumpeter Swan Management Area Cooperative Agreement (October 19, 1976 between DNR, ADF&G, USFS, and USF&WS); and the Cooperative Management Agreement between the Prince William Sound Recreation Association and the Alaska Division of Parks regarding Management of State Marine Parks in Prince William Sound (March 11, 1987).

The need for one additional cooperative agreement has been identified. The Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation should negotiate a cooperative management agreement with the U.S. Forest Service to establish and manage a joint State-Federal Alaska Marine Recreation and Park system. Initial discussions about this concept took place in 1982 with a high level of interest by both parties. Cooperative management of state marine parks and Forest Service marine recreation sites will decrease costs for both agencies, enhance recreation services available to the public, and coordinate recreation management in the Sound. This proposal is not a mandate for agreement; any cooperative agreement would require additional negotiations between the state and the USFS.

Coordination with Federal Land Management

Most uplands in the planning area are within Chugach National Forest and are managed by the U.S. Forest Service. The Prince William Sound Area Plan makes decisions only for state lands. The plan does not direct the use of federal, Native, or private land. However, DNR attempted to coordinate state management with that of the USFS. Representatives of the Forest Service were a part of the planning team and actively participated in the state planning process.

The USFS policies for management of federal land in Chugach National Forest are given in the USFS's Chugach National Forest Plan, July 1984, as amended by the National Forest Plan Settlement, January 1986. The Forest Service is currently completing more detailed

planning for a portion of eastern Prince William Sound. This plan, known as the Gravina and Big Islands Management Area Analysis, is being completed for approximately 640,000 acres of federal land between Valdez Arm and the Copper River Delta, including federal land on Hawkins, Hinchinbrook, and Montague Islands. It is scheduled for completion in February 1989. The more detailed plan will allow the Forest Service to begin on-the-ground projects proposed in the Forest Plan, and will coordinate transportation and resource development plans with other landowners in the region. Information on USFS policies or planning is available from: U.S. Forest Service, Chugach National Forest; 201 East 9th Avenue; Anchorage, Alaska 99501. Telephone: (907) 271-2500.

Coastal Management Coordination

Most of the Prince William Sound planning area is within the coastal zone. State actions with the coastal zone, including implementation of the PWSAP, must be consistent with the provisions of the Alaska Coastal Management Plan (ACMP), including approved local district plans. Cordova and Valdez have completed Coastal Management Plans. Both were approved by the Alaska Coastal Policy Council in 1986. Whittier is in the process of completing a plan.

Districts with approved programs review most of DNR's decisions within their boundaries to determine consistency with the district plan. DNR must also notify a district with an approved plan of proposed activities outside

their boundaries that would directly or significantly affect resources within the district.

Areas Meriting Special Attention

The Valdez and Cordova Coastal Management Plans designated seven areas as Areas Meriting Special Attention (AMSAs). Management of all state lands and waters within these areas must be consistent with the AMSA Plans. For additional information refer to the two Coastal Management Programs. **Table 4-1** presents the list of AMSA's located within the planning area.

Table 4-1. Areas Meriting Special Attention (AMSA)

<u>Coastal Management Plan</u>	<u>AMSA</u>
Cordova	Cordova Industrial Park Eyak Lake Ski Hill Area
Valdez	Duck Flats and Mineral Creek Islands Keystone Canyon Mineral Creek Canyon Robe Lake

Land-use Classifications

The plan establishes primary and secondary land-use designations for state lands and tidelands within Prince William Sound. To implement the plan, DNR must classify state land within the categories listed in 11 AAC 55 that reflect the intent of the plan. In addition, state law requires that classification precede

the leasing of state tide and submerged lands or the disposal of state uplands. The plan is also the final finding for land classifications of state land in the Prince William Sound planning area.

A land classification is the formal record of the primary uses for which each parcel of state land will be managed. The classifications do not contain specific land management directives; those directives are within this plan. Classifications are recorded on the state land-status plats that refer to this plan for management direction. Thus, applicants wanting to use state lands should refer to this plan to determine whether the proposed use will be allowed and to find applicable management policies and guidelines.

All state classifications are multiple-use classifications. The classification regulations allow up to three classifications to be made for any parcel where the dominance of a particular use cannot be determined.

