

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1900-1900 00/2

4395 STRA SB 39 - SB 49 1074



STATE OF ALASKA  
 COUNTY OF DENALI  
 DISTRICT OF NENENA  
 CITY OF NENENA  
 P.O. BOX 70  
 NENENA, ALASKA 99760  
**TOTCHAKET ROAD**  
**RIGHT OF WAY PL**  
 DRAWING BY: APPROXIMATE RECORDING  
 DATE: 8/78

840950  
 26.00

RECORDED  
 NENENA RECORDING  
 DISTRICT

NOV 5 3 47 PM '84

REQUESTED BY Steve

ADDRESS Bainbridge


C/O City of Nenena

P.O. Box 70

Nenena,

AK.

99760



BOOK **33** PAGE **445**  
 Nenena Recording District

**CORNER ACCESSORY TABLE**

MONUMENT NO.	BEARING	REF. HIGH & DISTANCE	LINE OF RIGHT PLAZED AREA WITH INCH
1/A-1	S 80° 03' 43" W	82.95'	4" BIRCH
1/A-2	N 10° 04' 38" E	101.74'	12" BIRCH
1/A-3	N 88° 04' 35" W	88.81'	8 1/2" BIRCH
1/A-4	N 0° 04' 38" E	178.95'	10" BIRCH

POOR FILMING QUALITY

NORTHERN REGION  
PROPOSED FY 87 DISPOSAL PROJECTS

HOMESTEADS

Name	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Lot Size (acres)
Cascaden	1,600	800	1-40
Grand Central	6,400	1,000	1-40
*Pilgrim	3,150	200	1-40
**Steppe	3,100	3,100	1-160
Taylor Mountain	48,500	1,000	1-40
**Wickersham	<u>19,200</u>	<u>4,000</u>	1-160
TOTAL	81,950	10,100	

\*Pilgrim was a FY 85 project. It is now being offered in FY 87 with a reduced boundary and reduced net acreage.

\*\*Depending upon their suitability for agriculture these homesteads might have a maximum lot size of 40 acres.

Current to: November 16, 1984

STEPPE HOMESTEAD

FBRS C-5

T. 4S., R. 9W., F.M.



TOTCHANET AG

T. 4S., R. 8&9W., F.M.



NORTH COMMISSION TRAIL

← ACCESS RT.


18  
NENANA  
4 MI. →

West

Middle

East

NENANA  
6




NORTHERN REGION  
PROPOSED FY 87 DISPOSAL PROJECTS

AGRICULTURAL SALES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Gross Acres</u>	<u>Net Acres</u>	<u>Lot Size (acres)</u>
French Creek Ag.	2,680	2,680	Undetermined
*Goldstream Ag.	13,600	6,500	Undetermined
Totchaket Ag.	<u>8,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	Undetermined
TOTAL	24,280	17,180	

\*The disposal will be split between FY 86 and FY 87 with a total offering of 13,600 acres. Approximately 6,500 acres will be offered in FY 87. The project will contain homesteads and agricultural sales.

Current to: November 16, 1984



STEPPE HOMESTEAD

FBKS C-5

T. 4S., R. 9W., F.M.



TOTCHAKET AG

T. 4S., R. 8&9W., F.M.



NORTH COMMISSION TRAIL

← ACCESS RT.

18  
NENANA  
4 MI. →

West

Middle  
River

East

SLED

NENANA  
6

# Alaska State Legislature

SENATOR  
JOHN B. "JACK" COCHILL  
Chairman



POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
(907) 465-4921

Senator Jan Faiks—Vice Chairman  
Senator Mitch Abood  
Senator Paul Fischer  
Senator Joe Josephson

## Senate Committee on Transportation

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Transportation Committee  
FROM: Chairman Coghill  
DATE: January 30, 1985  
RE: SB 39—Road and Bridges in the Totchaket resource area

S.B. 39 appropriates \$5,630,000 for construction of the following:

1. Nenana River Bridge, a three span concrete and steel bridge 440 feet in length.
2. Little Nenana River Bridge, a one span concrete and steel bridge 140 feet in length.
3. East Middle Fork of the Nenana River Bridge, a one span concrete and steel bridge 105 feet in length.
4. West Middle Fork of the Nenana River Bridge, a one span concrete and steel bridge 144 feet in length.
5. Construction of 22.8 miles of roadway.

The purpose of the construction is to open an area of approximately 346,000 acres of land west of the Parks Highway approximately 60 miles southwest of Fairbanks to economic development. The residents of Nenana have been interested in this development area for many years and instigated the studies enclosed in the packet.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the bill, a January, 1981 report on agricultural development, a DOT/PF bill analysis, a packet compiled by Steve Bainbridge of the City of Nenana entitled Backup Material for SB 39, and a copy of Alaska Statute Supplements Sec. 35.15.080 and Sec. 35.15.090.

IDENTIFICATION	BILL NAME < "An Act making a special appropriation to the Department of Transportation & Public Facilities for various construction projects in the Totchaket resources area; and providing for an effective date."	BILL NUMBER SB No. 39
	SPONSOR(S) Sen. G.B. 'Jack' Coghill	DATE INTRODUCED 1-14-85
INITIAL RESEARCH	INITIAL SUMMARY COMPLETED	RELATED BILLS PENDING None
		REFERRALS Finance
INITIAL RESEARCH	SPONSOR CONTACTED FOR BACKUP MATERIALS Yes	LEGAL DIVISION SUMMARY
	AGENCY RESPONSE	DEPT OF LAW SUMMARY
		FISCAL NOTE
		OTHER INTERESTED LEGISLATORS NOTIFIED Rep. Shultz
BACKGROUND RESEARCH	SIMILAR BILLS INTRODUCED IN PREVIOUS LEGISLATURES HB 72 73th Leg.	OTHER STATE OR FEDERAL PRECEDENTS, REGULATIONS, ETC
	RESPONSES FROM INTERESTED PERSONS AND/OR GROUPS DOT/PF Bill Analysis Steve Bainbridge/City of Nenana Thomas & Associates - Engineering Firm DNR: No Response	
HEARING PREPARATION	CHAIRMAN BRIEFED Yes	DATE & PLACE SET 1-30-85 Room 250/Batrovich
	STAFF MEMO TO COMMITTEE Yes	TELECONFERENCE
	BACKGROUND MATERIAL DISTRIBUTED	PSA/PRESS RELEASE
	LIST OF WITNESSES Steve Bainbridge Bob Thomas	SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS/CS DRAFTED



Peratrovich, Nottingham & Drage, Inc. ✓

Engineering Consultants

Telex 090 26436  
Int. Telex 200 26436

1506 West 36th Avenue • Suite 101 • Anchorage, Alaska 99503 • 907-561-1011

FILE  
TATCHAKET  
PN&D 85000jg

February 6, 1985

Senator Jan Faiks  
Co-Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance  
Alaska State Legislature  
Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Faiks:

We are requesting your favorable consideration of Senate Bill No. 39 which would provide funds for construction of a highway access road to the farming lands in the Tatchaket area.


We understand the State's limited resources may cause postponement of many worthy projects, and are concerned that this project may not be funded for the same reason.

The Tatchaket Highway Access Road has long range statewide significance in that it will open new lands for development and provide additional future income to the State as well as a useful product for Alaskans. The farming products would utilize our newly acquired railroad and thereby provide another source of revenue to the Alaska Railroad. More people would be employed and other related industries developed. Through our recent involvement as the design engineer for the City of Nenana's Tanana River Bulkhead, we have been very impressed with the efficient manner in which they have managed their capital improvement projects. On that particular project, our engineering company assisted the City in preparing their budget request for the new dock and assisted them in the design and construction management. The City of Nenana, acting as their own contractor, constructed the 1100 ft. of dock for \$1.5 million or about \$1 million less than conventional State contracting procedures. The City of Nenana used the money wisely and I feel confident they would do the same for this worthy project.

Your support would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

PERATROVICH, NOTTINGHAM & DRAGE, INC.

  
Roy Peratrovich, Jr., P.E.  
Vice President

DN/jk/L5



# Toghoththele Corp.

Nenana Village Corporation

P.O. BOX 74080

FAIRDANKS, ALASKA 99707

PHONE: (907) 452-1415

March 20, 1985

Edna B. De Vries, Senator  
Alaska State Legislature  
Pouch V  
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Ms. De Vries:

RE: SB 39 Road and Bridges to Totchaket area

Enclosed is a copy of a resolution in opposition to SB 39 that was passed recently by the Toghoththele Corporation Board of Directors. This resolution supports the position of the Nenana Native Council against the road and bridges proposed under SB 39.

SB 39 would provide \$4,600,000.00 for the construction of three bridges and \$1,030,000.00 for a road. The bridges to be built would cross the Nenana River, the East Middle River and the West Middle River.

It is important to note that the total distance between the three bridges is approximately three miles. Given the cost of constructing roads in Alaska, \$1,030,000.00 for the road will be sufficient to build little more than enough to connect the bridges. This will not connect with another road, any existing facility, or any existing State land disposal.

Our main objection is that the access provided by the proposed road and bridges will open the door for haphazard and piecemeal development of the Totchaket area. There is particular concern about the effect agriculture will have on subsistence hunting and fishing. If bridges are to be built that should take place only after there is a clear plan for the development of the Totchaket area and there is evidence that subsistence resources will be protected.

Sincerely,

Winnie B. Atwood  
Chief Executive Officer

WBA/cmw



# Toghoththele Corp.

Nenana Village Corporation

P.O. BOX 74080

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99707

PHONE: (907) 452-1415

## TOGHOTTHELE CORPORATION

Resolution 85-2

In Support of Nenana Native Council  
on SB 39

WHEREAS; the Nenana Native Council has taken a position of opposition to the bridges and road proposed for construction by SB 39, currently being considered by the 14th Alaska Legislature, and;

WHEREAS; in objecting to the proposed road and bridges the Nenana Native Council cites concerns over the loss of subsistence hunting areas, and;

WHEREAS; further concerns of the Nenana Native Council include the effect of road access on wildlife in the area on the fringe of the Agricultural development and the effect of agricultural on the quality of water in local rivers, and;

WHEREAS; the Nenana Native Council is in opposition to SB 39 specifically because of the adverse effects of agricultural development on traditional lifestyles and because no plan for how the Totchaket is to be developed has been presented to and approved by the residents of Nenana, and;

WHEREAS; the Toghoththele Corporation Board of Directors respects the concerns and objections of the Nenana Native Council, and;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED; the Toghoththele Corporation Board of Directors supports the Nenana Native Council in its opposition to the road and bridges proposed in SB 39.

