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DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

ANIAKCHAK NATIONAL MONUMENT

Aniakchak National Monument (138,000 acres) consists essentially of a vast volcanic caldera. The basic caldera was probably formed in a single massive eruption about 3,500 years ago, and the precaldera cone from which it was formed was around 7,000 feet high and 6 miles wide. Today the caldera rim averages 3,000 feet in elevation but rises to nearly 4,500 feet in places; its dry crater floor is at 1,100 feet. Also in the caldera is Vent Mountain, a small secondary crater with a snow-filled caldera. Nearby is Doughnut Cone, a smaller but perfectly round cinder cone.

Surprise Lake, a small turquoise-colored body of water tucked into the north side of the Aniakchak caldera, is the major source of the Aniakchak River. The Aniakchak River, near its origin on the east side of the crater, pours through 1,000 gates; a narrow, rocky corridor that results in several waterfalls. Pioneer plants grow in moist areas near Surprise Lake, including lyme grass, sedges, and horsetail. Further east the river gradually widens out, meanders slowly, and changes into a flat, moist tundra and shrub-covered valley edged by low hills on its way to Aniakchak Bay and the Pacific Ocean. These hills are covered with mosses, lichens, lupine, dwarf fireweed, Kamchatka rhododendron, aster, mountain bluebell, and dwarf willow.
The eastern boundary of the monument is defined by a broad, flat, drainage basin covered with wet tundra vegetation. The basin is formed by the north-flowing headwaters of the Cinder River (High and Lava creeks) and the southeast-flowing Aniakchak River (from Hidden Creek and Albert Johnson Creek). Wet tundra vegetation typically consists of water-tolerant wildflowers or sedges rooted in a mat of sphagnum moss and slightly drier peat mounds that support birch and heath shrubs such as crowberry and Labrador tea. The lower southwest corner of the monument is defined by Pinnacle Mountain, which overlooks Meshik Lake.

The southern flank of the caldera is rugged, rocky terrain characterized by steep escarpments and deep ravines cut by a few streams with waterfalls. The lower slopes of the caldera are covered with moist tundra and continue south of the monument boundary from about 1,200 feet to 985 feet. Several short streams drain the southern flanks of the caldera, the northwest slopes of the Aleutian Range, as well as Meshik Lake. These streams drain into the broad, flat, marshy Meshik River, which turns west to flow into Bristol Bay.

The western and northern flanks of the caldera slope gently down to the Bristol Bay plains and are covered by moist tundra vegetation. The western and northern boundary lines do not follow any special topographic or geologic features.
ANIAKCHAK NATIONAL PRESERVE

The Aniakchak National Preserve (376,000 acres) is composed of several major landscape components. The northwest-tending Aleutian Range runs diagonally across the preserve, averages about 2,000 feet in elevation, and is topped by alpine tundra, including various dwarf forbs and heath shrubs such as aster, cinquefoil, mountain avens, bearberry, dwarf blueberry, and crowberry. The Aleutian Range is broken by the broad, low-lying, moist tundra and shrub-covered Aniakchak River valley; the river flows eastward to Aniakchak Bay on the Pacific Ocean. The valley and adjacent hills are covered with moist tundra vegetation, including mosses, lichens, lupine, dwarf fireweed, Kamchatka rhododendron, aster, mountain bluebell, and some dwarf willow.

The eastern and southern boundaries of the preserve are separated from the national monument and its caldera by river valleys. On the east is the broad, flat drainage basin of the north-flowing Cinder River and its upper tributary creeks, as described above. On the south is the Aniakchak River and its upper tributary creeks, which were also previously described. On the south lies the broad, flat, wet tundra- and marsh-covered Meshik River valley and Meshik River, which flows west into Bristol Bay.

The western boundary of the preserve is defined by the rugged Pacific coastline. It is composed of numerous steep cliffs, offshore rocks, islands, and two mountain-spined peninsulas--Cape Kunmik and Cape
Kumlik—that create three large bays with protected coves—Amber, Aniakchak, and Kujulik bays. The shrublands vegetation community occurs around the heads of these bays, around the bases of the peninsulas, and inland on the lower eastern slopes of the Aleutian Range. It covers moderately well-drained lowlands, slopes, and hilltops up to about 1,000 feet. Open stands of low-growing willow are usually found lining steambanks and covering lowlands and gentle lower slopes. On rounded summits and progressively higher slopes, tall-growing alder and willow become common and typically appear in a belt around the mountainous areas. This occurs just below the alpine tundra and typically forms a mosaic of shrub and grass/forb vegetation types. The beach strand vegetation community occurs along a broad strip of the beach west of Kujulik Bay and along other coastal areas as well; it is found on very well drained coastal sand dunes and it consists of beach ryegrass and forbs.

Aniakchak has a rich and varied floral and faunal community and an abundance of wildlife. Moose are concentrated in the upper Meshik and Cinder river valleys and at the head of Amber Bay, primarily along the lower willow- and alder-lined slopes. The northern Alaska peninsula caribou herd (about 19,000 animals) uses the monument/preserve. The herd ranges widely across most of the lowlands and follows migratory routes in the spring and fall. Calving is known to occur south of Meshik Lake in the Aniakchak River drainage. Spring brown bear concentrations occur along coastal grass flats at the heads of Aniakchak and Amber bays where they feed on newly emerging sedges. In late summer and early
fall, brown bears shift to the salmon-spawning streams. Denning occurs on the slopes of the caldera and on the east side of the Aleutian Range in alder, willow, or grassy areas on hillsides and mountain slopes. A few wolves range throughout the Aniakchak region. Wolverines and lynx are scarce but travel widely throughout the area. The more common furbearers in the region include beaver, river otter, mink, short-tailed and least weasel, and red fox.

The Pacific coastal waters off Aniakchak support sea otters, Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, and northern sea lions throughout the year. Off the southern coast of Cape Kumlik there is a high/medium density group of sea otters. Harbor seals haul out in small groups along portions of Cape Kumlik, Cape Kunmik, and small islands off the monument/preserve. Northern fur seals are found near the coast in small numbers during most of the year, with peak numbers occurring during summer and winter migrations. The most frequently observed whales in nearby coastal waters are the humpback, gray, and fin whales. Sei, blue, and Pacific right whales occur only occasionally near the monument/preserve, and sperm whales are uncommon in these waters.

The fresh and salt waters of the Aniakchak region support an abundance of fish species. The Meshik and Cinder river systems have runs of sockeye, chum, coho, and king salmon. A small sockeye run occurs in the Aniakchak River and its tributaries. The Aniakchak River system and other shorter streams on the Pacific side provide spawning grounds for pink and chum salmon. Sockeye salmon are the only salmon species
known to spawn in Surprise Lake. Freshwater streams in Aniakchak contain Dolly Varden, arctic char, steelhead, and other freshwater species. Saltwater species found in coastal waters off Aniakchak include halibut, cod, herring, flounder, Dungeness crab, Tanner crab, king crab, shrimp, and clams.

Bristol Bay provides habitat for vast numbers of waterfowl, including ducks, geese, swans, and shorebirds that breed north of the bay, as well as local breeding bird populations. Millions of waterfowl and shorebirds migrate through the monument/preserve, including large populations of emperor geese, cackling Canada geese, and black brant. Nesting and feeding and spring and fall staging areas are generally associated with productive estuaries, lagoons, river deltas, and tidal flats. In the fall the Pacific bay’s rocky shores are important for black oystercatchers, rock sandpipers, seabirds, and black turnstones. The bays themselves are used by Steller’s, king, and common eiders as wintering areas. The Bristol Bay side of the peninsula supports millions of seabirds. Species observed along the Pacific coastline and sometimes found inland include black-legged kittiwakes, pelagic and red-faced cormorants, glaucous-winged gulls, murres, pigeon guillemots, and horned puffins. Nearby islands provide protected nesting habitat for small number of breeding pairs of bald eagles, which commonly can be found nesting and feeding along rivers and the Pacific coastline of Anlakchak. They have also been observed within the caldera and on the cliffs north of Meshik Lake. Other raptors found here include rough-legged hawks, gyrfalcons, ospreys, short-eared owls, and peregrine falcons.
ALTERNATIVE 1 (MAXIMUM WILDERNESS)

This alternative would designate and protect all wilderness-suatable lands within Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve. The resulting wilderness would be approximately _____ acres.

The following environmental and socioeconomic effects would be expected to occur as a result of designating all suitable lands within the monument/preserve as wilderness.

Impacts on Wilderness Values

Aniakchak is an area where opportunities for solitude abound. Its _____ acres had only 17 visitors in 1986. Air-taxi service or private aircraft is essential in gaining access to interior parts of the monument/preserve for recreational use. However, it is possible to gain access to the caldera overland from Port Heiden. Access to the Pacific Coast by boat is technically feasible from the Chigniks or Kodiak, but the distances are substantial. _____

The only recreation available in the area is of a primitive nature. Most of the known recreationists who have used the area have been transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up later after exploring the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and exploration. Some activity
may be unreported. There are two lodges within the preserve that are used by commercial guides.