The land-use designations used in the plan are intended to communicate clearly the allowable uses of an area. Upland area classifications will correspond to the appropriate designation. For example, upland areas designated "settlement" will be classified "Settlement Land;" those designated "Public Recreation" will be classified "Public Recreation Land."

Translating tideland designations into classification is more difficult. The classification terms defined in 11 AAC 55 emphasize uses on uplands rather than tidelands. For example, in the classification regulations, the

definition of the classification "Forest Land" implies that the land is covered by trees. Trees do not grow on tidelands, but on tidelands, "forestry" designates log transfer facilities and related development as the intended use. Consequently, on tidelands, "Settlement Land" rather than "Forest Land" is the classification that corresponds to the "forestry" designation in the plan.

A related problem occurs with the "general use" tideland designation. Tidelands designated as "general use" will be classified "Public Recreation Land/Settlement Land/Wildlife Habitat Land." Most tidelands in the Sound have recreation and habitat values. They also have settlement value in the form of access for the upland owner -- shoreline development, resource-transfer sites, and other developed or undeveloped access needs. Therefore, all three classifications -- recreation, habitat, and settlement -- are used. The exact management intent can only be determined from the management intent statements in each management unit in Chapter 3.

DNR is searching for a solution to the problem of tideland classifications. Any solution will require amendment of the classification regulations, so it was not possible to solve the problem before this plan and the resulting classifications are adopted. Table 4-2 lists the plan's upland land-use designations and the

Table 4-2. Conversion of Upland Primary Designations to Classifications

<u>Primary Use Designation</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Commercial/Industrial Use	Settlement Land
Forestry	Forest Land
Habitat & Harvest	Wildlife Habitat land
Heritage Resources	Heritage Resource Land
Minerals	Mineral Land
Public Recreation	Public Recreation Land
Reserved Use	Reserved Use Land
Resource Management	Resource Management Land
Settlement	Settlement Land
Transportation	Transportation Corridor Land
Water Resources	Water Resource Land

Table 4-3. Conversion of Tideland Primary Designations to Classifications

<u>Primary Use Designation</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Forestry	Settlement Land
General Use	Public Recreation Land, Settlement Land, and Wildlife Habitat Land (joint classification)
Habitat & Harvest	Wildlife Habitat Land
Heritage Resources	Heritage Resource Land
Mining	Settlement Land
Public Recreation	Public Recreation Land
Resource Management	Resource Management Land
Shoreline Development	Settlement Land

corresponding upland classifications. Table 4-3 lists the tideland designations and the cor-

responding tideland classifications.

Mineral Orders

Most state lands except previous land offering areas such as Jack Bay or Blying Sound are open to mineral entry. This plan identifies areas where mineral entry status will change. These include areas currently closed to new mineral entry that will be reopened, and areas

that will be closed to new mineral entry. To implement these decisions, mineral opening and closing orders must be prepared by DNR and signed by the commissioner. These orders are in Appendix D.

Land for Future Municipalities

Communities in Prince William Sound are studying the possibility of forming a Borough. Municipalities and boroughs are entitled to select certain land from the state. The Municipal Entitlement Act (AS 29.65) establishes the state land classification categories that determine a municipality's general grant land entitlement and that are available for transfer to a municipality. Under existing law, the size of a municipality's entitlement is 10 percent of the vacant, unappropriated, unreserved (VUU) uplands in the municipal boundaries, not to exceed 20 acres per capita. Tide and submerged lands are not VUU lands.

The Prince William Sound Area Plan classifies state land within the planning area (see Land Use Classifications in this chapter). Most uplands in the planning area are classified as Public Recreation Land or Resource Management Land. Both of these classifications are VUU categories under the existing law. Consequently, classifications made by the Prince William Sound Area Plan have little effect on the amount of land available to the proposed borough.

Classifications made by the plan have not considered whether the lands should be available for transfer to municipalities incorporated in

the future. A few parcels in the planning have been classified in categories that would not be available for transfer including Wildlife Habitat Land and Forestry Land. However, settlement of municipal entitlements is a priority for the department and the current classifications will not preclude consideration of parcels of land for reclassification and transfer to a municipality. In addition, prior to the plan, several parcels of state land were classified for transfer to existing municipalities to fulfill their municipal land entitlement. These lands are not reclassified by the plan.