ADOPTED and DATED this 8 day of March 1985,  
in Nenana, Alaska.

*Lena E. Dewey*  
Lena Dewey, Chairperson  
TOGHOTTHELE CORPORATION

*Winnie B. Atwood*  
Winnie Atwood, Secretary  
TOGHOTTHELE CORPORATION

# STATE OF ALASKA

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

POUCH Z  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
PHONE: (907) 465-3900

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER


January 28, 1985

Re: SB 39; Road & Bridge  
Construction  
in the Totchaket  
Resource Area

The funds requested for the bridges in SB 39 appear to be adequate. The funds for road construction would provide 2.3 to 5.15 miles of road, depending on the type of road constructed. It is our understanding that the project would include 22.8 miles of road. Perhaps the additional road could be included in subsequent appropriations.

Our costs to construct an 18 ft. wide road to minimum "pioneer" access road standards is \$200,000 per mile or about \$4,500,000 for 22.8 miles. However, given the type of traffic that would be expected to use this road (farm combines, logging trucks, dump trucks, etc.), we recommend a 28 ft. wide road built to secondary standards. This would cost approximately \$440,000 per mile or \$10,000,000 for 22.8 miles.

The long-term maintenance costs that might have to be borne by the State for this project could be substantial. The average maintenance costs for a two lane, secondary gravel road open 12 months are \$5,400 per mile or \$123,120 per year for 22.8 miles. A road constructed to lesser standards may require higher annual maintenance costs.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
R. J. Krapp  
for Commissioner

sect 11  
CL=PP<sup>00</sup>

# NENANA — TOTCHAKET

UNLOCKING THE AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL  
OF WESTERN ALASKA



A Report on A Seminar and Workshop. on  
Agricultural Development.

Sponsored by THE CITY OF NENANA

December 20, 1980

JANUARY, 1981



# City of Nenana


## State of Alaska

### OVERVIEW OF THE NENANA-TOTCHAKET PROJECT

Date: March 2, 1981  
From: John B. Coghill, Mayor

In 1968, during route survey and soil testing work associated with the North Commission west of Nenana, Alaska, field crews found relatively deep top soil covering a broad plateau lying between the Tanana and Nenana rivers to the east and the Kantishna river on the west. More extensive analysis of these soils showed that they possessed excellent agricultural potential. A more extensive and detailed soil survey conducted between 1975 and 1977 by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture defined the extent of the agricultural soils in what SCS has called the "Totchaket Area", at least 175,000 acres of Class II and Class III soils...soils which, for Alaska, show the highest potential for agricultural productivity. Thousands of acres of Class IV soils with lesser potential are also extensive on the plateau, and preliminary reconnaissance of areas west of the Kantishna show lands with agricultural potential numbering in the millions of acres.

That these lands are capable of producing both high quantity and high quality yields has been accepted by the



Page 2 Overview

State's agricultural community for several years. The more important discussion in recent years has not been whether Totchaket should be developed for agriculture, but what kind of agricultural development would better satisfy the multiple and diverse needs of individual Alaskans and Alaskan families on the one hand, and on the other, what kind of agriculture can best meet the State's urgent need to invest its' short term oil wealth in long term renewable resource industries which can sustain themselves economically far into the future.

Even in view of these urgent concerns, however, planning for eventual development of Totchaket by City, State, University and Federal agricultural interests proceeded slowly during the 1970s as Native Claims in the area were resolved according to the provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971. With final conveyance of land title to Native corporations in the area in late 1979 the last of the major concerns affecting the future of Totchaket were resolved, and the City of Nenana initiated the necessary financing and studies required for the design and long term development of what we are now calling Nenana-Totchaket.

With the support of our delegation to the legislature and the encouragement and assistance of many people around the State, these reports are now either complete or nearly complete and are being presented to the legislature for consideration. It

### Page 3 Overview

is important to emphasize again that these studies were not designed by the City to figure out whether or not to develop agriculture. They were designed to determine what kind of agriculture will respond to the real needs of Alaska's people for food, access to land, and increased self-sufficiency; what kind of agriculture can be developed in Nenana-Totchaket which will help the State's new agricultural industry become economically self-sustaining in a reasonably short period of time; and, finally, what will it all cost.

We are pleased with the reports, and we believe they offer a well thought out and detailed plan for initial development of Nenana-Totchaket. The transportation proposal includes both the initial design, and cost estimates for overland access from Nenana to the first two townships which the City and the Department of Natural Resources have scheduled for disposal in February 1982...less than one year from today. The livestock report lays out a detailed and comprehensive plan for the development of a red meat industry that will involve all the State's farming regions. The composite Planning, Development, and Production Schedule from 1980 through 1990 shows our best estimates of the annual financing required and the annual production and employment associated with development in the area. Clearly the amounts of money involved are not insignificant even when compared with the multi-billion annual revenues of the State of Alaska. More importantly, financing decisions this

Page 4 Overview

year will be followed by financing decisions as large, or larger, in subsequent years throughout the decade.

The transportation system should fall into our highest priority for without that access, the proposed clearing, wood fiber harvest, and land disposal programs are meaningless.

AGRICULTURAL PROJECT

Composite Planning, Development and Production Schedule: 1980 through 1990.

Calendar year.	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
<b>Planning</b>										
1. Research, Development	Phase I			Phase II				Phase III		
2. Project	—————									
3. Lot Survey	—————									
costs per year (000's)	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600	500	500	500	1600	
<b>Development Programs</b>										
1. Clearing	Phase I			Phase II				Phase III		
2. Farm support	Phase I			Phase II				Phase III		
3. Marketing	Phase I			Phase II				Phase III		
4. Livestock	Purchase					Production				
costs per year(000's)	15450	15450	15561	12561	8450	150	150	150	8450	
<b>Capital Projects</b>										
1. Roads and bridges	Phase I			Phase II				Phase III		
2. Storage, transfer and support facilities	—————									
3. Processing facilities	Livestock					Vegetables				
4. Research Facilities	—————									
costs per year(000's)	14000	15000	13000	15000	12500	13000	15000	7000	7000	
<b>Land Disposals</b> (# of townships)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(2)				(2)	
<b>Fiscal year</b>	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
Total Costs Per Year (000's) (1980 dollars)	31050	32050	24161	25161	22550	13650	15650	7650	17050	
Total Costs Per Year (000's) (12% inflation)	35087	40704	48850	46949	41041	27983	36175	19890	49616	
Disposed Acreage	46080	92160	161280	230400	276480	276480	276480	276480	322560	
Cultivable	41472	82944	145152	226056	248832	248832	248832	248832	250304	
In Cultivation	13686	34422	69051	107205	142041	159666	166716	166716	160402	
# of Farms	24	48	84	120	144	144	144	144	168	
<b>Employment; Farm Production</b>										
1. Direct (on farm)	150	378	758	1176	1558	1752	1829	1829	1979	
2. Secondary (marketing)	3	7	13	20	26	30	31	31	33	
3. Tertiary (support)	42	105	210	326	432	485	506	506	547	
<b>Production Value, Barley</b>										
1. Tons per year		15465	35897	78028	121142	160506	180423	185359	188389	
2. Price, F.O.B. Port		150	195	210	225	240	255	270	285	
3. Total (000's)		2754	7585	16386	27257	38521	46008	50665	57691	

Revised: 2/23/81

by: Northern Development Associates  
Fairbanks, Alaska

\* Preliminary calculations.

T2S

TO PHASE III





T3S


BLACK BEAR LAKE


T4S

T5S

KEY


-  PHASE I
-  PHASE II
-  PHASE I ROADS
-  PHASE II ROADS

CLASS 2 SOIL 

CLASS 3 SOIL 

TO REX

SCALE = 1:250,000



# Alaska State Legislature

SENATOR  
JOHN B. "JACK" COGHILL  
Chairman

Senator Jan Faiks—Vice Chairman  
Senator Mitch Abood  
Senator Paul Fischer  
Senator Joe Josephson



POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
(907) 465-4921

## Senate Committee on Transportation

### MEMORANDUM

To: Committee members  
From: Committee staff  
Date: March 4, 1985  
Re: Background material for SB 39

---

The last time the committee heard SB 39, the major question the members could not seem to reconcile was how the City of Nenana could construct the proposed road at considerably less cost than the State DOT/PF estimate.

Included along with the bill in today's packet are background materials as follows:

- A letter from Steve Bainbridge, Nenana city engineer, explaining how the city should be able to build the road for less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  the DOT/PF estimate
- A cover letter and computation sheets from David Truax, DOT/PF planner, showing how the department figured their estimate of \$200,000 per mile for the pioneer road. They say they have to meet AASHTO standards: AASHTO is the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.
- Resolution number 83-02, passed by the City of Nenana in April 1983, assuming maintenance obligations for Totchaket ag roads
- Information regarding proposed agricultural land disposals in the Totchaket area

Introduced: 1/14/85  
Referred: Transportation and Finance

Funding Information  
General Fund \$500,000  
Other Funds -0-  
\$500,000

1 IN THE SENATE

BY COGHILL

2

SENATE BILL NO. 49

3

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4

FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5

A BILL

6

For an Act entitled: "An Act making a special appropriation to the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to determine the feasibility of building Kantishna Road; and providing for an effective date."

7

8

9

10 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

11

\* Section 1. The sum of \$500,000 is appropriated from the general fund to the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to determine the feasibility of building Kantishna Road.

14

\* Sec. 2. The unexpended and unobligated portion of the appropriation made by this Act lapses into the general fund June 30, 1986.

15

16

\* Sec. 3. The appropriation made by this Act is subject to AS 35.15.080 and 35.15.090.

17

18

\* Sec. 4. This Act takes effect July 1, 1985.

19



# City of Nenana

State of Alaska

February 8, 1985

FEB 14 1985

Senator John B. Coghill  
Alaska State Legislature  
Pouch V (MS 3100)  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Coghill,

Ref: SB39 - Totchaket Resource Area Roads


Attached you will find a copy of correspondence from David Truax, DOT/PF, Division of Planning, Northern Region that serves to expand on the assumptions made to arrive at a cost per mile of \$200,000.

In his letter, Dave comments that ---- "our costs to construct a road would likely be higher than yours. This is because the State DOT/PF must adhere to AASHTO standards ---". In addition, I would add the following comments as to why the City of Nenana is likely to be able to construct roads for lower per mile costs than those indicated by DOT/PF:

FIRST - The City's method of approach to a project would be the "force account" method. This allows the City to act as the "contractor", whereby the City assumes any "risk" associated with the performance on a job. Also the City, by acting as it's own contractor, eliminates the "profit" factor which any private sector contractor would normally include in its contract unit bid prices and in any "change orders" to the contract.