Because of the remoteness of the area and the fact that it receives very few visitors, it is an area that shows very little impact from the activities of man; it is an area that is in a nearly natural state.

Special features of the monument/preserve include: the caldera and associated volcanic features; the rugged Pacific coastline; several peninsulas, bays, and protected coves; portions of the Aleutian Range; the Bristol Bay lowlands; waterfalls; the Meshik, Aniakchak, and Cinder rivers; good air and water quality; tundra, shrubland, and beach stand vegetation; varied and abundant wildlife, including moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, wolves, sea otters, Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, northern sea lions, whales, waterfowl, shorebirds, seabirds, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons; fish, including five species of salmon and marine fish and shellfish; three areas of moose winter range; a caribou calving area; two caribou migration routes; two brown/grizzly bear spring use areas; bear denning areas; two large raptor nesting areas along the coast; viewing areas for porpoise, whale, waterfowl, shorebirds, and seabirds along the coast; and many summer salmon use streams.

The qualities of solitude, primitive recreation, naturalness, and the special features described above that qualify these lands to be designated as wilderness would receive maximum protection and preservation with the
wilderness designation in this alternative. The earth and its community of life would remain untrammeled by man, except for the minimal impacts of visitors who enter and use the wilderness but do not remain. The undeveloped, primeval, natural character of wilderness, without permanent habitation, would be preserved, as would excellent opportunities to experience solitude; primitive, unconfined recreation; and the potential for enjoyment or study of the area's many special features.

Conclusions: This alternative would protect and preserve wilderness values on approximately _________ acres of federal monument and preserve lands for generations to come by ensuring that natural processes be allowed to continue unimpeded.

**Impacts on the Subsistence Use of Motorized Equipment and New Motorized Technology**

Subsistors use motorized tools like chain-saws; gasoline-fueled generators, and powered ice augers and winches in pursuits directly related to the taking of fish and game and the cutting and gathering of vegetative resources. These uses have become part of the subsistence way of life maintained by rural Alaska residents and are permitted by the National Park Service in nonwilderness areas. However, in Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, there is probably no use of chain saws on public lands to obtain house logs or firewood for subsistence purposes. This is because of a scarcity of easily accessible timber within the monument/preserve.
The use of other mechanized equipment in activities such as winter fishing through the ice (in which the setting of nets and traps could involve the use of motorized ice augers and winches) is minimal if it exists at all in Aniackchak. Although some freshwater ice fishing occurs near the villages, a large commercial salmon fishery offshore from the preserve and monument provides most of the fish resources needed by area residents. Consequently, there is probably no use of mechanized equipment associated with ice fishing or other winter subsistence activities taking place on the public lands within the monument/preserve.

Regarding access to subsistence resources, the National Park Service realizes that new technologies may be invented that could be suitable for access to public lands by subsisters. However, new motorized technologies, like chain saws and other contemporary motorized tools and vehicles not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811), would be incompatible with wilderness values if allowed for subsistence access to a designated wilderness area.

The National Park Service interprets section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 to provide precedence for this situation. The act prohibits motorized equipment and motor vehicles in wilderness areas and would apply to the subsistence use of chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers, winches, and new motorized technologies. Section 4(c) applies because, unlike snowmobiles and motorboats, chain saws and other motorized tools and technologies are not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811).
In alternative 1, subsisters would be prohibited from using motorized tools like chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers and winches, and new motorized technologies in designated wilderness areas.

Conclusions: New motorized technologies would not be allowed in wilderness areas because of their inherent incompatibility with wilderness values. The impact on subsistence use from the prohibition of motorized equipment would be minimal in the case of chain saws, generators, ice augers, and winches because no, or perhaps only a few, subsisters employ such equipment within the monument/preserve.

Impacts on Recreational Use Levels

Recreational use at Aniakchak is affected by its remoteness. The monument/preserve is 400 miles from Anchorage, and the only community nearby, Meshik-Port Heiden, is 10 miles away, very small, and has no visitor facilities. Access to the park is usually by airplane, making it a relatively expensive destination.

Another factor affecting recreational use levels is weather. Rain and fog cover the mountain most of the time. The Pacific side of Aniakchak gets about 126 inches of rain per year, and the Bering-Sea side is almost continuously fogged in. Within the caldera, hurricane force winds occur at times.
Recreational activities in the Aniakchak area include sport hunting and fishing, as well as backpacking, rafting, camping, exploration, photography, and nature study.

Perhaps four or five unguided parties or individuals per year enter the preserve for sport hunting or fishing. They come by small plane and land on ash fields at higher elevations on Aniakchak's slopes (for hunting caribou), gravel bars in the Cinder River drainage (for moose or caribou), or Pacific-side river drainages (for moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, and river fishing).

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users have entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake
for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

Other than those escorted by commercial use license holders, 117 visitors were reported in 1986. Based on continuing increases in the area's popularity and long-term positive growth of the national economy, public use of Aniakchak is expected to reach 2,000 to 7,000 recreation visits by the year 2020.

Projected numbers of visitors are not expected to be affected by wilderness designation or nonwilderness designation.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]

Scenario 1—Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. The lodges, if not removed by owners, would become public use cabins. There would be no impact on numbers of hunters using the facilities.
Under alternative 1, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about ____ recreationists during the months of ____ through _____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists could camp outdoors.

A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) could no longer be used as private facilities. The lodge near Rainbow Creek can probably sleep about 12 visitors; the one on Cinder Creek about 30 (probably averaging 12-14 people at a time). The owners of the lodges would be given the opportunity to remove the lodges. If the owners do not remove them, the cabins would remain as public use cabins. The absence of the lodges would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Although the lodges could not be used for commercial purposes any longer, it is expected that the hunting guides would continue their operation using portable accommodations for their customers. However, should the guides decide to move their operations outside the monument/preserve (if the boundary of their guiding areas allowed them to do so), there could be a decrease in recreation use levels.
of the 99 visitors per year (based on 1985 figures). The extent to which other visitors would use the abandoned hunting lodges and therefore add to the number of visitors in the area is not known.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by guides and outfitters. Hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging, and, because of the severe weather, the guides and outfitters would have no customers as a result of this action.

Under alternative 1, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about ____ recreationists during the months of ____ through ____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists could camp outdoors here where weather is moderated by the Pacific Ocean.

A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) could no longer be used as private facilities. The lodge near Rainbow Creek can probably sleep about 12 visitors; the one on Cinder Creek
about 30 (probably averages 12-14 people at a time). The owners of the lodges would be given the opportunity to remove the lodges. If they are not removed by their owners, under this alternative, they would be removed by the National Park Service because no one uses the area except guided hunters. Out-of-state hunters may only hunt in Alaska if accompanied by a licensed guide. The weather in the areas of Aniakchak where the lodges are located is so severe that the absence of the lodges would mean that it would not be possible for hunters to remain in the area to hunt. Therefore, the businesses of the two guides would no longer be viable and recreation use levels would be expected to decrease by about 99 visitors per year.

Scenario 3—the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under alternative 1, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about ____ recreationists during the months of ____ through ____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists would camp outdoors.
A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) could continue to be used as private facilities as long as their current operators own and operate them. The lodge near Rainbow Creek can probably sleep about 12 visitors; the one on Cinder Creek about 30 (probably averaging 12-14 people at a time). The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to anyone. The current owners of the lodges would be allowed to continue to operate them. However, when the current owners die or transfer their guide operations to another party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. There could be a decrease in recreation use levels of 99 visitors per year, based on 1985 figures, when the owners of the two lodges die or transfer their guiding licenses.

Conclusions: This will depend on the scenario chosen.

Impacts on Use of ANILCA Title XI Permits

ANILCA provides a process for the consideration of proposed transportation (access) or utility systems that would occupy or traverse any conservation system units created by ANILCA, including national park system areas. Transportation applications, along with all pertinent information, must be submitted to the park superintendent for approval or
denial. For utility systems proposing to cross or occupy nonwilderness areas, applications are forwarded to the secretary of the interior, who in turn submits them to Congress for approval or denial. For applications proposing to traverse or occupy designated wilderness areas, the process is the same with the exception that applications are submitted by the secretary of the interior to the president who then submits them to Congress for final decision.

The impacts that might be associated with this process relate to the fact that title XI permit applications would go through an extra step and probably receive the closest of scrutiny if they involved designated wilderness. However, no title XI permits, no applications, and no proposals for title XI access are known about at this time. The state's preferred route for a transpeninsula transportation corridor lies outside the monument/preserve boundary. An alternative route includes 22 miles within the monument/preserve boundary.