When an area incorporates under state law, it may select state land within its boundaries that, except for classification, otherwise meets the definition of vacant unappropriated, unreserved land under AS 29.65. When such land is selected, the Departments of Natural Resources and Fish and Game will do a more detailed, site-specific analysis of the resource values of the selected lands. This analysis may

result in a change in the designation and classification of all or part of the parcel under consideration to a classification that is available for transfer. Changes in the designations and classifications will require plan amendment and reclassification before the selection may be approved.

For example, land in river corridors that is classified Wildlife Habitat Land is not available for transfer. A more detailed review of habitat values may show that parts of the corridor are suitable for local management either because the resource values do not merit state retention or because the land is not essential to the overall management intent for the area. Where this is the case, reclassification of part of the land may be recommended to allow for transfer. Transfer to a municipality will not be approved until the recommended changes have been publicly reviewed through the amendment and reclassification processes.

Areas Proposed for Legislative Designation

In certain areas with outstanding resource or public use values, the plan recommends the legislature designate state lands for long-term retention. The plan also specifies management of these areas. The plan can only recommend these areas be established; the final decisions are made by the legislature.

Legislative designation results in a much greater likelihood of permanent retention in public ownership than occurs under administrative land classification. Other results of legislative designation vary greatly depending on the language that establishes an area. Legislative designation can have the effect of expanding and protecting public use (for example, by designating a recreation area or marine park in an area heavily used for recreation); it can lead to increased public use by increasing investment in facilities (such as campgrounds, roads, or boat launches); it can

result in increased resource protection; and finally, it can target these areas for state enforcement, management, or clean-up.

Keystone Canyon - Thompson Pass (Subunits 21P and S). The proposed area is located partially within the boundaries of the Prince William Sound Area Plan and the Copper River Basin Area Plan (CRBAP). The CRBAP also recommended this area for legislative designation. The area includes steep-sided canyons, mountain peaks, glaciers, and deep glacier-carved valleys. The Richardson Highway runs through Keystone Canyon and Thompson Pass. Keystone Canyon is very scenic. Bridalveil and Horsetail Falls cascade down the narrow steep-sided canyons. Near the middle of the canyon is a sheer rock precipice 1/2 mile long and 800 feet high. The Lowe River flows through the canyon; the Richardson Highway parallels the river

through the canyon making it an easily accessible scenic area.

Thompson Pass has spectacular alpine scenery. Worthington Glacier is the most accessible glacier in the state and the most popular tourist attraction in the Copper River Basin. Summer recreation activities such as hiking and camping are popular. In the winter, cross-country skiing, downhill skiing, and snow machining are popular. The pass receives the heaviest recorded snowfall in Alaska, and most of the area is prone to powerful avalanches.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline, the Valdez to Copper River Basin electric intertie, and proposed routes for an Alaskan natural-gas pipeline all run through this area.

A study entitled "Master Plan for the Proposed Keystone Canyon State Park" was prepared by Joseph Hoffman of the University of Alaska Institute for Social, Economic, and Government Research in October 1970. This study includes the Keystone Canyon and Thompson Pass area, and provides a thorough description of its resources and possible management options.

The proposed recreation area at Keystone Canyon - Thompson Pass should be actively managed for recreation. Camping facilities should be expanded, and hiking and interpretive trails and pullouts should be established. Certain recreation activities, particular winter sports, also need more active management for public safety and to avoid conflicts between users. Establishment of a recreation area and subsequent development of facilities would also encourage visitors to spend more time in the area and benefit the local economy.

A corridor should be reserved through the area for future transportation routes including the Trans-alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, the proposed Copper River Highway, or other transportation needs.

The Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (DPOR) will work with an advisory group of local residents to prepare the preliminary

legislative proposal for the area including management guidelines. Until legislative action is taken, DLWM will have management responsibility for the recreation area under consultation with DPOR.

The local advisory group established through this plan and the Copper River Basin Area Plan can make recommendations to the legislature on what specific types of legislation will be most appropriate to implement management intent. The advisory group can also make a final determination of the boundaries of the Keystone Canyon and Thompson Pass Recreation Area, which includes approximately 80,000 acres.