SECOND - The City of Nenana, again as its own contractor, can schedule the work on a project so as to take advantage of competitive bidding climates and slack seasons. For example, for building roads to the Two Mile Lake Agricultural Project, construction was scheduled for the winter months when typically construction equipment is idle. By doing this we achieved the benefit of low equipment rental rates during the off season.

From experience on the Two Mile Lake Ag road construction project where we are building a typical "pioneer" road for approx. \$70,000 per mile, it is evident that the above two items allow for a drastic reduction in per mile construction costs.



In addition, and specific to, the proposed Totchaket road project,

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE COMPLETE:


1. Surveying and Design of the roads and bridges was accomplished with funds received during First Session of the Twelfth Legislature (CSSB222)
2. Right-of-way acquisition complete  
Right-of-way Plats filed and recorded
3. Right-of-way partially cleared

IN CONSLUSION, all the above factors should allow the City of Nenana, acting under a "T.O.R.A." with DOT/PF, to accomplish the first seven miles of road construction at \$90,000 per mile (TOTAL \$630,000) The other \$400,000 in the line item appropriation of \$1,030,000 for Road Construction was to allow for the upgrading of an additional 20 miles of road to the west at \$20,000 per mile. (Note: This 20 miles is already cleared and driveable!)

IT SHOULD BE EMPASIZED that the main thrust of this project is the first seven miles of road and the bridges. The money requested is sufficient to accomplish this.

Please call me at 832-5501 should you require additional information.

Sincerely,



Steve Bainbridge, P.E.  
City of Nenana

cc Commissioner Richard Knapp, Pouch Z, Juneau, Alaska 99811  
Susan Fleischhauer, Pouch Z Juneau, Alaska 99811  
Jon Widdis, 600 University Ave, Suite B, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
Dave Truax, 600 University Ave, Suite B, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
Bob Thomas, Box 80783, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

# STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

DIVISION OF PLANNING, NORTHERN REGION

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

600 University Avenue, Suite B  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
(907) 479-4211

February 5, 1985

Re: Totchaket Resource Area Roads

Steve Bainbridge  
City Engineer  
City of Nenana  
P.O. Box 70  
Nenana, Alaska 99760


Dear Steve:

Enclosed is a copy of the typical section and computations we used to arrive at our construction cost estimate for an 18' wide access road in the Totchaket resource area. As you know this cost estimate was provided to Senator Coghill by letter on January 25, 1985.

As I mentioned to you during our February 5, 1985, telephone conversation, wherein you requested the enclosed materials, our costs to construct a road would likely be higher than yours. This is because the State DOT&PF must adhere to AASHTO standards, which may not necessarily be true for road construction done by the City of Nenana.

If you have any questions regarding the computations or the typical section please contact Dan Sterley at our Design Section. He can be reached at 452-1911.

Sincerely,



David W. Truax  
Southern/Interior Planner

DWT:tc

cc: Susan Fleischhauer, Legislative Liaison, Headquarters  
Dan Sterley, Design, Northern Region

State of Alaska  
 Department of Transportation  
 & Public Facilities  
 Interior Region

Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Calc. by DISNEY Date 7-6-69

Checked by \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

# Computations

For VENANAH AG. ROADS - TOTCHAKET AREA

## RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT ROAD - DESIGN CRITERIA

DESIGN SPEED - 40 MPH

STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE - 325 FT. MINIMUM

PASSING SIGHT DISTANCE - 1500 FT. MINIMUM

MAXIMUM GRADE 7% ASSUMING LEVEL TERRAIN

MAXIMUM SUPERELEVATION 6%

WIDTH OF TRAVELED WAY FOR TWO LANE AREA ROAD - 18 FT.

SHOULDER WIDTH - 2 FT.

TOTAL WIDTH - 22 FT.

HORIZONTAL CURVE RADIUS - 750 FT.

DEGREE OF CURVE - 7.5°

State of Alaska  
 Department of Transportation  
 & Public Facilities  
 Interior Region

Project No. \_\_\_\_\_


Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Calc. by R. S. S. S. S. Date 2-6-57

Checked by \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

# Computations

For 1.5 MILE 38" DIA. CULVERT



## QUANTITIES

BORROW "H"  $(.22' + .26') (2') (5280') (22.8 \text{ mi}) \div 27 \frac{\text{cu yd}}{\text{ft}^3} (= \frac{\text{TON}}{\text{CU YD}}) = 606,500 \text{ TONS}$

C.H.B.  $(.26' + .22') (\frac{1}{2}') (5280') (22.8 \text{ mi}) \div 27 (2) = 107,000 \text{ TONS}$

1 PIPE, 38" DIA., EVERY 500 FT = 7200 L.F.

## COST

BORROW "H" 606,500 TONS @ \$3.50/TON = 2,125,000

C.H.B. 107,000 TONS @ \$12.00/TON = 1,284,000

CULVERTS 7200 L.F. @ \$40.00/L.F. = 368,000

3,775,000

+ 5% CONTINGENTS

189,000

3,964,000

+ 5% PRELIMINARY ENGR

198,000

4,162,000

+ 10% CONSTRUCTION ENGR

476,000

4,638,000

4,638,000 = 22.8 - \$208,500/MI

RESOLUTION 83-02

WHEREAS: the Nenana - Totchaket Agricultural Project is of vital importance to the future economic base of the Municipality of Nenana; and

WHEREAS: the access roads and bridges within the project area are necessary for the project to proceed on schedule; and

WHEREAS: the support of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOTPF) for legislative capital funding for these access facilities is desired; and

WHEREAS: the DOTPF is concerned about the impact these roads could have upon the DOTPF maintenance budget; and


WHEREAS: the Municipality of Nenana has road powers and the authority to assume maintenance responsibilities for roadway maintenance; and

WHEREAS: AS 19.30.211 (a) provides the DOTPF an ideal vehicle to transfer this maintenance responsibility; and


WHEREAS: the Municipality of Nenana is willing to assume this maintenance responsibility;

NOW THEREFORE let it be known that the Municipality of Nenana assumes the maintenance obligations for the Nenana - Totchaket Agricultural Project access roads.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED by the Municipal Assembly of the Municipality of Nenana, Alaska this 12 day of April, 1983 by an affirmative vote of 5 to 0.

  
John B. Coghill, Mayor

Introduced: 4/12/83  
Adopted: 4/12/83  
ATTEST: 4/12/83

  
Rick S. Brewer, Municipal Clerk



# Land Disposal - Totchaket

## NORTHERN REGION PROPOSED FY 87 DISPOSAL PROJECTS

### AGRICULTURAL SALES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Gross Acres</u>	<u>Net Acres</u>	<u>Lot Size (acres)</u>
French Creek Ag.	2,680	2,680	Undetermined
*Goldstream Ag.	13,600	6,500	Undetermined
Totchaket Ag.	<u>8,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	Undetermined
TOTAL	24,280	17,180	

\*The disposal will be split between FY 86 and FY 87 with a total offering of 13,600 acres. Approximately 6,500 acres will be offered in FY 87. The project will contain homesteads and agricultural sales.

Current to: November 16, 1984

18

17

16

15

14

13

18

19

20

21

STEPPE HOMESTEAD

FBKS C-5

T. 4S., R. 9W., F.M.



TOTCHNET AG

T. 4S., R. 3&9W., F.M.



19

30

29

28

30

31

32

33


34

35

36

31

NORTH COMMISSION TRAIL



Rin

ACCESS RT.

NENANA AMI.

Middle

West

East

19

20

22

23

24

30

29

28

27

26

25

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

31

1

6

5

4

3

2


1


NENANA 6



# RECORDS CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, an employee of the State of Alaska, do hereby certify that the microfilm images on this microform are accurate reproductions of the original records of the State of Alaska as accumulated during the regular course of business, and that it is the established policy and practice of this State to microfilm its records and to dispose of the original records after microfilm reproductions have been made.

  
Signature of Camera Operator

  
Date

S B

4 9

## KANTISHNA ACCESS

### Warrants

A highway to the Kantishna area can be justified on the following basis:

Tourism is Alaska's second largest industry and Mt. McKinley is the State's number one tourist attraction. The park road is inadequate to serve this industry for the following reasons:

- a. Geometrics, the road is substandard in width, alignment and grade. The road is hazardous as demonstrated by the rash of serious bus accidents that have occurred during the past few years.
- b. Access is too restrictive, visitors must travel by bus (shuttle school buses or buses operated by park concessionaires). This ride can last up to six hours and is a source of discomfort, especially to senior citizens and young children.
- c. Capacity, the demand has increased dramatically during the past decade as has the growth of tourism. The Interior Alaska Transportation Study estimated nearly 5000 vehicles by the year 2005.
- d. Because time at vantage viewpoints is extremely limited, over 50% of those seeking a view of Mt. McKinley are disappointed.
- e. The increase of traffic on this road has degraded the wildlife viewing aspect of this route.

Mining is also an important industry in Alaska and the Kantishna area is an important mining area. Recent assessments conducted by governmental officials documented the existence of commercial ore deposits. The existing road is inadequate to serve this industry because of slow moving tour bus traffic, and it is substandard.

FBKS. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Enhance the State's ability to assure our visitors and residents a quality experience. Mt McKinley is Alaska's crown jewel. Access and vantage viewing are at the sole discretion of the U.S. Park Service. However Alaska's entire tourist industry and the State's reputation suffer when visitors ride an uncomfortable bus for six hours and still do not get to see the main attraction.

Give opportunity for the private sector to provide tourist facilities that are now being provided by the government sector or not being provided at all. Mining claims in the Kantishna area are patented and can be used by the private developer to locate hotels, lodges, camping parks, hostels and other visitors facilities. The area provides an unsurpassed view of Mt. McKinley and visitors would have the opportunity to remain in the area for longer periods increasing their chances of seeing the mountain. (note, the cyclic type weather that occurs during the dry interior summer virtually assures all visitors a view of the mountain if they can remain there for a day or so.

The private sector is more sensitive to visitor satisfaction thus when this sector caters to our visitors the results are happier, longer and more return visits.

An alternate access to the Kantishna area would make it possible for the park service to redirect the park road traffic toward wildlife viewing. This is more compatible to that portion of the park's classification, (wilderness). It also provides a more focused and quality wildlife viewing concession.

A northern access, currently economically viable as far as the Kantishna area, can be extended toward the McGrath area to serve that area as the need warrants.

A northern access would tie into the existing park road, making it

possible to provide a loop system, a limited loop system or limited to wildlife tours. Note this would be a popular concession and with some imagination could be worked in two directions.