Conclusion: There are no title XI permits at Aniakchak now. None are proposed. With this alternative there would be a greater likelihood of permit denial (or approval with more stringent and costly environmental protection measures) than if the monument were not mostly a designated wilderness area. Thus, there could be negative impacts on title XI transportation and utility permit applications if it is proposed that designated wilderness be traversed or occupied by such systems.
Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Businesses

There were three commercial use licenses in 1985 for activities that had no facilities--air taxi service, backpacking guide, and hunting guide. Wilderness designation would not impact these operations. Enterprises with facilities would be impacted. There are two hunting guide operations using two lodges within the area that would be designated wilderness under this alternative.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]

Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If the lodges were not removed by their owners, they would become public use cabins. The two operations at the monument/preserve might have to lower their prices up to 25 percent because of the more rustic nature of the accommodations they would provide. This would not be expected to make their businesses unprofitable. However, if it did, two tourism related businesses could be lost as a result of implementation of alternative 1.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by the guides and outfitters, and hunters would have to rely on tents for lodging.
Because of the severity of the weather at Aniakchak during hunting season and the nature of the clients, the guides and outfitters would have no customers as a result of this action. Therefore, two tourism related businesses in the monument/preserve would be lost as a result of implementation of alternative 1.

Scenario 3—the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under alternative 1, the two lodges would remain in use as private facilities in wilderness as long as their current operators own and operate them. The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to anyone except the current owner. When the current owners die or transfer their guide operations to another party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. There could be a loss of two tourism related businesses as a result of implementation of alternative 1 if the businesses ceased to be profitable as a result of the loss of the right to use the lodges.

Conclusion: This will depend on the scenario chosen.
Impacts on Amount of Tourism Related Revenue

At present the only tourism related revenue generated by the presence of the monument/preserve is from the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board has assigned eight hunting guide areas that include parts of the monument or preserve. (Only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).
There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

The only tourism related businesses that would be impacted by this alternative would be the two hunting guide operations that own lodges.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]

Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If owners did not remove the lodges, they would become public use cabins. The two operations at the monument/preserve might have to lower their prices up to 25 percent because of the more rustic nature of the accommodations they would provide. The two existing hunting guide operations reported having 99 clients in the 1985 season. Hunters usually stay for a period of 10 days each at a cost of approximately $10,000 each for total revenue of $990,000 per year. The pertinent hunting seasons are normally 60 days per year. With the necessity to move from cabins to more primitive accommodations, it is estimated that the cost of the trip per person would have to be dropped to as low as $7,500 per person for a total revenue of $742,500. This would result in a loss of approximately $247,500 in tourism related revenue. It is unlikely that loss of the use of the lodges would make the hunting guide businesses unprofitable. However, if it did, two tourism related businesses could be lost as a
result of implementation of this alternative, with a resulting loss in
tourism related revenue of $990,000 dollars.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National
Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by the guides
and outfitters, and hunters would have to rely on tents for lodging.
Because of the severity of the weather at Aniakchak during hunting
season and the nature of the clients, the guides and outfitters would
have no customers as a result of this action. Therefore, two tourism
related businesses in the monument/preserve would be lost as a result of
implementation of this alternative. This would result in a loss in tourism
related revenue of $990,000 dollars.

Scenario 3--the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The
existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue
use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be
nontransferrable.

Under alternative 1, the two lodges would remain in use as private
facilities in wilderness as long as their current operators own and operate
them. The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to
anyone except the current owner. When the current owners die or
transfer their guide operations to another party, the right to use the
lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as
public use cabins. If the guiding businesses continue to operate with
tents, the loss in tourism revenue is estimated to be about 25 percent of
the current level of $990,000 or a loss of $247,500. There could be a loss of two tourism related businesses as a result of implementation of alternative 1 if the businesses ceased to be profitable as a result of the loss of the right to use the lodges. This would result in a loss of tourism related revenue of $990,000 dollars.

Conclusion: This will depend on the scenario chosen.

**Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Jobs**

At present the only tourism related jobs within the monument/preserve are a result of the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.
Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

The only tourism related businesses that would be impacted by this alternative would be the two hunting guide operations with lodges.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]

Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If the owners did not remove the structures, they would become public use cabins. The two operations at the monument/preserve might have to lower their prices up to 25 percent because of the more rustic nature of the accommodations they would provide. This could cause the guiding
operations to employ fewer people. The number of people employed by
the guiding operations is not known. It is estimated that the two
existing guiding operations together employ fewer than 10 people.
Presumably a layoff as the result of a loss in 25 percent of revenue would
be a total of two to three people (jobs) at most. It is unlikely that the
loss of the use of the lodges would make the hunting guide businesses
unprofitable. However, if it did, all 10 jobs related to hunting guides
could be lost as a result of implementation of this alternative.

There is nothing in this alternative that would limit the number of new
businesses and therefore tourism related jobs that could depend on the
monument/preserve. However, the businesses would not be allowed to
build structures or to engage in activities that are incompatible with
wilderness preservation. Should the number of people using the area
become incompatible with wilderness preservation, permits might not be
issued for some businesses, therefore limiting the number of jobs for
people directly dependent on the monument/preserve.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National
Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by the guides
and outfitters, and hunters would have to rely on tents for lodging. The
weather in the areas where the lodges are located is so severe that the
absence of the lodges would mean it would not be possible for hunters to
remain in the area to hunt. Therefore, the businesses of the two guides
would no longer be viable.
Under this alternative, all jobs related to the two hunting guide operations would be lost. It is estimated that the total loss would be fewer than 10 jobs.

Scenario 3—the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under this alternative, the two hunting guide operations could continue to use their lodges as private facilities as long as their current operators own and operate them. The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to anyone except the current owner. However, when the current owner dies or transfers his guide operations to another party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. If the operations continue in tents there would be a loss of two to three tourism related jobs. If the businesses ceased to exist as the result of the loss of the cabins, 10 tourism related jobs would be lost.

Conclusion: This would depend on the scenario chosen.
Impacts on Use of Alaska Land Bank Program by Native Corporations

ANILCA (section 907) established an Alaska land bank program to provide legal and economic benefits to private landowners and to provide for the maintenance of land in its natural condition, particularly where these nonfederal lands adjoin federal and state conservation system units. Under the program, native corporation lands, but not native allotments or small patented tracts, have immunity from adverse possession and real property taxes and assessments. They are also immune from judgment in any action of law or equity to recover sums owed or penalties incurred by any native corporation or group or any officer, director, or stockholder of a corporation or group. Land bank agreements will be particularly important in cooperating with native corporations that own or will own large tracts of land in or adjacent to the monument. They may also be important as an interim protective measure pending federal or state acquisition by exchange or purchase.

The initial term for land bank agreements is 10 years; renewals may be made for additional periods of five years. However, there is a provision for withdrawal from the program, with a 90-day notice to all parties. This could create an adverse situation for landowners, who are immediately responsible for back taxes and other obligations that were deferred. If obligations are not met, the land is subject to condemnation for public purposes.
Under certain circumstances there may be impacts or perceived impacts on native or village corporations when their lands eligible for the land bank program abut wilderness within National Park Service (or other federal) units. If the corporations decide they are obligated to bank tracts because they abut or are mostly surrounded by National Park Service wilderness, while the corporations' preferences are to use the lands for other purposes, this perception of obligation to utilize the program (or loss of lands when withdrawn from the program) might be considered an adverse impact on the corporations stemming from the wilderness designation of the adjacent federal land. At present there are no known situations of this type involving Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, and the monument/preserve contains no existing wilderness; thus, there are no known impacts.

Conclusion: If the presence of adjacent wilderness causes a native corporation to bank large tracts of corporation-owned lands rather than using or developing them for other purposes, the wilderness designation could be considered to cause negative impacts to the native corporation. However, because there are no known situations of this type, this must be considered an area of potential impacts.

**ALTERNATIVE 2 (WILDERNESS WITH MINIMUM EXCLUSIONS)**

This alternative would designate and protect all wilderness-suible land within Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve with the exceptions of the eastern and southwestern portions of the preserve.
The eastern portion of the preserve that surrounds Amber Bay is deleted from wilderness designation from a north-south line running down along the crest of the Aleutian Range to Aniakchak Bay, leaving a potential wilderness corridor containing the Aniakchak River valley. This eliminates the portion of the preserve on the Kunmik Peninsula (____ acres).

The southwestern corner of the preserve is deleted from wilderness designation along a line running from Aniakchak Bay parallel to the Aniakchak River corridor, west to east from the Cape Horn hills along the high points of the nearby foothills, and swinging south along the crests of the Aleutian Range down to the R 55 W/R 54 W range line near Kuju Point. This essentially eliminates the Cape Kumliik peninsula and its surrounding hills (____ acres) from wilderness designation.

The following environmental and socioeconomic effects would be expected to occur as a result of the wilderness designation proposed in this alternative.

**Impacts on Wilderness Values**

Aniakchak is an area where opportunities for solitude abound. Its _____ acres had only 117 visitors in 1986. Air-taxi service or private aircraft is essential in gaining access to interior parts of the monument/preserve for recreational use. However, it is possible to gain
access to the caldera overland from Port Heiden. Access to the Pacific Coast by boat is technically feasible from the Chigniks or Kodiak, but the distances are substantial.