Existing Marine Parks. In 1983, seven areas were designated as state marine parks by the legislature in AS 41.21.300. Within these areas, lands are administered by the DPOR, and land-use authorizations are made pursuant to AS 41.21. To coordinate area-wide recreation management in Prince William Sound, this plan provides the general guidance for managing these units. The plan also provides general guidance for park-unit management plans that DPOR will prepare as required by AS 41.21.302(c). **Table 4-4** lists the existing marine parks.

Proposed Marine Parks. Because of the frequent public use, the need for active management, or the exceptional public values, some areas in Prince William Sound should be considered by the legislature for long-term retention and management as Marine Parks under AS 41.21, Article 3. The Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation has the expertise and can provide the field presence to manage these areas. **Table 4-5** lists the areas. Please see Chapter 3 for a complete explanation of management intent for each area.

Although Glacier Island was initially considered for a marine park recommendation, the decision whether to designate the Island as a marine park should be postponed. Within the next few years, development will likely occur on private land near Glacier Island. When this occurs, the state will decide what

Table 4-4. Existing State Marine Parks in Prince William Sound

<u>Marine Park</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Upland Acreage</u>
Surprise Cove	Cochrane Bay (subunit 4A)	1,425
Bettles Bay	Port Wells (subunit 5C)	555
Ziegler Cove	Port Wells (subunit 5D)	305
South Esther Island	Esther Island (subunit 7A)	2,285
Horseshoe Bay	Chenega (subunit 13G)	286
Shoup Bay	Valdez Arm (subunit 22A)	2,925
Sawmill Bay	Valdez Arm (subunit 22C)	1,310*
		<hr/>
		Total: 9,091 acres

* For Sawmill Bay, the final acreage may be less than that listed. Some of the area may be conveyed to The Tatitlek Corporation. Non-state land is excluded from the marine park.

Table 4-5. Potential Areas for Legislative Designation as State Marine Parks.

<u>Marine Park</u>	<u>Management Unit</u>	<u>Upland Acreage</u>
Entry Cove	Passage Canal (subunit 2D)	370
Decision Point	Passage Canal (subunit 2E)	460
Granite Bay	Port Wells (subunit 5G)	2,015
Driftwood Bay	Day Harbor (subunit 15A)	840
Safety Cove	Day Harbor (subunit 15A)	660
Boswell Bay Beaches	Hinchinbrook Island (subunit 25A)	799
Canoe Passage	Hawkins Island (subunit 26A)	1,455
Jack Bay North	Valdez Arm (subunit 22F)	811
Kayak Island	Katalla (subunit 29A)	1,927
		<hr/>
		Total: 9,337 acres

facilities, if any, are required on state land and what management is needed to complement the private land management. The decision whether a marine park is the most appropriate method to achieve state management objectives will be made at that time. For more information about the management intent for Glacier Island, please see Chapter 3, subunit 19D, page 3-148.

The plan also proposes new selections to adjust the boundaries for three of the six exist-

ing state marine parks. These new selections are "Priority C" selections (see Chapter 5 for an explanation of selection priorities). The new selections increase the marine park boundaries to correspond to watersheds, to add adjacent public use areas, or to consolidate land ownership patterns for more efficient land management. After selection, these areas will be transferred to DPOR for management as part of the adjacent marine park. The legislature should consider changing the boundaries of the existing parks to correspond to these ex-

Table 4-6. Proposed Boundary Adjustments to Existing State Marine Parks

<u>Existing Marine Park</u>	<u>Management Unit</u>	<u>Additional Acreage</u>
Surprise Cove	Cochrane Bay (subunit 4A)	800
Esther Island	Esther Island (subunit 7A)	2,320
Sawmill Bay	Valdez Arm (subunit 22C)	1,882
		Total: 5,002 acres

pansions as part of any new marine park legislation. The boundary adjustments are listed in **Table 4-6**.

Proposed Lake George Addition to Chugach State Park. Lake George and surrounding lands totalling approximately 249,600 acres should be considered for addition to Chugach State Park by the legislature under AS 41.21.121-.125. The remote, wilderness area contains a variety of scenic features including Lake George (a lake dammed by the Knik Glacier), large valley-glaciers, and high mountain peaks. Portions of the area are important mountain goat and black bear habitat and the area is often used by bear and goat

hunters. Other public use includes frequent flight-seeing trips by airplane, mountaineering, and occasionally other wilderness recreation. This addition to the park was proposed by the 1981 Chugach State Park Master Plan. (See subunit 6A.)