There is less precipitation on the north side of the Alaska Range than on the south. This can be documented through weather records but is clearly evident by the lack of glaciers on the north side when compared with the south side. Since viewing of the mountain is of paramount importance, this aspect cannot be overlooked when establishing park facilities, nor should the North or South facilities be exclusive, both offer differing experiences making improvements not an either/or decision but rather one of establishing priorities.

It should also be recognized that the Park is such a major attraction that constructing additional facilities will not provide a proportional increase in capacity as visitors will elect to extend their stay to experience all that is offered.

#### Issues and Strategy

Establishing a northern access will require careful planning and is subject to stipulations established in the National Interest Lands Act as well as the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969. It will be subject to critical review, organized environmental and philosophical opposition.

Provision has been made in the National Interest Lands Act to mandate access decision on a timely basis. When the environmental document is officially started a time frame also starts. This is an advantage, if the State has the project well in order. However, it can be a detriment if the State is unprepared to deal with all the issues that may surface, resulting in a decision that may not be in the best interest of the State. If that should occur, the ability to appeal is limited and the State may be required to begin the process all over. Because of this, it is important that the DOTPF ensure that

all interested entities are involved, all issues identified and all decision making agencies be as much in accord as possible prior to starting the clock.

This can be accomplished by adding a preliminary phase to the normal location phase of a project. Generally the location report and environmental document are prepared at the same time. In this case it is recommended that the DOTPF prepare a draft location report and in so doing identify and resolve all issues with decision making agencies to gain as much of a consensus as possible, then begin the environmental document. The location report would be finalized concurrent with developing the environmental document.

#### Project description

Access to Kantishna via the north has three major alternatives, they are:

1. Via the Stampede trail to Stampede then through foot hills to Kantishna.
2. Via the old sled trail leaving the Parks Highway near Rex.
3. Via the proposed Nenana Agriculture access road to the Kantishna River then upriver to Kantishna (note, the route to the Kantishna River is already designed).

It is premature to speculate on which alternate is the most attractive. All have attractive aspects. Some have already been investigated to some degree and some aerial photographs are available. It is conceivable that the final routing will be a combination of these.

The road itself will be a major highway and probably have to be widened to four lanes by the year 2020. Initially it should be paved with two 12' lanes and 8' shoulders. Alignment and grade should be designed for 55 mph and should take advantage of the scenic opportunities. The road should be designed and classified as a State

Scenic Route.

Funding

Immediate funding needs are for the location phase. During that phase the merits of the project will be documented, standards adopted, an alignment chosen and preliminary costs developed. The project will have location approval with authority to design and construct or it will be determined to be in the best interest of the State or Nation not to proceed.

Because of the sensitive nature of the project the DOTPF should allow ample lead time and funding to ensure that location documents will stand up to close scrutiny. At this time the cost to accomplish this is estimated at \$500,000 with a time frame of three years.

This work entails field surveys aerial photography, research, conceptual design, economic analysis, comparison of alternatives, indepth agency coordination and public involvement. The completed product will include:

- approved environmental impact statement with 4(f) determination
- approved location study report
- certified location public hearing documents
- draft soils report
- location approval.



February 26, 1985

MAR 4 1985

Senator Jack Coghill, Chairman  
Senate Transportation Committee  
ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
Pouch V  
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Senator Coghill:

I have read your Senate Bill #49 and agree wholeheartedly that now is the time to aggressively pursue the development of a road to Kantishna. Mt. McKinley is one of Alaska's greatest assets, however, many people have a disappointing experience in the Park because of inadequate facilities and limited viewing opportunities. Although we will never be able to guarantee a view of the mountain, increased access and facilities would provide us with an increased opportunity to satisfy the Alaska visitors.

We greatly appreciate your interest in this vital segment and fully support the efforts to begin this project.

If we can be of any further assistance please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Tougas".

Thomas C. Tougas  
Vice President  
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

TCT/ss

# STATE OF ALASKA

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE &  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**  
OFFICE OF MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

POUCH EE  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
PHONE: 465-2023

March 4, 1985

MAR 4 1985

The Honorable Jack Coghill  
Chairman  
Senate Transportation Committee  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Coghill:


The Office of Mineral Development has reviewed SB 49 calling for a feasibility study on building the Kantishna access highway.

The Kantishna area has long been recognized for its substantial gold resource. Numerous mining claims have been patented. In addition to gold, significant deposits of strategic metals such as tungsten and antimony have been discovered in the area. With access, the region has much enhanced potential to become once again a significant productive mining region.

Currently, traffic on the Denali Park road is restricted by the National Park Service which severely limits mining activity at Kantishna. This restriction also limits Alaska's rapidly growing visitor industry. Access would allow entry to Denali National Park to many more people now unable to visit because of the severe travel restrictions in effect on the Denali Highway. The Kantishna access would enable firms in the travel industry to construct additional hotels and visitor facilities on privately held land at Kantishna. Additionally, it would greatly facilitate the expanded use of the Stampede Mine as a training property for mining students from the University of Alaska.

Of the three alternative routes being considered, this office supports the Old Stampede Road route. This is the shortest of the options being considered. It makes use of a long established trail to Stampede and requires a relatively short extension through the foothills connecting Stampede to Kantishna.

Sincerely,

  
John F. M. Sims  
Director

JFS/cwREGLR3/Coghill  
3485a

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

POIICH Z  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
PHONE: (907) 465-3900

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

January 28, 1985

Re: SB 49; Feasibility of  
Building a Road to  
Kantishna

A road to Kantishna would have two major economic advantages. First, it would provide a northern access for tourists into Denali Park. The Interior Transportation Study estimates that within twenty years such an access could generate 5,000 vehicles a day in the summer months. Secondly, the road would provide access for mining in the Kantishna area, and possible future extension to the Kuskokwim Valley.

The possible benefits to be derived from this project compare favorably with other major system extensions, such as extension of Chena Hot Springs Road to Twin Mountain, construction of a road to the Slate Creek asbestos deposit or a major rail extension.

Provided we receive the cooperation of the National Park Service, the feasibility study through location approval is expected to take about 27 months to complete. Because of this timeframe, we recommend that the lapse date be extended to June 30, 1987.

The amount of \$500,000 for the study is adequate.

*Wm S. Spurr*

---

R.J. Knapp  
for Commissioner

Senator John W. (Jack) Coghill  
Alaska State Legislature

Pouch A  
Juneau Alaska 99811  
(907) 465-1715

Box 158  
Nenana Alaska 99760  
(907) 853-5171



April 3, 1985

The Honorable Frank Murkowski, *Stevens Young*  
317 Hart Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Frank:

During this legislative session, the Senate Transportation Committee, of which I am chairman, has considered a proposal to construct a Kantishna access road north of the Alaska Range to connect the Kantishna area with the Parks Highway.

Our State's most popular tourist attraction, the viewing of Mt. McKinley, has disappointed many tourists because inclement weather conditions prevent adequate viewing of the mountain. Summer tourists plan well in advance to visit our great state and the continent's highest mountain. According to Denali Park officials over 50% of the visitors do not even get a glimpse of Mt. McKinley because crowded conditions on the park road and at park facilities do not allow them to stay until the weather clears.

The proposed highway will help solve this problem by providing access to many excellent viewpoints of the mountain. The road will also allow access to private property in the area which can be used by individuals for the construction of new hotels and tourist facilities. Tourists can then be assured of a more satisfying visit to the park, and therefore, a more pleasurable trip to Alaska.

I have received correspondence from a variety of interested groups, including private tour groups and the Alaska State Division of Tourism recognizing the need to develop this project.

Tourism is Alaska's second largest industry. In light of the State's declining oil revenues, it seems prudent to me that we invest in this growing sector.

The proposed road to Kantishna would not only have positive effects on the Denali National Park and Alaska's tourist industry, it would also benefit the mining industry.

The Alaska Miners Association and its 2000 members have extended their support. Many rich mineral deposits are being worked - or have been identified - in the Kantishna area, and the existing access road is limited for miners to certain nighttime hours in the summer.

Presently, mining trucks cannot compete with tour buses which use the road all day long. A new highway will solve this problem and should enable further mining development.

The agriculture industry will also share the benefits of construction of a highway. Rich agricultural land exists in the area. Easy access to these lands will be of value.

The Department of Transportation and Public Facilities is in the process of adopting a five-year plan to answer our highway problems. Construction of the Kantishna Highway is part of that answer; particularly when we consider the growing pressure of visitors on Denali and the pivotal role such a road would play. Federal funding will be necessary to study and implement this project. I urge you to consider the construction of the Kantishna Access Highway and look forward to your reply.

Enclosed with this letter is a synopsis of the Kantishna Access Highway and various correspondence in support of this proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jack", written in dark ink. The signature is fluid and somewhat stylized, with a large loop at the beginning.

JBC:mcm  
Enclosure



# United States Department of the Interior

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

ALASKA REGIONAL OFFICE  
2525 Gambell Street, Room 107  
Anchorage, Alaska 99503-2892

IN REPLY REFER TO:

A22(ARO-SA)

February 13, 1985

**FEB 19 1985**

Honorable Jack Coghill  
Alaska State Senate  
Pouch V  
Anchorage, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Coghill:

We appreciate your request for our review and comments on Senate Bill 49 and the accompanying report and route map.

As you recognize, Denali National Park and Preserve is a major resource and asset to both the State of Alaska and the nation. I believe it is incumbent upon all of us at the state and federal levels to work together to assure that the experience for the visitor is enjoyable and that the wildlife and other resources of the park are preserved.


We agree with and support the goal of improving the visitor's experience. However, it would be inappropriate for the National Park Service to take a position on the proposed bill to appropriate \$500,000 for a state feasibility study of a northern access route. As your study recognizes, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and the National Environmental Policy Act set forth procedures for analysis and consideration which must be followed before any decision to allow access across a national park. Title XI of ANILCA sets forth the process for reviewing and permitting construction of a new access route.

The quality of the visitor's experience in Denali National Park has been a major concern within our organization. As you know, we are currently in the process of designing a new visitor access center near the park headquarters and we will soon be contracting with another local firm for the design of the reconstruction of Denali Park Hotel. Recommended budgeting for these two projects totals \$14.2 million. In addition approximately \$15 million is programmed for improvements on the Denali Park Road.

A draft general management plan for Denali National Park will be released in March for public review and comment. This plan invites public comment on alternative ways of improving the visitor's experience while preserving the wildlife and natural features which they come to see. As soon as it is available we will send copies of this draft plan to you and members of the Senate and House Resources Committees. We would very much appreciate your thoughts and recommendations.