The only recreation available in the area is of a primitive nature. Most of the known recreationists who have used the area have been transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up later after exploring the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and exploration. Some activity may be unreported. There are two lodges within the preserve that are used by commercial guides.

Because of the remoteness of the area and the fact that it receives very few visitors, it is an area that shows very little impact from the activities of man; it is an area that is in a nearly natural state.

Special features of the study area that would be included in wilderness under this alternative are: the caldera and associated volcanic features; 5 of the approximately 95 miles of Pacific coastline fronting Aniakchak Bay; portions of the Aleutian Range; the Bristol Bay lowlands; waterfalls [where are these waterfalls? are they in or out?]; the Meshik, Aniakchak, (a designated wild river), and Cinder rivers; good air and water quality; tundra, shrubland, and about 5 percent of the monument/preserve's beach strand vegetation; varied and abundant wildlife, including moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, wolves, sea otters, Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, eight species of whale, waterfowl, shorebirds,
seabirds, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons; fish, including five species of salmon and marine fish and shellfish; the moose winter range northeast and southeast of the caldera; most of the caribou calving area southeast of the monument; caribou migration routes; an approximately 5-square-mile area of brown/grizzly bear spring use area on Aniakchak Bay (about one/sixth of the brown/grizzly bear spring use area in the monument/preserve); less than 10 percent of the bear denning areas (those on the caldera); less than five percent of the raptor nesting/use areas; less than 5 percent of the Pacific coastline (from which Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, whales, waterfowl, shorebirds and seabirds can be viewed); and summer salmon use streams in most of the preserve.

Special features of the monument/preserve that would not be designated wilderness under this alternative are: approximately 90 miles of the 95 miles of rugged Pacific coastline fronting on Amber, Aniakchak, and Kujulik bays; the Cape Kumlik, Cape Ayutka, and Cape Kunmik peninsulas; the western slopes of the Aleutian Range, including West, Main, and North creeks, which flow into Amber Bay; tundra, shrubland, and 95 percent of the monument/preserve's beach vegetation; the moose winter range near Amber Bay and a portion of the moose winter range near Amber Bay and a portion of the moose winter range southeast of the monument; one-fifth of the caribou calving area southeast of the monument; approximately five/sixths of the brown/grizzly bear spring use areas in the monument/preserve (fronting Aniakchak and Amber bays); approximately 90 percent of the bear denning areas (all those on the eastern slopes of the Aleutian Mountains; the sea otter area in Kujulik.
Bay, all the harbor seal haulout areas along the Pacific Coast; 05 or more percent of the raptor nesting/use areas; 95 percent of the Pacific Coast (from which Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, and northern sea lions, whales, waterfowl, shorebirds, and seabirds can be viewed and marine fish and shellfish taken); the summer salmon concentration streams; and critical salmon habitat of North Fork, Wolverine, Village, Black, West, Main and Northeast creeks.

The qualities of solitude, primitive recreation, naturalness, and the special features described above that qualify these lands to be designated as wilderness would receive maximum protection and preservation on the lands designated wilderness in this alternative. The earth and its community of life would remain untrammeled by man, except for the minimal impacts of visitors who enter and use the wilderness but do not remain. The undeveloped, primeval, natural character of wilderness, without permanent habitation, would be preserved, as would excellent opportunities to experience solitude; primitive, unconfined recreation; and the potential for enjoyment or study of the area's many special features.

These qualities in the _____ acres of wilderness suitable-land that are not proposed for wilderness designation would not receive the extra protection provided by wilderness designation.

Conclusions: This alternative would protect and preserve wilderness values on approximately ________ acres of federal monument and preserve lands for generations to come by ensuring that natural processes be allowed to continue unimpeded.
Wilderness values, including many special features on ____ acres of the preserve, would not receive the protection of wilderness designation.

**Impacts on the Subsistence Use of Motorized Equipment and New Motorized Technology**

Subsisters use motorized tools like chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, and powered ice augers and winches in pursuits directly related to the taking of fish and game and the cutting and gathering of vegetative resources. These uses have become part of the subsistence way of life maintained by rural Alaska residents and are permitted by the National Park Service in nonwilderness areas. However, in Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, there is probably no use of chain saws on public lands to obtain house logs or firewood for subsistence purposes. This is because of a scarcity of easily accessible timber within the monument/preserve.

The use of other mechanized equipment in activities such as winter fishing through the ice (in which the setting of nets and traps could involve the use of motorized ice augers and winches) is minimal if it exists at all in Aniakchak. Although some freshwater ice fishing occurs near the villages, a large commercial salmon fishery offshore from the preserve and monument provides most of the fish resources needed by area residents. Consequently, there is probably no use of mechanized equipment associated with ice fishing or other winter subsistence activities taking place on the public lands within the monument/preserve.
Regarding access to subsistence resources, the National Park Service realizes that new technologies may be invented that could be suitable for access to public lands by subsisters. However, new motorized technologies, like chain saws and other contemporary motorized tools and vehicles not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811), would be incompatible with wilderness values if allowed for subsistence access to a designated wilderness area.

The National Park Service interprets section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 to provide precedence for this situation. The act prohibits motorized equipment and motor vehicles in wilderness areas and would apply to the subsistence use of chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers, winches, and new motorized technologies. Section 4(c) applies because, unlike snowmobiles and motorboats, chain saws and other motorized tools and technologies are not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811).

In alternative 2, subsisters would be prohibited from using motorized tools like chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers and winches, and new motorized technologies in designated wilderness areas.

Conclusions: New motorized technologies would not be allowed in wilderness areas because of their inherent incompatibility with wilderness values. The impact on subsistence use from the prohibition of motorized equipment would be minimal in the case of chain saws, generators, ice augers, and winches because no, or perhaps only a few, subsisters employ such equipment within the monument/preserve.
Impacts on Recreational Use Levels

Recreational use at Aniakchak is affected by its remoteness. The monument/preserve is 400 miles from Anchorage, and the only community nearby, Meshik-Fort Heiden, is 10 miles away, very small, and has no visitor facilities. Access to the park is usually by airplane, making it a relatively expensive destination.

Another factor affecting recreational use levels is weather. Rain and fog cover the mountain most of the time. The Pacific side of Aniakchak gets about 126 inches of rain per year, and the Bering Sea side is almost continuously fogged in. Within the caldera, hurricane force winds occur at times.

Recreational activities in the Aniakchak area include sport hunting and fishing, as well as backpacking, rafting, camping, exploration, photography, and nature study.

Perhaps four or five unguided parties or individuals per year enter the preserve for sport hunting or fishing. They come by small plane and land on ash fields at higher elevations on Aniakchak's slopes (for hunting caribou), gravel bars in the Cinder River drainage (for moose or caribou), or Pacific-side river drainages (for moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, and river fishing).
The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. [Are any of these areas within the part of the preserve that would be excluded from wilderness designation.] (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users have entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978), that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

Other than those escorted by commercial use license holders, 117 visitors were reported in 1986. Based on continuing increases in the area's popularity and long-term positive growth of the national economy, public
use of Aniakchak is expected to reach 2,000 to 7,000 recreation visits by the year 2020.

Projected numbers of visitors are not expected to be affected by wilderness designation or nonwilderness designation.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]

Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If owners did not remove them, they would become public use cabins. There would be no impact on numbers of hunters using the facilities.

Under alternative 2, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about _____ recreationists during the months of _____ through ____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists could camp outdoors.
A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) could no longer be used as private facilities. The lodge near Rainbow Creek can probably sleep about 12 visitors; the one on Cinder Creek about 30 (probably averaging 12-14 people at a time). The owners of the lodges will be given the opportunity to remove the lodges; if not removed, they would become public use cabins. The conversion of the lodges to public use cabins would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Although the lodges could not be used for commercial purposes any longer, it is expected that the hunting guides would continue their operation using portable accommodations for their customers. However, should the guides decide to move their operations outside the monument/preserve (if the boundary of their guiding areas allowed them to do so), there could be a decrease in recreation use levels of the 99 visitors per year (based on 1985 figures). The extent to which other visitors would use the abandoned hunting lodges and therefore add to the number of visitors in the area is not known.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by guides and outfitters. Hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging, and, because of the severe weather, the guides and outfitters would have no customers as a result of this action.
Under alternative 2, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about ____ recreationists during the months of ____ through ____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists could camp outdoors here where the weather is moderated by the Pacific Ocean.

A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) could no longer be used as private facilities. The lodge near Rainbow Creek can probably sleep about 12 visitors; the one on Cinder Creek about 30 (probably averages 12-14 people at a time). The owners of the lodges would be given the opportunity to remove the lodges. If they are not removed by their owners, under this alternative, they would be removed by the National Park Service because no one uses the area except guided hunters. Out-of-state hunters may only hunt in Alaska if accompanied by a licensed guide. The weather in the areas of Aniakchak where the lodges are located is so severe that the absence of the lodges would mean that it would not be possible for hunters to remain in the area to hunt. Therefore, the businesses of the two guides would no longer be viable and recreation use levels would be expected to decrease by about 99 visitors per year.
Scenario 3—the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under alternative 2, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about _____ recreationists during the months of _____ through ____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists would camp outdoors.