Mount Eccles. This area is important because it is one of the few areas of public land near Cordova with good views and varied topography. It should be considered for legislative designation to support the recreation and tourism needs of Cordova. The exact type of legislative designation should be determined in coordination with the city. (See subunit 27C.)

Procedures for Plan Modification and Amendment

The land-use designations, policies, implementation actions, and management guidelines of this plan may be changed if conditions warrant. The plan will be updated periodically as new data and new technologies become available and as changing social or economic conditions place different demands on state land.

Periodic Review. The plan will be reviewed at least once every 5 years to determine if revisions are necessary. An inter-agency planning team will coordinate this review. The plan review will include meetings that are open to all interested groups and the general public. A meeting of the Prince William Sound area planning team will be held annually to review plan implementation.

Amendments. The plan may be amended. An amendment adds to or modifies the basic intent of the plan. Amendments consist of changes to allowed uses that would change the management intent of a significant portion of the management unit or changes to prohibited uses, policies, or guidelines throughout an entire management unit or subunit (see exceptions to guidelines below); or changes in implementation actions. Amendments must be approved by the Commissioner of DNR. Amendments require public notice and consultation with affected agencies. Amendments may require public meetings if the commissioner decides the level of controversy warrants it. Amendments may be proposed by DNR (division directors or regional managers), other agencies (commissioner or division director), or the public.

The following actions are examples of changes that would require an amendment:

- A proposal to close an area to new mineral entry.
- Allowing a use in an area where it is currently prohibited.
- A new land offering in an area designated for retention.

The Director of DLWM determines what constitutes an amendment or just a minor change. For land administered by DPOR, the Director of DPOR may make the decision.

Minor Changes. A minor change is one that does not modify or change the basic intent of the plan or a management unit. Minor changes may be necessary for clarification, consistency, or to facilitate implementation of the plan. Minor changes are made at the discretion of the Director of DLWM and do not require public review. For land administered by DPOR, the Director of DPOR may make the decision. The director's decision may be appealed to the Commissioner of DNR. Minor changes may be proposed by agencies or the public. The director will notify other agencies when minor changes are made. Affected agencies will have the opportunity to comment following notification; the comment period may be provided through existing inter-agency review processes for associated actions.

Special Exceptions. Exceptions to the provisions of the plan may be made without modification of the plan. Special exceptions shall occur only when complying with the plan is excessively difficult or impractical and an alternative procedure can be implemented that adheres to the purposes and spirit of the plan. Special exceptions may also occur when the proposed activity requires only a small part of a management unit, does not change or modify the intent of the management unit, and serves to clarify or facilitate the implementation of the plan. Special exceptions may apply to prohibit uses or guidelines.

An example of what may constitute a special exception would be allowing a prohibited use in a small area on the edge of a management unit next to a unit where it is allowed based on more detailed data. A second example would be a preference right granted under AS 18.05.035 where the director determines such an action is necessary to correct an injustice and will not significantly affect the intent of the plan.

DNR may make a special exception in the implementation of the plan in accordance to the procedures below:

1. A Regional Manager of DNR shall prepare a written finding that specifies the following:

- The extenuating conditions that require a special exception.
- The alternative course of action to be followed.
- How the intent of the plan and management unit will be met by the alternative course of action.

2. Agencies that have responsibility for land uses with primary or secondary designations in the affected area will be given an opportunity to review the findings. If an agency disagrees with the regional manager's decision, the decision may be appealed to the director of DLWM; (or to the Director or DPOR for lands administered by DPOR); the director's decision may be appealed to the Commissioner of DNR. If warranted by the degree of controversy, the Commissioner may hold a public meeting before making a decision.

3. Some policies in the plan, like those modified by the terms "feasible and prudent," "feasible," and "should" are written to allow for exceptions if the conditions described in the policy are met. (See Appendix A for the definitions of these terms.)

Requests for amendments, minor changes, and special exception should be submitted to the Southcentral Regional Office of DLWM. If the land in question is administered by DPOR, the request may also be submitted to an office of DPOR.