This summer we will also be working with the State Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities under a cooperative agreement to investigate the possibilities for developing visitor access and facilities on the south side of the Alaska Range. We were pleased to note that your report recognizes that development on the north and south sides is not an either or situation, and that the south side development would offer visitors a different experience in a landscape which is much in contrast to that of the north. Further, it is important to distribute the points of access to the natural resources of the Mt. McKinley massif so that they are readily accessible from both Anchorage and Fairbanks. We will keep you informed of the results of this cooperative study and look forward to your comments.

Sincerely,



Regional Director  
Alaska Region

cc:

Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources  
Commissioner, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities  
Members of Senate and House Resources Committees

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### DIVISION OF TOURISM

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

POUCH E  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
PHONE: 465-2010  
TELEX: 45331

February 25, 1985

The Honorable Jack Coghill  
Chairman  
Senate Transportation Committee  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811


Dear Senator Coghill:

Since statehood, Denali National Park and majestic Mt. McKinley have been one of Alaska's major travel attractions. A recent research report released by our Division of Tourism and compiled by the Department of Labor entitled "Alaska Traveler Survey and Visitor Industry Analysis 1983" shows that more than 70 percent of summer highway pleasure visitors indicated they had visited Anchorage and Fairbanks and 60 percent of these visitors reported they had visited Mt. McKinley/Denali.

Certainly a growing need for access into and through the park suggests that alternative access be explored. The legislation you have proposed in SB 49 calling for a feasibility study of building the Kantishna Access Highway would be a step in this direction.

Because traffic to the park continues to grow and considering the time needed to conduct a feasibility study, the sooner the necessary engineering and cost information is compiled, the sooner our State can move to have some control over the traffic flow to this unique vacation destination. The more visitors who can view the mountain and enjoy our wildlife, the more who will return home with an unequalled vacation experience.

Best regards,



Don Dickey  
Director

DD/wfs1752W  
22585a

# STATE OF ALASKA

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**  
**OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER**

P.O. BOX 3-2000  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802  
PHONE: 907 / 465-4100

February 26, 1985

Mr. John Manly  
Committee Aide  
Senate Transportation  
Committee  
c/o Senator Coghill  
Alaska State Senate  
Pouch V  
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Mr. Manly:

This letter is in response to your request dated February 9, 1985, that the department prepare a brief statement on the fish and wildlife values and potential impacts associated with an extension of the state highway system to Kantishna via three alternative routes from the Parks Highway. It is our understanding that the three alternatives under consideration include access:

1. Via the Stampede Trail to Stampede then through the foothills to Kantishna;
2. Via the Rex Trail to the Kantishna River then upriver to Kantishna;
3. Via the proposed Nenana-Totchaket Agriculture access road to the Kantishna River then upriver to Kantishna.

Our Habitat Division has performed a review of the alternatives. An abbreviated summary of the fish and wildlife values and the department's recommendations relative to the three alternative routes follows.

Alternative #1 - Stampede Trail: Wildlife values adjacent to this route are moderate to high in importance. Black bear, grizzly bear, moose, caribou, and a variety of furbearers are present. Dall sheep are present along the north flank of the Alaska Range to the immediate south. The McKinley Caribou Herd historically utilized this area as prime overwintering and limited calving habitat. Although population abundance is currently low, an expansion of the herd size will necessitate use of this historic range. The

proposed route also transects important moose fall and winter concentration areas. Recreational and subsistence use is moderate and occurs predominately along the Stampede Trail. Trapping intensity is moderate to heavy.

Alternative #2 - Rex Trail: Fish and wildlife values adjacent to this route are moderate to high in importance. Black bear, grizzly bear, moose and a variety of furbearers are present in moderate numbers throughout most of the area. Significant populations of these species, however, are present within the Nenana, Teklanika, Toklat, and Kantishna River riparian corridors. Recreational and subsistence use is moderate to heavy within these river corridors. Human use outside of these corridors is limited.

The portions of the upper Kantishna River and Bearpaw River drainages affected by this route are considered critical waterfowl habitat areas, providing nesting and molting habitat for high concentrations of several species of waterfowl and stopover sites for cranes and other species that utilize the western Interior.


The Toklat River Springs located at the confluence of the Toklat and Sushana Rivers supports the largest known population of fall chum salmon in Alaska and is estimated to contribute 27% of the commercial and subsistence fall chum salmon harvest in the Yukon and Tanana River fisheries downstream from the mouth of the Kantishna River. The spring's area also supports a small population (500-600) of overwintering mallards which is believed to be the northern-most freshwater waterfowl wintering area in North America. The Toklat River Springs' fall chum salmon spawning area is considered critical habitat and has been nominated for legislative designation.

Alternative #3 - Totchaket Agriculture Access Road and Extension: Based upon the limited data presently available, most of the area adjacent to this route appears to have moderate to low fish and wildlife habitat value. Recreational hunting, subsistence use and trapping also appear to very light in the area. There are no critical habitat areas yet identified. From the standpoint of potential impacts, the department's primary concerns are related to those portions of the route which are (1) adjacent to the Kantishna River (which is a designated anadromous fish stream) or (2) require crossings of resident fish streams. Rather than influencing route selection, these concerns are normally addressed by the department, via its AS 16 authorities, through the provision of adequate mitigating measures as a component of route design and construction.

Recommendations: From the sole standpoint of minimizing impacts to fish and wildlife or their habitats, the department prefers that any extension of the state highway system to Kantishna be aligned along the Alternative #3 - Nenana-Totchaket Agriculture Access Road and Extension route.

The department appreciates the Senate Transportation Committee's solicitation of our concerns and recommendations. We remain available to provide additional information as may be needed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "James Ayers", written over the typed name.

James Ayers  
Special Assistant to  
the Commissioner

## PART II: INTERIOR SYSTEM EXTENSIONS

### Kantishna Extension

The Kantishna Extension could be a highway located along the north flank of the Alaska Range connecting the Kantishna area with the Parks Highway in the area of Anderson or Nenana.

The Kantishna extension should be on the drawing board and ready to be developed into a linkage loop road. A great deal of thought should be given to having this linkage road take-off from the proposed Nenana Agriculture roads. This road can serve at least three industries in the State and give people of our State more access to our lands.

### Tourism

Mt. McKinley is Alaska's number one tourist attraction. The demand to see Mt. McKinley has grown dramatically in the past ten years going from less than 100,000 annual visitors to over 300,000, all of which are accommodated during the tourist season. The existing road that goes through Denali National Park back to Wonder Lake, which is in the Kantishna area, is inadequate to accommodate the traffic demands. As a result, users are severely restricted. This restriction stems not only from safety considerations but also to retain the wildlife viewing opportunities that are available along this route. There have been a number of bus accidents on this road which testifies to its inadequacy from a safety standpoint. Because of the imposed restrictions, those wishing to see McKinley must ride a tour bus or shuttle bus back to the more spectacular viewing points--a ride that often takes as much as five hours. Throughout this ride they are treated to magnificent scenery and excellent wildlife viewing opportunities. Too often visitors are unable to view the mountain itself because of the weather conditions at the time they are there. Park officials estimate that the mountain is obscured by clouds more than 50 percent of the time.

No doubt there are many disappointed visitors as well as uncomfortable ones who have endured the round trip. Those older visitors and younger ones with small children can find this exceedingly difficult.

The dilemma that is presented to the Park Service is how can all the visitors be transported back to a viewing vantage point in a comfortable manner and still retain the wildlife viewing opportunities that now exist. There are basically three options. One is to upgrade the existing road within the park. This option would be extremely expensive because of the mountainous terrain that the road traverses, notably that area through Polychrome Pass. An upgraded roadway would also tend to reduce the wildlife viewing opportunities. A second alternative would be to add more shuttle and tour buses, but even this alternative would call for some upgrading to the existing road and would adversely effect wildlife viewing as well. For these reasons, the Park Service is concerned about adding more buses to accommodate the anticipated visitor growth. A third alternative would be to create another viewing vantage point for the mountain. The Park Service has considered this as well. Their concept would be to provide another viewing area on the south flank of the Alaska Range. They have not considered one on the north flank. The Interior Transportation Study (ITS) suggested that the north flank has high potential. The south flank concept would essentially be single purpose. Visitors would drive in and return, probably from the Parks Highway south of Cantwell. There would still be a demand for wildlife viewing and those wishing this service would have to take the tour on the existing park road and return, perhaps a ten hour round trip or longer.

A vantage point on the north side in the vicinity of the Kantishna area and served by a well designed highway, leaving the Parks Highway somewhere between Nenana and Healy, would have some apparent advantages over a southern concept. The weather on the north side of the range is better than on the


south side. It would seem prudent that a vantage point would recognize the number of clear days before making a decision. The Kantishna area has numerous patented mining claims which would be available for private entrepreneurs to construct hotels and other visitor accommodations. Tourists would then have a greater opportunity to view the mountain in all its awesome splendor because they would be based at the viewing vantage point rather than being transported to one for only a few hours. Under this concept the existing park road could be closed to all but wildlife tours and tour buses; thus creating an opportunity for taking different groups each direction.

#### Mining

In addition to tourism and recreational travel, a highway into the Kantishna area would serve the mining industry. Currently there are ten active gold mines in the area and significant known reserves of antimony as well as deposits of lead, silver, zinc and tungsten. The importance of this area as a mineral district has been recognized in the Alaska National Interest Lands Act which mandated a study of the impact of mineral development on other resources in the Denali National Park and Preserve. A highway would serve the existing miners as well as encouraging new ventures into this mineral rich area. Presently miners must travel the existing park road by permission of the Parks Service and are restricted to certain hours of operation. This would be unnecessary under the proposed extension.

In addition to the above, this proposed highway extension could be further extended into the McGrath area, also known for mining. The corridor has also been recognized as one which will be needed in Alaska's future. An additional linkage possibility would be to connect the McGrath extension to the road between Ruby and Poorman. Such a connection would provide additional road access to the Yukon River.

# SB 49 - STUDY ROUTES





# ALASKA MINERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

509 W. Third Ave., Suite 17, Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 276-0347

March 8, 1985

MAR 11 1985

The Honorable John B. Coghill  
ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
Pouch V (MS 3100)  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Coghill:

On behalf of the Alaska Miners Association and its 2000 members, I wish to extend our support for SB 49 and SJR 10 which you have sponsored.

Access to the resources of the public lands in Alaska is essential if we are to achieve the economic and social benefits of living here. It is essential that the State assert its right to access those resources and RS 2477 is the vehicle by which that can be achieved. AMA wholeheartedly supports you in your efforts to cause that to happen.