A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) could continue to be used as private facilities as long as their current operators own and operate them. The lodge near Rainbow Creek can probably sleep about 12 visitors; the one on Cinder Creek about 30 (probably averaging 12-14 people at a time). The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to anyone. The current owners of the lodges would be allowed to continue to operate them. However, when the current owners die or transfer their guide operations to another
party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. There could be a decrease in recreation use levels of 99 visitors per year, based on 1985 figures, when the owners of the two lodges die or transfer their guiding licenses.

Conclusions: This will depend on the scenario chosen.

**Impacts on Use of ANILCA Title XI Permits**

ANILCA provides a process for the consideration of proposed transportation (access) or utility systems that would occupy or traverse any conservation system units created by ANILCA, including national park system areas. Transportation applications, along with all pertinent information, must be submitted to the park superintendent for approval or denial. For utility systems proposing to cross or occupy nonwilderness areas, applications are forwarded to the secretary of the interior, who in turn submits them to Congress for approval or denial. For applications proposing to traverse or occupy designated wilderness areas, the process is the same with the exception that applications are submitted by the secretary of the interior to the president who then submits them to Congress for final decision.

The impacts that might be associated with this process relate to the fact that title XI permit applications would go through an extra step and probably receive the closest of scrutiny if they involved designated
wilderness. However, no title XI permits, no applications, and no proposals for title XI access are known about at this time. The state's preferred route for a transpeninsula transportation corridor lies outside the monument/preserve boundary. An alternative route includes 22 miles within the monument/preserve boundary.

Conclusion: There are no title XI permits at Aniakchak now. None are proposed. With this alternative there would be a greater likelihood of permit denial (or approval with more stringent and costly environmental protection measures) than if the monument were not mostly a designated wilderness area. Thus, there could be negative impacts on title XI transportation and utility permit applications if it is proposed that designated wilderness be traversed or occupied by such systems.

Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Businesses

There were three commercial use licenses in 1985 for activities that had no facilities—air taxi service, backpacking guide, and hunting guide. Wilderness designation would not impact these operations. Enterprises with facilities would be impacted. There are two hunting guide operations using two lodges within the area that would be designated wilderness under this alternative.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]
Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If not removed, the lodges would become public use cabins. The two operations at the monument/preserve might have to lower their prices up to 25 percent because of the more rustic nature of the accommodations they would provide. This would not be expected to make their businesses unprofitable. However, if it did, two tourism related businesses could be lost as a result of implementation of alternative 2.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by the guides and outfitters, and hunters would have to rely on tents for lodging. Because of the severity of the weather at Aniakchak during hunting season and the nature of the clients, the guides and outfitters would have no customers as a result of this action. Therefore, two tourism related businesses in the monument/preserve would be lost as a result of implementation of alternative 2.

Scenario 3--the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under alternative 2, the two lodges would remain in use as private facilities in wilderness as long as their current operators own and operate them. The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to
anyone except the current owner. When the current owners die or transfer their guide operations to another party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. There could be a loss of two tourism related businesses as a result of implementation of alternative 2 if the businesses ceased to be profitable as a result of the loss of the right to use the lodges.

Conclusion: This will depend on the scenario chosen.

Impacts on Amount of Tourism Related Revenue

At present the only tourism related revenue generated by the presence of the monument/preserve is from the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board has assigned eight hunting guide areas that include parts of the monument or preserve. (Only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990
visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt of 10 days per person, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most of those were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

The only tourism related businesses that would be impacted by this alternative would be the two hunting guide operations that own lodges.

[The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.]

Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If the lodges were not removed by the owners, they would become public use
cabins. The two operations at the monument/preserve might have to lower their prices up to 25 percent because of the more rustic nature of the accommodations they would provide. The two existing hunting guide operations reported having 99 clients in the 1985 season. Hunters usually stay for a period of 10 days each at a cost of approximately $10,000 each for total annual revenue of $990,000. The pertinent hunting seasons normally last 60 days per year. With the necessity to move from cabins to more primitive accommodations, it is estimated that the cost of the trip per person would have to be dropped to as low as $7,500 per person for a total revenue of $742,500. This would result in a loss of approximately $247,500 in tourism related revenue. It is unlikely that loss of the use of the lodges would make the hunting guide businesses unprofitable. However, if it did, two tourism related businesses could be lost as a result of implementation of this alternative, with a resulting loss in tourism related revenue of $990,000.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by the guides and outfitters, and hunters would have to rely on tents for lodging. Because of the severity of the weather at Aniakchak during hunting season and the nature of the clients, the guides and outfitters would have no customers as a result of this action. Therefore, two tourism related businesses in the monument/preserve would be lost as a result of implementation of this alternative. This would result in a loss in tourism related revenue of $990,000.
Scenario 3—the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under alternative 2, the two lodges would remain in use as private facilities in wilderness as long as their current operators own and operate them. The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to anyone except the current owner. When the current owners die or transfer their guide operations to another party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. If the guiding businesses continue to operate with tents, the loss in tourism revenue is estimated to be about 25 percent of the current level of $900,000 or a loss of $247,500. There could be a loss of two tourism related businesses as a result of implementation of alternative 2 if the businesses ceased to be profitable as a result of the loss of the right to use the lodges. This would result in a loss of tourism related revenue of $990,000.

Conclusion: This will depend on the scenario chosen.

Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Jobs

At present the only tourism related jobs within the monument/preserve are a result of the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from
the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985 only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.
The only tourism related businesses that would be impacted by this alternative would be the two hunting guide operations with lodges.

(The following are the three scenarios I have heard for the guide lodges. Someone needs to decide which one is correct and should be included in the draft EIS.)

Scenario 1--Guides and outfitters would have to remove all permanent structures, and hunters would need to rely on tents for lodging. If the owners did not remove the structures, they would become public use cabins. The two operations at the monument/preserve might have to lower their prices up to 25 percent because of the more rustic nature of the accommodations they would provide. This could cause the guiding operations to employ fewer people. The number of people employed by the guiding operations is not known. It is estimated that the two existing guiding operations together employ fewer than 10 people. Presumably a layoff as the result of a loss in 25 percent of revenue would be a total of two to three people (jobs) at most. It is unlikely that the loss of the use of the lodges would make the hunting guide businesses unprofitable. However, it if did, all 10 jobs related to hunting guides could be lost as a result of implementation of this alternative.

There is nothing in this alternative that would limit the number of new businesses and therefore tourism related jobs that could depend on the monument/preserve. However, the businesses would not be allowed to build structures or to engage in activities that are incompatible with wilderness preservation.
Should the number of people using the area become incompatible with wilderness preservation, permits might not be issued for some businesses, therefore limiting the number of jobs for people directly dependent on the monument/preserve.

Scenario 2--Guides and outfitters would have to remove (or the National Park Service would remove) all permanent structures used by the guides and outfitters, and hunters would have to rely on tents for lodging. The weather in the areas where the lodges are located is so severe that the absence of the lodges would mean it would not be possible for hunters to remain in the area to hunt. Therefore, the businesses of the two guides would no longer be viable.

Under this alternative, all jobs related to the two hunting guide operations would be lost. It is estimated that the total loss would be fewer than 10 jobs.

Scenario 3--the Guides and Outfitters policy of February 1987. The existing holder of the commercial use permit would be allowed to continue use of the lodges all his life, and the right to use the lodges would be nontransferrable.

Under this alternative, the two hunting guide operations could continue to use their lodges as private facilities as long as their current operators own and operate them. The right to use the existing lodges could not be transferred to anyone except the current owner. However, when the
current owners die or transfer their guide operations to another party, the right to use the lodges would terminate and the lodges would be removed or remain as public use cabins. If the operations continue in tents there would be a loss of two to three tourism related jobs. If the businesses ceased to exist as the result of the loss of the cabins, 10 tourism related jobs would be lost.

Conclusion: This would depend on the scenario chosen.

Impacts on Use of Alaska Land Bank Program by Native Corporations

ANILCA (section 907) established an Alaska land bank program to provide legal and economic benefits to private landowners and to provide for the maintenance of land in its natural condition, particularly where these nonfederal lands adjoin federal and state conservation system units. Under the program, native corporation lands, but not native allotments or small patented tracts, have immunity from adverse possession and real property taxes and assessments. They are also immune from judgment in any action of law or equity to recover sums owed or penalties incurred by any native corporation or group or any officer, director, or stockholder of a corporation or group. Land bank agreements will be particularly important in cooperating with native corporations that own or will own large tracts of land in or adjacent to the monument. They may also be important as an interim protective measure pending federal or state acquisition by exchange or purchase.
The initial term for land bank agreements is 10 years; renewals may be made for additional periods of five years. However, there is a provision for withdrawal from the program, with a 90-day notice to all parties. This could create an adverse situation for landowners, who are immediately responsible for back taxes and other obligations that were deferred. If obligations are not met, the land is subject to condemnation for public purposes.