We also support your efforts on the Kantishna Road. As you may know, a recent cursory mineral inventory of that area showed much greater mineralization than had been previously known to exist.

We recently contacted the Park Service for information on inholder and commercial traffic through the Park which might be alleviated by the Kantishna Road. According to their records, there are currently 322 permits for personal use by inholders and an additional 300 permits for oversized vehicles. This is a significant amount of traffic through the Park that could be reduced by the Kantishna Road. Of course there are the additional benefits of access to the other values of the Park by others users via the Kantishna.

The Alaska Miners Association appreciates your efforts on these two matters and supports them.

Sincerely,

ALASKA MINERS ASSOCIATION

  
James R. Jinks  
Executive Director

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

### INTRODUCTION

The Kantishna Hills study area encompasses approximately 196,500 acres and is located near Wonder Lake north of the former Mount McKinley National Park boundary in a group of rugged low lying hills known as the Kantishna Hills.

Currently, in the Kantishna Hills study area there are 179 unpatented placer claims, 92 unpatented lode claims, 2 patented placer claims, and 37 patented lode claims recorded with the Bureau of Land Management (see Recorded Claims - Kantishna Hills Study Area map). These 310 claims cover approximately 6,960 acres, the majority of which are located in the southern half of the study area.

Additionally, there are 20 unpatented placer claims covering approximately 400 acres located on Moose Creek that are actually located outside the study area boundary; they comprise a portion of a contiguous claim group on Moose Creek recorded with BLM, the remainder of which lies within the study area. For purposes of this DEIS, they are included in the analysis.

Of the total, 14 claims including 2 unpatented placer claims, 7 unpatented lode claims, 2 patented placer claims, and 3 patented lode claims, are located in the northeastern portion of the study area and comprise the Stampede Mill and mines complex. These claims are currently being managed for educational purposes under the 1979 memorandum of understanding between the University of Alaska and the National Park Service. The memorandum provides that the Stampede area be used for educational rather than commercial purposes.

In summary, the total area covered by recorded claims associated with the Kantishna Hills study area is 7,360 acres or 3.7 percent of the study area.

The Dunkle Mine study area, which includes the historic coal mine complex, encompasses approximately 22,400 acres and is located south of the Alaska Range and east of the West Fork of the Chulitna River near Broad Pass. Currently, there are 142 unpatented lode claims recorded with BLM that are located in the Dunkle Mine study area, covering approximately 2,840 acres. There are 8 recorded unpatented placer claims located partially within the study area and 1 recorded unpatented placer claim (part of the same claim group) located outside the study area boundary. These claims cover approximately 180 acres. For purposes of this DEIS, the single claim located outside the study area boundary is included in the analysis. There are no patented claims in this study area. The total area covered by recorded claims associated with the Dunkle Mine study area is 3,020 acres or 13.5 percent of the study area (see Recorded Claims- Dunkle Mine Study Area map).

Kantishna Hills

Refer to the Alternative 2 map for the Kantishna Hills study area for the location of claims affected under this alternative.

Claims Affected Under Alternative 2:

185 unpatented placer claims	-	4,460 acres
5 unpatented lode claims	-	100 acres
34 patented lode claims	-	680 acres
<hr/>		
224 total claims		5,240 acres

Assumptions for Alternative Formulation and Analysis:

The 5 recorded unpatented lode claims and 185 unpatented placer claims assumed valid would pass validity examination and be acquired.

The 2 placer claims on Slate Creek, 10 placer claims on Spruce Creek, and the 80 unpatented lode claims assumed invalid would not be acquired.

Stampede claims would be developed under NPS/University of Alaska memorandum of understanding--claims would not be acquired.

Placer mining effects in alternative 1 would not occur in alternative 2.

Lode mining effects in alternative 1 would not occur in alternative 2.

Dunkle Mine

Refer to the Alternative 2 map for the Dunkle Mine study area for the location of claims affected under this alternative.

Claims Affected Under Alternative 2:

9 unpatented placer claims - 180 acres

Assumptions for Alternative Formulation and Analysis:

Placer Mining Effects Assumptions

Placer mining effects in alternative 1 would not occur in alternative 2.



## Alaska Environmental Lobby, Inc.

~~419 6th Street, Suite 375~~ Juneau, Alaska 99801  
204 N. Franklin St. Suite 3

907-586-2345

### Position Paper on Kantishna Road Feasibility Study SB 49

SB 49 provides for a \$500,000 appropriation for a feasibility study of building the Kantishna Road. All of the proposed routes would cross through Denali National Park whose boundaries were expanded by the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act of 1980. Mt. McKinley National Park was established in 1917 to preserve one of the most spectacular populations of large mammals in North America. The boundaries were expanded in 1980 to afford protection of those populations that were dependent on an ecosystem that extended beyond the original boundaries.

The construction of a four lane highway over any of the proposed routes of SB 49 would be extremely destructive to park wildlife populations. In the Environmental Impact Statement done for the Kantishna Hills-Dunkle Mine Study it was concluded that the development of the Stampede/Kantishna Road would cause excessive disturbance and reduction of large mammal populations and result in reduced wildlife viewing in other sections of the park. The study also found that:

- \* \* One of the largest populations of moose use the Clearwater Creek drainage and such development of the Kantishna Road would cross that drainage causing damaging disturbance
- \* \* The road would cross the Toklat River wolf range, reducing wolf activity and bringing disturbance closer to denning and activity sites. Wolves are very intolerant of human disturbance. The mysterious disappearance of the Toklat wolf pack in 1983 was attributed to the probability that they traveled up to the Stampede Road where they were trapped.
- \* \* Caribou use the Kantishna Hills and Moose Creek for rutting and prerutting activity while the Stampede area is one of the major calving areas of an already unstable herd. Further disturbance of the herd especially during calving time would be detrimental to their survival.
- \* \* Development of the Kantishna area could lead to both black and brown bears being attracted to the area if facilities do not have adequate garbage disposal. This in turn would lead to the relocation or destruction of problem bears, thus removing one of the most popular animals viewed by visitors to Denali National Park.

Because of the potential damage the construction of a major highway over any of the proposed routes would do to Denali wildlife populations, the Alaska Environmental Lobby opposes any appropriation for a feasibility study for the construction of Kantishna Road.

Prepared by Jane G. Anderson, Staff Lobbyist

ALASKA CENTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT • ALASKA CHAPTER, SIERRA CLUB  
ALASKA WILDERNESS GUIDES ASSOCIATION • ANCHORAGE AUDUBON SOCIETY  
ARCTIC AUDUBON SOCIETY • DENALI CITIZENS' COUNCIL • FRIENDS OF THE EARTH  
JUNEAU AUDUBON SOCIETY • KACHEMAK BAY CONSERVATION SOCIETY • KENAI AUDUBON SOCIETY  
KODIAK AUDUBON SOCIETY • LYNN CANAL CONSERVATION • NORTHERN ALASKA ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER  
SITKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY • SOUTHEAST ALASKA CONSERVATION COUNCIL

IDENTIFICATION	BILL NAME	BILL NUMBER SB-49
		DATE INTRODUCED 1-14-85
		RELATED BILLS PENDING
	SPONSOR(S) Sen. J. B. Coghill	None
		REFERRALS Finance
INITIAL RESEARCH	INITIAL SUMMARY COMPLETED  Yes	LEGAL DIVISION SUMMARY
	SPONSOR CONTACTED FOR BACKUP MATERIALS  Yes	DEPT OF LAW SUMMARY
	AGENCY RESPONSE	FISCAL NOTE N/A
		OTHER INTERESTED LEGISLATORS NOTIFIED
BACKGROUND RESEARCH	SIMILAR BILLS INTRODUCED IN PREVIOUS LEGISLATURES  None	OTHER STATE OR FEDERAL PRECEDENTS, REGULATIONS, ETC
	RESPONSES FROM INTERESTED PERSONS AND/OR GROUPS OOT/PP Bill Analysis Thomas & Assoc. - Synopsis of Project Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce - Interior Roads Study NPS - Regional Office - Janet McCabe Sen Ted Stevens - <del>Janet McCabe</del> 7 Gen Dickey	
HEARING PREPARATION	CHAIRMAN BRIEFED Yes	DATE & PLACE SET 1-30-85 3:30 Batovich room
	STAFF MEMO TO COMMITTEE Yes	TELECONFERENCE No
	BACKGROUND MATERIAL DISTRIBUTED	PSA/PRESS RELEASE No
	LIST OF WITNESSES Bob Thomas -	SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS/CS DRAFTED

- NPS - 586-7127-271-4196

Environmental Lobby - 586-2345

ANILCA - Road Build Auth.

Background on R52477 roads

Fish & Game - Jim Ayers

Grey Line/West Tower - Tom Tougas

THOMAS  
&  
ASSOCIATES

Box 80783  
Fairbanks, AK 99708  
(907) 479 4972

February 6, 1985

Senator Jack Coghill  
Chairman of the Senate Transportation Committee  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Coghill:

I appreciated the opportunity to present the Kantishna highway project to the Senate Transportation Committee. I am writing this letter in response to some of the questions that arose during my presentation.

1. Could federal highway funds be used to fund this reconnaissance effort, essentially reducing the State monies to that required to match federal highway monies? The answer is yes. The funding amount would be approximately five percent (5%) or \$25,000.
2. What is the mechanism whereby the State may construct roads through National Interest Lands? I have included that information as an attachment to this letter.
3. Should not the National Park Service and other interested agencies be approached prior to this project in order to get their approval? The National Park Service has been approached a number of times regarding this project. I believe their position at this time is one that neither approves nor disapproves. In their analysis of the mining potential in the Kantishna area (which they confirmed as substantial) this access scenario was described as one way to serve the mining industry. No position was taken. At this time, it is premature to expect a writeoff of this concept. This does not mean that these agencies are categorically opposed to the concept. There are many questions that need to be answered before any sort of concensus can be had. The location phase of a project is the time these issues are resolved. As an example, of the three basic routes, only one may be acceptable from an environmental standpoint. It takes the location phase analysis to make this determination.

The important considerations from the State's viewpoint at this time are that this proposed project will require the National Park Service to address current, critical access problems. It also gives the State a strong voice in resolving these problems. The process established by the D-2 legislation assures that these problems will be addressed within a short time frame.