Under certain circumstances there may be impacts or perceived impacts on native or village corporations when their lands eligible for the land bank program abut wilderness within National Park Service (or other federal) units. If the corporations decide they are obligated to bank tracts because they abut or are mostly surrounded by National Park Service wilderness, while the corporations' preferences are to use the lands for other purposes, this perception of obligation to utilize the program (or loss of lands when withdrawn from the program) might be considered an adverse impact on the corporations stemming from the wilderness designation of the adjacent federal land. At present there are no known situations of this type involving Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, and the monument/preserve contains no existing wilderness; thus, there are no known impacts.

Conclusion: If the presence of adjacent wilderness causes a native corporation to bank large tracts of corporation-owned lands rather than using or developing them for other purposes, the wilderness designation could be considered to cause negative impacts to the native corporation.
However, because there are no known situations of this type, this must be considered an area of potential impacts.

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (WILDERNESS WITH MAJOR EXCLUSIONS)**

This alternative would designate and protect ____ acres of wilderness-suitable land within Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve. The wilderness-suitable land that would not be protected would be approximately ____ acres.

Under this alternative the northwest portion of the preserve would be deleted from wilderness designation along a line running from the north boundary of the preserve southeast along the crest of the Aleutian Range and its foothills to Aniakchak River valley and then turns to the southeast and runs parallel to the preserve boundary and into Amber Bay. This would eliminate a portion of bear habitat from wilderness designation. The south portion of the preserve would also be eliminated from wilderness designation under this alternative, along a line running from Pinnacle Mountain on the southeast corner of the monument boundary, southward by Meshik Lake, swinging east along the crest of the nearby foothills to parallel the Aniakchak River valley, and ending at Aniakchak Bay.

The following environmental and socioeconomic effects would be expected to occur as a result of designating ______ acres of wilderness-suitable lands within the monument as wilderness.
Impacts on Wilderness Values

Aniakchak is an area where opportunities for solitude abound. Its ______ acres had only 117 visitors in 1986. Air-taxi service or private aircraft is essential in gaining access to interior parts of the monument/preserve for recreational use. However, it is possible to gain access to the caldera overland from Port Heiden. Access to the Pacific Coast by boat is technically feasible from the Chigniks or Kodiak, but the distances are substantial.

The only recreation available in the area is of a primitive nature. Most of the known recreationists who have used the area have been transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up later after exploring the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and exploration. Some activity may be unreported. There are two lodges within the preserve that are used by commercial guides.

Because of the remoteness of the area and the fact that it receives very few visitors, it is an area that shows very little impact from the activities of man; it is an area that is in a nearly natural state.

Special features of the study area that would be included in wilderness under this alternative are: the caldera and associated volcanic features; 5 of the approximately 95 miles of Pacific coastline fronting on Aniakchack Bay; portions of the Aleutian Range; the Bristol Bay lowlands; waterfalls
[where are these waterfalls? are they in or out?]; the Meshik, Aniakchak, (a designated wild river), and Cinder rivers; good air and water quality; tundra, shrubland, and about 5 percent of the monument/preserve's beach strand vegetation; varied and abundant wildlife, including moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, wolves, sea otters, Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, eight species of whale, waterfowl, shorebirds, seabirds, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons; fish, including five species of salmon and marine fish and shellfish; the moose winter range northeast and southeast of the caldera; most of the caribou calving area southeast of the monument; caribou migration routes; an approximately 5-square-mile area of brown/grizzly bear spring use area on Aniakchak Bay (about one-sixth of the brown/grizzly bear spring use area in the monument/preserve); less than 10 percent of the bear denning areas (those on the caldera); less than five percent of the raptor nesting/use areas; less than 5 percent of the Pacific coastline (from which Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, whales, waterfowl, shorebirds and seabirds can be viewed); and summer salmon use streams in most of the preserve.

Special features of the monument/preserve that would not be designated wilderness under this alternative, which are the same as those features that would not be preserved in alternative 2, are: approximately 90 miles of the 95 miles of rugged Pacific coastline fronting on Amber, Aniakchak, and Kujulik bays; the Cape Kumlik, Cape Ayutka, and Cape Kunmik peninsulas; the western slopes of the Aleutian Range, including West, Main, and North creeks—which flow into Amber Bay; tundra, shrubland, and 95 percent of the monument/preserve's beach strand vegetation; the
moose winter range near Amber Bay and a portion of the moose winter range near Amber Bay and a portion of the moose winter range southeast of the monument; one-fifth of the caribou calving area southeast of the monument; approximately five-sixths of the brown/grizzly bear spring use areas in the monument/preserve (fronting Aniakchak and Amber bays); approximately 90 percent of the bear denning areas (all those on the eastern slopes of the Aleutian Mountains; the sea otter area in Kujulik Bay; all the harbor seal haulout areas along the Pacific coast; 95 or more percent of the raptor nesting/use areas; 95 percent of the Pacific Coast from which Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, northern sea lions, whales, waterfowl, shorebirds, seabirds can be viewed and marine fish and shellfish taken; the summer salmon concentration streams; and critical salmon habitat of North Fork, Wolverine, Village, Black, West, Main and Northeast creeks.

Scenic qualities that would be excluded from wilderness in alternative 3 (in addition to those excluded in alternative 2) are: three-fourths of the Aleutian Range within the monument/preserve; the eastern side of the Cinder River valley; Pumice, Ray, and Wiggly creeks in the northeast portion of the preserve; the Meshik River, Meshik Lake, Shoe and Cub creeks, and portions of Plenty Bear, Rainbow, and Waterfall creeks and associated wet tundra in the southern portion of the preserve; additional moose winter range in the southern part of the preserve; portions of the eastern caribou migration route; two-thirds of the caribou calving area near the southeastern corner of the monument; and a majority of the remaining critical habitat for salmon (only the Aniakchak River, with most
of its tributaries, and the western tributaries of the Cinder River would remain).

The qualities of solitude, primitive recreation, naturalness, and the special features described above that qualify these lands to be designated as wilderness would receive maximum protection and preservation with the wilderness designation. The earth and its community of life would remain untrammeled by man, except for the minimal impacts of visitors who enter and use the wilderness but do not remain. The undeveloped, primeval, natural character of wilderness, without permanent habitation, would be preserved, as would excellent opportunities to experience solitude; primitive, unconfined recreation; and the potential for enjoyment or study of the area's many special features.

These qualities in the _____ acres of wilderness suitable-land that are not proposed for wilderness designation would not receive the extra protection provided by wilderness designation.

Conclusions: This alternative would protect and preserve wilderness values on approximately _____ acres of federal monument and preserve lands for generations to come by ensuring that natural processes be allowed to continue unimpeded.

Wilderness values, including many special features on ____ acres of the preserve, would not receive the protection of wilderness designation.
Impacts on the Subsistence Use of Motorized Equipment and New Motorized Technology

Subsisters use motorized tools like chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, and powered ice augers and winches in pursuits directly related to the taking of fish and game and the cutting and gathering of vegetative resources. These uses have become part of the subsistence way of life maintained by rural Alaska residents and are permitted by the National Park Service in nonwilderness areas. However, in Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, there is probably no use of chain saws on public lands to obtain house logs or firewood for subsistence purposes. This is because of a scarcity of easily accessible timber within the monument/preserve.

The use of other mechanized equipment in activities such as winter fishing through the ice (in which the setting of nets and traps could involve the use of motorized ice augers and winches) is minimal if it exists at all in Aniackchak. Although some freshwater ice fishing occurs near the villages, a large commercial salmon fishery offshore from the preserve and monument provides most of the fish resources needed by area residents. Consequently, there is probably no use of mechanized equipment associated with ice fishing or other winter subsistence activities taking place on the public lands within the monument/preserve.

Regarding access to subsistence resources, the National Park Service realizes that new technologies may be invented that could be suitable for
access to public lands by subsisters. However, new motorized technologies, like chain saws and other contemporary motorized tools and vehicles not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811), would be incompatible with wilderness values if allowed for subsistence access to a designated wilderness area.

The National Park Service interprets section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1954 to provide precedence for this situation. The act prohibits motorized equipment and motor vehicles in wilderness areas and would apply to the subsistence use of chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers, winches, and new motorized technologies. Section 4(c) applies because, unlike snowmobiles and motorboats, chain saws and other motorized tools and technologies are not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811).

In alternative 3, subsisters would be prohibited from using motorized tools like chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers and winches, and new motorized technologies in designated wilderness areas.

Conclusions: New motorized technologies would not be allowed in wilderness areas because of their inherent incompatibility with wilderness values. The impact on subsistence use from the prohibition of motorized equipment would be minimal in the case of chain saws, generators, ice augers, and winches because no, or perhaps only a few, subsisters employ such equipment within the monument/preserve.
Impacts on Recreational Use Levels

Recreational use at Aniakchak is affected by its remoteness. The monument/preserve is 400 miles from Anchorage, and the only community nearby, Meshik-Port Heiden, is 10 miles away, very small, and has no visitor facilities. Access to the park is usually by airplane, making it a relatively expensive destination.

Another factor affecting recreational use levels is weather. Rain and fog cover the mountain most of the time. The Pacific side of Aniakchak gets about 126 inches of rain per year, and the Bering Sea side is almost continuously fogged in. Within the caldera, hurricane force winds occur at times.

Recreational activities in the Aniakchak area include sport hunting and fishing, as well as nonconsumptive leisure activities such as backpacking, rafting, camping, exploration, photography, and nature study. Guided recreational use is considered an element of recreational use.

Perhaps four or five unguided parties or individuals per year enter the preserve for sport hunting or fishing. They come by small plane and land on ash fields at higher elevations on Aniakchak's slopes (for hunting caribou), gravel bars in the Cinder River drainage (for moose or caribou), or Pacific-side river drainages (for moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, and river fishing).
The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now, only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtained annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming each hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users have entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

Other than those escorted by commercial use license holders, 117 visitors were reported in 1986. Based on continuing increases in the area's popularity and long-term positive growth of the national economy, public use of Aniakchak is expected to reach 2,000 to 7,000 recreation visits by the year 2020.
Projected numbers of visitors are not expected to be affected by wilderness designation or nonwilderness designation.

Under alternative 3, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about _____ recreationists during the months of _____ through ____. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists could camp outdoors here where the weather is moderated by the Pacific Ocean.

A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) would not be in wilderness under this alternative. Thus, they would not be impacted.

Conclusion: There would be no impact on recreation use levels as a result of implementation of alternative 3.
Impacts on Use of ANILCA Title XI Permits

ANILCA provides a process for the consideration of proposed transportation (access) or utility systems that would occupy or traverse any conservation system units created by ANILCA, including national park system areas. Transportation applications, along with all pertinent information, must be submitted to the park superintendent for approval or denial. For utility systems proposing to cross or occupy nonwilderness areas, applications are forwarded to the secretary of the interior, who in turn submits them to Congress for approval or denial. For applications proposing to traverse or occupy designated wilderness areas, the process is the same with the exception that applications are submitted by the secretary of the interior to the president who then submits them to Congress for final decision.

The impacts that might be associated with this process relate to the fact that title XI permit applications would go through an extra step and probably receive the closest of critical scrutiny if they involved designated wilderness. However, no title XI permits, no applications, and no proposals for title XI access are known about at this time. The state's preferred route for a transpeninsula transportation corridor lies within the monument/preserve boundary but outside the proposed wilderness under alternative 3.

Conclusion: There are no title XI permits at Aniakchak now. None are proposed. With this alternative there would be a greater likelihood of
permit denial (or approval with more stringent and costly environmental protection measures) than if the monument had no designated wilderness area. Thus, there could be negative impacts on title XI transportation and utility permit applications if it is proposed that designated wilderness be traversed or occupied by such systems.

**Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Businesses**

There were three commercial use licenses in 1985 for activities that had no facilities—air taxi service, backpacking guide, and hunting guide. Wilderness designation would not impact these operations. The two guiding operations using two lodges within the monument/preserve are outside designated wilderness under this alternative. There would, therefore, be no impact on them from wilderness designation.

Conclusion: There would be no impact on tourism related businesses as a result of implementation of alternative 3.

**Impacts on Amount of Tourism Related Revenue**

At present the only tourism related revenue generated by the presence of the monument/preserve is from the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150
miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt lasts 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.
There would be no impact on tourism related revenue under this alternative. The two existing guide operations within the monument/preserve would be outside wilderness under this alternative. Therefore, wilderness designation would have no impact on them.

Conclusion: There would be no impact on tourism related revenue from implementation of this alternative.

**Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Jobs**

At present the only tourism related jobs within the monument/preserve are a result of the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.
Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

There would be no impacts on tourism related jobs of air taxi service, the backpacking guide, or the fishing guide. The two existing hunting guide operations that use the monument/preserve would not be within the wilderness boundary under this alternative. Therefore, there would be no impacts on them or related tourism related jobs under this alternative.

There is nothing in this alternative that would limit the number of new businesses and therefore tourism related jobs that could depend on the monument/preserve. However, the businesses would not be allowed to build structures or to engage in activities that would be incompatible with wilderness preservation. Should the number of people using the area become incompatible with wilderness preservation, permits might not be issued for some businesses therefore limiting the number of jobs for people directly dependent on the monument/preserve.
This alternative would have no impact on existing tourism related businesses in the monument/preserve. It would, however, prevent the establishment of new businesses that are incompatible with wilderness preservation within the designated wilderness.

Impacts on Use of Alaska Land Bank Program by Native Corporations

ANILCA (section 907) established an Alaska land bank program to provide legal and economic benefits to private landowners and to provide for the maintenance of land in its natural condition, particularly where these nonfederal lands adjoin federal and state conservation system units. Under the program, native corporation lands, but not native allotments or small patented tracts, have immunity from adverse possession and real property taxes and assessments. They are also immune from judgment in any action of law or equity to recover sums owed or penalties incurred by any native corporation or group or any officer, director, or stockholder of a corporation or group. Land bank agreements will be particularly important in cooperating with native corporations that own or will own large tracts of land in or adjacent to the monument. They may also be important as an interim protective measure pending federal or state acquisition by exchange or purchase.

The initial term for land bank agreements is 10 years; renewals may be made for additional periods of five years. However, there is a provision for withdrawal from the program, with a 90-day notice to all parties.
This could create an adverse situation for landowners, who are immediately responsible for back taxes and other obligations that were deferred. If obligations are not met, the land is subject to condemnation for public purposes.

Under certain circumstances there may be impacts or perceived impacts on native or village corporations when their lands eligible for the land bank program abut wilderness within National Park Service (or other federal) units. If the corporations decide they are obligated to bank tracts because they abut or are mostly surrounded by National Park Service wilderness, while the corporations' preferences are to use the lands for other purposes, this perception of obligation to utilize the program (or loss of lands when withdrawn from the program) might be considered an adverse impact on the corporations stemming from the wilderness designation of the adjacent federal land. At present there are no known situations of this type involving Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, and the monument/preserve contains no existing wilderness; thus, there are no known impacts.

Conclusion: If the presence of adjacent wilderness causes a native corporation to bank large tracts of corporation-owned lands rather than using or developing them for other purposes, the wilderness designation could be considered to cause negative impacts to the native corporation. However, because there are no known situations of this type, this must be considered an area of potential impacts.
ALTERNATIVE 4 (NO ACTION)

This alternative would designate and protect no wilderness-suitable land within Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve. Within the ___ acres of the monument/preserve, there would be no wilderness.

The following environmental and socioeconomic effects would be expected to occur as a result of designating no suitable lands within the monument as wilderness.

Impacts on Wilderness Values

Aniakchak is an area where opportunities for solitude abound. Its ___ acres had only 117 visitors in 1986. Air-taxi service or private aircraft is essential in gaining access to interior parts of the monument/preserve for recreational use. However, it is possible to gain access to the caldera overland from Port Heiden. Access to the Pacific Coast by boat is technically feasible from the Chigniks or Kodiak, but the distances are substantial.

The only recreation available in the area is of a primitive nature. Most of the known recreationists who have used the area have been transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up later after exploring the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and exploration. Some activity
may be unreported. There are two lodges within the preserve that are used by commercial guides.

Because of the remoteness of the area and the fact that it receives very few visitors, it is an area that shows very little impact from the activities of man; it is an area that is in a nearly natural state.

Special features of the monument/preserve include: the caldera and associated volcanic features; the rugged Pacific coastline; several peninsulas, bays, and protected coves; portions of the Aleutian Range; the Bristol Bay lowlands; waterfalls; the Meshik, Aniakchak, and Cinder rivers; good air and water quality; tundra, shrubland, and beach strand vegetation; varied and abundant wildlife, including moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, wolves, sea otters, Dall porpoise, harbor porpoise, harbor seals, and northern sea lions; eight species of whale, waterfowl, shorebirds, seabirds, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons; and fish, including five species of salmon and marine fish and shellfish.

The qualities of solitude, primitive recreation, naturalness, and the special features described above that qualify these lands to be designated as wilderness would receive no additional protection without wilderness designation.

Conclusions: This alternative would provide for no additional protection or preservation of wilderness values on approximately ___ acres of federal monument and preserve land. There would be no requirement
that the National Park Service manage the lands to ensure that the wilderness values of solitude, naturalness, primitive recreation, and special features would remain unimpaired for future generations.