February 6, 1985

I would like to add a bit of personal philosophy to this letter. At one time I enjoyed making the trip on the Park Road to Wonder Lake. I have not done this in the past 15 years. The reason for this is that it is no longer very attractive to me. In order for me to travel the Park Road I must make reservations well in advance and my summers are not that well planned. In addition, it may be heavily overcast and raining during that time. The heavy commercial traffic along the existing Park Road, coupled with the poor condition of that road, make the drive a frustrating one at any rate. As a result, I--and I'm sure many other railbelt residents--do not take advantage of living in close proximity to Denali because of the inconvenience. This project would be very attractive and result in more spontaneous use by Alaskan residents. I believe this extra use would be significant.

It disturbs me at great deal when officials are reluctant to address a serious problem because the Park Service is perceived as a formidable opponent particularly when a logical solution to a serious problem exists.

It is important to keep in mind that tourism is our second largest industry and oil revenues are declining as a result of both lower prices and declining resources. Investment in our second largest industry that is growing and renewable seems prudent.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink that reads "Bob C. Thomas". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "B" and a cursive "C" and "T".

Bob C. Thomas, P.E.

Attachment

potential on all public lands in the State of Alaska in order to expand the data base with respect to the mineral potential of such lands. The mineral assessment program may include, but shall not be limited to, techniques such as side-looking radar imagery and, on public lands other than surface lands within the national park system, core and test drilling for geologic information, notwithstanding any restriction on such drilling under the Wilderness Act. For purposes of this Act, core and test drilling means the extraction of geologic samples in order to assess the metal values of geologic strata, but shall not include exploratory drilling of oil and gas test wells. If practicable, the Secretary shall consult with the State of Alaska regarding the responsibilities of the Secretary under this section and similar programs undertaken by the State. In order to carry out mineral assessments authorized under this or any other law, including but not limited to the National Uranium Resource Evaluation program, the Secretary shall allow for access by air for assessment activities permitted in this subsection to all public lands involved in such study. The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Energy and heads of other Federal agencies carrying out such programs, to determine such requirements as may be necessary to protect the resources of such lands, including fish and wildlife. Such requirements may provide that access will not occur during nesting, calving, spawning or other times as fish and wildlife in the specific area may be especially vulnerable to such activities. The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with public or private entities to carry out a portion of the mineral assessment program. This section shall not apply to the lands described in section 1001 of this title.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Activities carried out in conservation system units under subsection (a) shall be subject to regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Such regulations shall ensure that such activities are carried out in an environmentally sound manner—

- (1) which does not result in lasting environmental impacts which appreciably alter the natural character of the units or biological or geological systems in the units; and
- (2) which is compatible with the purposes for which such units are established.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSMITTAL

Section 1. On or before October 1, 1980, and annually thereafter, the President shall transmit to the Congress all pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska gathered by the United States Geological Survey.

TITLE XI—TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITY SYSTEMS IN AND ACROSS, AND ACCESS INTO, CONSERVATION SYSTEM UNITS

FINDINGS

SEC. 1101. Congress finds that—

(a) Alaska's transportation and utility network is largely undeveloped and the future needs for transportation and utility system in Alaska would best be identified and provided for through an orderly,

16 USC 1131

Consultation.

Contracts.

General information, transmitted to Congress.

Bob Thomas

16 USC 3161.

## EFFECT OF TITLE

SEC. 1103. Except as specifically provided for in this title, applicable law shall apply with respect to the authorization and administration of transportation or utility systems. 16 USC 3163.

## PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 1104. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of applicable law, no action by any Federal agency under applicable law with respect to the approval or disapproval of the authorization, in whole or in part, of any transportation or utility system shall have any force or effect unless the provisions of this section are complied with. 16 USC 3164.

(b)(1) CONSOLIDATED APPLICATIONS.—Within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall jointly prescribe and publish a consolidated application form to be used for applying for the approval of each type of transportation or utility system. Each such application form shall be designed to elicit such information as may be necessary to meet the requirements of this title and the applicable law with respect to the type of system concerned.

(2) For purposes of this section, the heads of all appropriate Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Transportation, shall share decisionmaking responsibility in the case of any transportation or utility system described in section 1102(4)(B) (ii), (iii), or (vii); but with respect to any such system for which he does not have programmatic responsibility, the Secretary of Transportation shall provide to the other Federal agencies concerned such planning and other assistance as may be appropriate.

(c) FILING.—Each applicant for the approval of any transportation or utility system shall file on the same day an application with each appropriate Federal agency. The applicant shall utilize the consolidated form prescribed under subsection (b) for the type of transportation or utility system concerned.

(d) AGENCY NOTICE.—(1) Within sixty days after the receipt of an application filed pursuant to subsection (c), the head of each Federal agency with whom the application was filed shall inform the applicant in writing that, on its face—

(A) the application appears to contain the information required by this title and applicable law insofar as that agency is concerned; or

(B) the application does not contain such information.

(2) Any notice provided under paragraph (1)(B) shall specify what additional information the applicant must provide. If the applicant provides additional information, the head of the Federal agency must inform the applicant in writing, within thirty days after receipt of such information, whether the information is sufficient.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The draft of any environmental impact statement required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in connection with any application filed under this section shall be completed, within nine months from the date of filing, by the head of the Federal agency assigned lead responsibility for the statement. Any such statement shall be jointly prepared by all Federal agencies with which the application was filed under subsection (c). The final environmental impact statement shall be com-

42 USC 4321  
note.





such thing. Such nine-month  
 for good cause by the Federal  
 y for the preparation of such  
 nal time is necessary for such  
 riting of such determination,  
 ion, together with the reasons  
 rovision of section 505 of the  
 Act of 1966 shall apply to each  
 r this section in the same  
 lication relating to the public  
 The Federal agency assigned  
 on with such other Federal  
 is pending shall hold public hear-  
 n appropriate location in the  
 al impact statement and the  
 dered by affected agencies  
 al joint environmental impact

nine-month period, and the  
 y extension of provided  
 deral agencies concerned shall  
 er Federal departments and  
 il, the State, affected units of  
 affected corporations formed  
 s Settlements, and, after  
 er statement of recommenda-  
 mitted by interested individuals

four months after the final  
 ublished in accordance with  
 nspiration or utility system,  
 sion to approve or disapprove,  
 ch authorization that applies  
 within the jurisdiction of that

in making a decision referred  
 and make detailed findings  
 a respect to—

asibility of, the transportation

s of access, including a determi-  
 re is an economically feasible  
 uting of the system through or  
 t, national recreation area, or  
 not, whether there are alterna-  
 l results in fewer or less severe  
 ation system unit;

of including different transpor-  
 ne areas;

conomic, and environmental  
 local significance, including  
 d their habitat, and on rural,

ational security interests of the  
 from approval or denial of the  
 r utility system;

ect the purposes for which the  
 as established;

(G) measures which should be instituted to avoid or minimize negative impacts; and

(H) the short- and long-term public values which may be adversely affected by approval of the transportation or utility system versus the short- and long-term public benefits which may accrue from such approval.

STANDARDS FOR GRANTING CERTAIN AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1105. In any case in which there is no applicable law with respect to a transportation or utility system, the head of the Federal agency concerned shall, within four months after the date of filing of any final Environmental Impact Statement, make recommendations, for purposes of section 1106(b), to grant such authorizations as may be necessary to establish such system, in whole or in part, within the conservation system unit concerned if he determines that—

16 USC 3165.

(1) such system would be compatible with the purposes for which the unit was established; and

(2) there is no economically feasible and prudent alternative route for the system.

AGENCY, PRESIDENTIAL, AND CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS

SEC. 1106. (a)(1) AGENCY ACTION IN CASES OTHER THAN THOSE INVOLVING SECTION 1105 OR WILDERNESS AREAS.—In the case of any application for the approval of any transportation or utility system to which section 1105 does not apply or that does not occupy, use, or traverse any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System, if, in compliance with section 1104—

16 USC 3166.

(A) each Federal agency concerned decides to approve each authorization within its jurisdiction with respect to that system, then the system shall be deemed to be approved and each such agency shall promptly issue, in accordance with applicable law, such rights-of-way, permits, licenses, leases, certificates, or other authorizations as are necessary with respect to the establishment of the system; or

(B) one or more Federal agencies decide to disapprove any authorization within its jurisdiction with respect, to that system, then the system shall be deemed to be disapproved and the applicant for the system may appeal the disapproval to the President.

(2) If an applicant appeals under paragraph (1)(B), the President, within four months after receiving the appeal, shall decide whether to approve or deny the application. The President shall approve the application if he finds, after consideration of the factors set forth in section 1104(g)(2), that such approval would be in the public interest and that (1) such system would be compatible with the purposes for which the unit was established; and (2) there is no economically feasible and prudent alternative route for the system. In making a decision, the President shall consider any environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to section 1104(e), comments of the public and Federal agencies received during the preparation of such statement, and the findings and recommendations, if any, of each Federal agency that rendered a decision with respect to the application. The President's decision to approve or deny the application shall be published in the Federal Register, together with a statement of the reasons for his determination.

Appeals, Presidential review.

Publication in Federal Register.



application under paragraph (2),  
 promptly issue, in accordance  
 with the right-of-way, permits, licenses, leases,  
 and other authorizations as are necessary with respect to

application under paragraph (2), the  
 President exhausted his administrative  
 authority to refer the application to an appropriate Federal court to

**SECTION 1105 OR WILDER-**  
 application for the approval of a  
 right-of-way which section 1105 applies or that  
 is in any area within the National  
 System of Public Lands. Each Federal agency concerned  
 shall submit a written notification, whether the  
 President disapproved each authorization  
 with respect to the system. Such  
 notification shall include a statement of the reasons and  
 conclusions.

including all notification referred to in  
 such notifications, any environ-  
 mental impact statement pursuant to section 104(e), and  
 any other information received during the  
 review. The President shall decide whether the  
 right-of-way concerned should be approved. If  
 the applicant shall be deemed to  
 be aggrieved, and may file suit in any  
 Federal court. If the President  
 does not submit to Congress his recommen-  
 dation or utility system covered,  
 the application as provided in  
 section 1105 shall include with his recommendation

the subject of his recommendation;  
 detail the relevant factual back-  
 ground, findings and recommendation;  
 a concise statement;  
 conditions and stipulations which would  
 apply if approved by the Congress.  
 No application for any transpor-  
 tation or utility system to which the President makes a  
 recommendation under subsection (b) shall be approved  
 unless the House of Representatives approve a resolution  
 within the first period of one hundred and  
 twenty days of the first session of the Congress beginning  
 after the date of the report by the Senate and House of  
 Representatives.