Impacts on the Subsistence Use of Motorized Equipment and New Motorized Technology

Subsistees use motorized tools like chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, and powered ice augers and winches in pursuits directly related to the taking of fish and game and the cutting and gathering of vegetative resources. These uses have become part of the subsistence way of life maintained by rural Alaska residents and are permitted by the National Park Service in nonwilderness areas. However, in Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, there is probably no use of chain saws on public lands to obtain house logs or firewood for subsistence purposes. This is because of a scarcity of easily accessible timber within the monument/preserve.

The use of other mechanized equipment in activities such as winter fishing through the ice (in which the setting of nets and traps could involve the use of motorized ice augers and winches) is minimal if it exists at all in Aniackchak. Although some freshwater ice fishing occurs near the villages, a large commercial salmon fishery offshore from the preserve and monument provides most of the fish resources needed by area residents. Consequently, there is probably no use of mechanized
equipment associated with ice fishing or other winter subsistence activities taking place on the public lands within the monument/preserve.

Regarding access to subsistence resources, the National Park Service realizes that new technologies may be invented that could be suitable for access to public lands by subsisters. However, new motorized technologies, like chain saws and other contemporary motorized tools and vehicles not specifically permitted by ANILCA (section 811), would be incompatible with wilderness values if allowed for subsistence access to a designated wilderness area.

The National Park Service interprets section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964, which prohibits motorized equipment and motor vehicles in wilderness areas, to apply.

Conclusions: Alternative 4, the no-action proposal, would mean that subsisters would be permitted to use chain saws, gasoline-fueled generators, powered ice augers and winches, and new motorized technologies in the study area if they wished, consistent with existing laws and regulations.

**Impacts on Recreational Use Levels**

Recreational use at Aniakchak is affected by its remoteness. The monument/preserve is 400 miles from Anchorage, and the only community
nearby, Meshik-Port Heiden, is 10 miles away, very small, and has no visitor facilities. Access to the park is usually by airplane, making it a relatively expensive destination.

Another factor affecting recreational use levels is weather. Rain and fog cover the mountain most of the time. The Pacific side of Aniakchak gets about 126 inches of rain per year, and the Bering Sea side is almost continuously fogged in. Within the caldera, hurricane force winds occur at times.

Recreational activities in the Aniakchak area include sport hunting and fishing, as well as nonconsumptive leisure activities such as backpacking, rafting, camping, exploration, photography, and nature study.

Perhaps four or five unguided parties or individuals per year enter the preserve for sport hunting or fishing. They come by small plane and land on ash fields at higher elevations on Aniakchak's slopes (for hunting caribou), gravel bars in the Cinder River drainage (for moose or caribou), or Pacific-side river drainages (for moose, caribou, brown/grizzly bears, and river fishing).

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985,
only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users have entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

Other than those escorted by commercial use license holders, 117 visitors were reported in 1986. Based on continuing increases in the area's popularity and long-term positive growth of the national economy, public use of Aniakchak is expected to reach 2,000 to 7,000 recreation visits by the year 2020.

Projected numbers of visitors are not expected to be affected by wilderness designation or nonwilderness designation.
Under alternative 4, an existing public use cabin at the mouth of the Aniakchak River would be converted to a seasonal ranger station. It would continue to be used for public use when not in use by rangers. Conversion of the public use cabin to seasonal ranger use would decrease its availability to recreationists. At present it is used by about ______ recreationists during the months of ______ through ______. The decrease in the availability of the cabin for public use would not be expected to affect recreation use levels. Recreationists could camp outdoors here where the weather is moderated by the Pacific Ocean.

A hunting lodge just south of the monument between Rainbow and Waterfall creeks (made up of one permanent cabin and three tent frame platforms) and one lodge just south of the northern preserve boundary on Cinder Creek (made up of seven buildings and two tent frame floors) would not be in wilderness under this alternative. There would be no impact on recreation use of these lodges under alternative 4.

Conclusion: There would be no impact on recreational use levels under alternative 4.

Impacts on Use of ANILCA Title XI Permits

ANILCA provides a process for the consideration of proposed transportation (access) or utility systems that would occupy or traverse any conservation system units created by ANILCA, including national
park system areas. Transportation applications, along with all pertinent information, must be submitted to the park superintendent for approval or denial. For utility systems proposing to cross or occupy nonwilderness areas, applications are forwarded to the secretary of the interior, who in turn submits them to Congress for approval or denial. For applications proposing to traverse or occupy designated wilderness areas, the process is the same with the exception that applications are submitted by the secretary of the interior to the president who then submits them to Congress for final decision.

There would be no impacts on title XI permit applications under this alternative because no land would be designated wilderness. There are no title XI permits or applications at Aniakchak at this time, and none are proposed. The state's preferred route for a transpeninsular transportation corridor lies outside the monument/preserve boundary. An alternate route includes 22 miles of alignment within the monument/preserve boundary that would not be wilderness under this alternative.

Conclusion: There are no title XI permits at Aniakchak now. None are proposed. Under alternative 4 there would be no impact on title XI permits.
Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Businesses

There were three commercial use licenses in 1985 for activities that had no facilities—air taxi service, backpacking guide, and fishing guide. There are two guiding operations using two lodges within the monument/preserve. None of these businesses would be located within wilderness in alternative 4 because no wilderness designation would be made.

Conclusion: There would be no impact on the number of tourism related businesses under alternative 4.

Impacts on Amount of Tourism Related Revenue

At present the only tourism related revenue generated by the presence of the monument/preserve is from the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Pot Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual
commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days during 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).

There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

There would be no impact on tourism related revenue because there would be no wilderness designation under this alternative.

Conclusion: There would be no impact on tourism related revenue from implementation of this alternative.
Impacts on Number of Tourism Related Jobs

At present the only tourism related jobs within the monument/preserve are a result of the use of airplanes to gain access to the area and from the use of hunting, backpacking, or fishing guides once in the monument/preserve. Scheduled airlines fly into King Salmon (150 miles away) and Meshik-Port Heiden (10 miles away). Airplanes can be chartered to the monument/preserve from either community.

The Alaska State Guide License Control Board had assigned eight hunting guide areas that included parts of the monument or preserve. (Now only those in the preserve have legal status because sport hunting is not allowed within the monument.) The hunting guides obtain annual commercial use licenses from the National Park Service. During 1985, only two hunting guides received NPS commercial use licenses. They reported guiding 990 visitor days in 1985. Assuming a hunt would last 10 days, this would be 99 visitors.

Statistics for backpacking, rafting, and other nonconsumptive uses are scarce. Fewer than 25 known users entered the area during the first six seasons (beginning in 1978) that Aniakchak was a unit of the national park system. Most were transported by amphibious aircraft into Surprise Lake in the Aniakchak caldera and picked up after hiking and exploring within the caldera. A few parties have landed on Meshik Lake for camping and local exploration. Other holders of commercial use licenses in 1985 were a backpacking guide (20 visitors), a fishing guide (15 visitors), and an air taxi service (10 visitors).
There were no commercial use licenses for river-running in the monument and preserve during the 1985 season.

There would be no impacts on tourism related jobs of air taxi service, the backpacking guide, or the fishing guide. The two existing hunting guide operations that use the monument/preserve would not be within the wilderness boundary under this alternative. Therefore, there would be no impacts on them or related tourism related jobs under this alternative.

There is nothing in this alternative that would limit the number of new businesses, and therefore tourism related jobs that could depend on the monument/preserve. However, the businesses would not be allowed to build structures or to engage in activities that are incompatible with wilderness. Should the number of people using the area become incompatible with its monument/preserve preservation, permits might not be issued for some businesses, therefore limiting the number of jobs for people directly dependent on the monument/preserve. Limitations placed on permittees would be less restrictive without wilderness designation.

Conclusions: There would be no impact on number of tourism related jobs under alternative 4--no action.
Impacts on Use of Alaska Land Bank Program by Native Corporations

ANILCA (section 907) established an Alaska land bank program to provide legal and economic benefits to private landowners and to provide for the maintenance of land in its natural condition, particularly where these nonfederal lands adjoin federal and state conservation system units. Under the program, native corporation lands, but not native allotments or small patented tracts, have immunity from adverse possession and real property taxes and assessments. They are also immune from judgment in any action of law or equity to recover sums owed or penalties incurred by any native corporation or group or any officer, director, or stockholder of a corporation or group. Land bank agreements will be particularly important in cooperating with native corporations that own or will own large tracts of land in or adjacent to the monument. They may also be important as an interim protective measure pending federal or state acquisition by exchange or purchase.

The initial term for land bank agreements is 10 years; renewals may be made for additional periods of five years. However, there is a provision for withdrawal from the program, with a 90-day notice to all parties. This could create an adverse situation for landowners, who are immediately responsible for back taxes and other obligations that were deferred. If obligations are not met, the land is subject to condemnation for public purposes.
This alternative represents a continuation of existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no impact on use of federal land bank programs by native corporations.

Conclusion: There would be no impacts on use of federal land bank programs by native corporations under alternative 4.