The Congress is broken only by a  
 recess of not more than three days.  
 If the House is not in session because of  
 a recess of more than three days to a day certain are  
 the one-hundred-and-twenty-day

The Congress—  
 making power of each House of the  
 Congress shall be applicable only with respect to the  
 House in the case of resolutions

described by paragraph (6) of this subsection; and it supersedes  
 other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith;  
 and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either  
 House to change the rules (so far as those relate to the procedure  
 of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same  
 extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(4) For the purposes of this subsection, the term "resolution" means  
 a joint resolution, the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That  
 the House of Representatives and Senate approve the application for  
 a right-of-way under title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conser-  
 vation Act submitted by the President to the Congress on \_\_\_\_\_,  
 19\_\_"; the first blank space therein to be filled in with the appropriate  
 date of transportation or utility system and the second blank therein to be  
 filled with the date on which the President submits the application to  
 the House of Representatives and the Senate.

"Resolution."

(5) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions  
 of section 8(d) of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act shall  
 apply to the consideration of the resolution.

15 USC 719f.

(6) After an application for a transportation or utility system has  
 been approved under subsection 1106(a), the appropriate Federal  
 agencies shall issue appropriate authorizations in accordance with  
 applicable law. In any case in which an application for a transpor-  
 tation or utility system has been approved pursuant to section 1106(b),  
 the appropriate Federal agencies shall issue appropriate authoriza-  
 tions in accordance with title V of the Federal Lands Policy Manage-  
 ment Act or other applicable law. After issuance pursuant to this  
 subsection, the appropriate land managing agency shall administer  
 the right-of-way in accordance with relevant management authori-  
 ties of the land managing agency and title V of the Federal Lands  
 Policy Management Act.

43 USC 1761.

#### RIGHTS-OF-WAY TERMS AND CONDITIONS

**SEC. 1107. (a) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary, or the  
 Secretary of Agriculture where national forest wilderness is involved,  
 shall include in any right-of-way issued pursuant to an application  
 under this title, terms and conditions which shall include, but not be  
 limited to—

16 USC 3167.

(1) requirements to insure that, to the maximum extent feasi-  
 ble, the right-of-way is used in a manner compatible with the  
 purposes for which the affected conservation system unit,  
 national recreation area, or national conservation area was  
 established or is managed;

(2) requirements for restoration, revegetation, and curtailment  
 of erosion of the surface of the land;

(3) requirements to insure that activities in connection with  
 the right-of-way will not violate applicable air and water quality  
 standards and related facility siting standards established pursu-  
 ant to law;

(4) requirements, including the minimum necessary width,  
 designed to control or prevent—

(A) damage to the environment (including damage to fish  
 and wildlife habitat),

(B) damage to public or private property, and

(C) hazards to public health and safety;



of individuals living in  
rely on the fish, wildlife,  
subsistence purposes; and  
to avoid or minimize  
impacts.

Any transportation or util-  
ity which occupies, uses, or  
s of a unit of the National  
subject to such conditions as  
amount of, and transporta-  
h of, and that the  
ted and constructed in an

ase of a pipeline described in  
of 1920, a right-of-way issued  
e same manner as a right-of-  
provisions of subsections (c)  
h (y) of such section 28 shall  
this title.

#### REVIEW

ss that any judicial review of  
ompliance with the National  
suant to this title shall be  
le.

ourt in which an administra-  
the National Environmental  
title is challenged shall be  
he earliest possible date, and  
a court, and such court shall  
challenge within one hundred  
allenge is brought unless such  
time is required to satisfy the  
ituation.

o grant any injunctive relief  
t any action pursuant to this  
l judgment entered in a case  
e.

#### RIGHTS

all be construed to adversely

#### AS TO HOLDINGS

other provision of this Act or  
on conservation system units,  
l conservation areas, and those  
study, the use of snowmachines  
r, or frozen river conditions in  
or boats, airplanes, and nonmo-  
ods for traditional activities  
y this Act or other law) and for  
tes. Such use shall be subject to  
ary to protect the natural and  
tem units, national recreation

areas, and national conservation areas, and shall not be prohibited  
unless, after notice and hearing in the vicinity of the affected unit or  
area, the Secretary finds that such use would be detrimental to the  
resource values of the unit or area. Nothing in this section shall be  
construed as prohibiting the use of other methods of transportation  
for such travel and activities on conservation system lands where  
such use is permitted by this Act or other law.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act or other law,  
in any case in which State owned or privately owned land, including  
subsurface rights of such owners underlying public lands, or a valid  
mining claim or other valid occupancy is within or is effectively  
surrounded by one or more conservation system units, national  
recreation areas, national conservation areas, or those public lands  
designated as wilderness study, the State or private owner or occu-  
pier shall be given by the Secretary such rights as may be necessary  
to assure adequate and feasible access for economic and other  
purposes to the concerned land by such State or private owner or  
occupier and their successors in interest. Such rights shall be subject  
to reasonable regulations issued by the Secretary to protect the  
natural and other values of such lands.

#### TEMPORARY ACCESS

SEC. 1111. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision  
of this Act or other law the Secretary shall authorize and permit  
temporary access by the State or a private landowner to or across any  
conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conser-  
vation area, the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska or those public  
lands designated as wilderness study or managed to maintain the  
wilderness character or potential thereof, in order to permit the State  
or private landowner access to its land for purposes of survey,  
geophysical, exploratory, or other temporary uses thereof whenever  
he determines such access will not result in permanent harm to the  
resources of such unit, area, Reserve or lands.

16 USC 3171.

(b) STIPULATIONS AND CONDITIONS.—In providing temporary access  
pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary may include such stipula-  
tions and conditions he deems necessary to insure that the private  
use of public lands is accomplished in a manner that is not inconsis-  
tent with the purposes for which the public lands are reserved and  
which insures that no permanent harm will result to the resources of  
the unit, area, Reserve or lands.

#### NORTH SLOPE HAUL ROAD

SEC. 1112. (a) IN GENERAL.—So long as that section of the North  
Slope Haul Road referred to in subsection (c) is closed to public use,  
but not including regulated local traffic north of the Yukon River,  
regulated industrial traffic and regulated high occupancy buses, such  
regulation to occur under State law, except that the Secretary, after  
consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, and the Governor  
of Alaska shall agree on the number of vehicles and seasonality of  
use, such section shall be free from any and all restrictions contained  
in title 23, United States Code, as amended or supplemented, or in  
any regulations thereunder. Prior to executing an agreement pursu-  
ant to this subsection, the Secretary and the Governor of Alaska shall  
consult with the head of any unit of local government which encom-  
passes lands located adjacent to the route of the North Slope Haul  
Road. The State of Alaska shall have the authority to limit access,

16 USC 3172.

impose restrictions and impose tolls, notwithstanding any provision of Federal law.

(b) **RELEASE.**—The removal of restrictions shall not be conditioned upon repayment by the State of Alaska to the Treasurer of the United States of any Federal-aid highway funds paid on account of the section of highway described in subsection (c), and the obligation of the State of Alaska to repay these amounts is hereby released so long as the road remains closed as set forth in subsection (a).

(c) **APPLICATION OF SECTION.**—The provisions of this section shall apply to that section of the North Slope Haul Road, which extends from the southern terminus of the Yukon River Bridge to the northern terminus of the Road at Prudhoe Bay.

#### STIKINE RIVER REGION

**SEC. 1113.** Congress finds that there is a need to study the effect of this Act upon the ability of the Government of Canada to obtain access in the Stikine River region of southeast Alaska. Accordingly, within five years from the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall consult with the Government of Canada and shall submit a report to the Congress containing his findings and recommendations concerning the need, if any, to provide for such access. Such report shall include, among other things, an analysis of the need for access and the social, environmental and economic impacts which may result from various forms of access including, but not limited to, a road along the Stikine and Iskut Rivers, or other alternative routes, should such access be permitted.

### TITLE XII—FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

#### ALASKA LAND USE COUNCIL

**SEC. 1201. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established the Alaska Land Use Council (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Council").

(b) **COCHAIRMEN.**—The Council shall have Cochairmen. The Federal Cochairman shall be appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. The State Cochairman shall be the Governor of Alaska.

(c) **MEMBERS.**—In addition to the Cochairmen, the Council shall consist of the following members:

(1) the head of the Alaska offices of each of the following Federal agencies: National Park Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Department of Transportation;

(2) the Commissioners of the Alaska Departments of Natural Resources, Fish and Game, Environmental Conservation, and Transportation; and

(3) two representatives selected by the Alaska Native Regional Corporations (in consultation with their respective Village Corporations) which represent the twelve geographic regions described in section 7(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

Any vacancy on the Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Consultation  
with Canadian  
Government and  
report to  
Congress.  
16 USC 3173.

16 USC 3181.

Presidential  
appointment.

(j) **STATE DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE.**—If the State decides not to participate on the Council or elects to terminate the Council, the Cochairman, the agencies referred to in subsection (c)(3), the representatives of the Alaska Native Regional Corporations, and the private landowners referred to in subsection (c)(4) shall continue to perform the administrative functions required by this Act until the Council is terminated. The Federal Cochairman shall make recommendations from time to time to the President concerning such matters.

(e) **COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES.**—

(1) The Federal Cochairman shall be determined by the President for level IV of the Executive United States Code.

(2) The other members of the Council shall receive no additional compensation.

(3) While away from their homes in the performance of services for the Council who are Federal employees referred to in subsection (c)(3), including per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons employed intermittently, the Council shall be allowed expenses under section 5705 of the United States Code.

(4) The State Cochairman shall be compensated in accordance with State law.

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.**—

(1) The Cochairmen, acting jointly, shall create and abolish employment positions, determine the ordinary and intermittent employment qualifications, appointment, reappointment, retirement rights of Council members, office space, supplies, and equipment.

(2) The office of the Council shall be located in Alaska.

(3) Except as provided in subsection (4), the Federal Government shall bear the costs and other expenses, other than the salaries of members, incurred in carrying out the duties under this Act.

(4) The Council is authorized to employ such personnel, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities as may be necessary, and other agencies with or without the consent of the agency of the Federal Government directed to cooperate fully in carrying out the duties of the Council. The personnel, and facilities available to the Council in accordance with subsection (3) shall be under the control of the Council for any period such staff is so detailed to the Council.

(5) The Council is authorized to accept and to make other contributions and to contribute to the carrying out

1-2 3 GUIDELINES FILE

Applicant states that the proposed subsidiary would engage in the activities of operating an industrial bank in a manner authorized by Colorado law, and engaging in the sale as agent of credit life, credit disability, credit accident and health, loan redemption and loan cancellation insurance in connection with extensions of credit by bank and nonbank subsidiaries of Maryland National Corporation. These activities would be performed from offices of Applicant's subsidiary in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and the geographic areas to be served are entire United States. Such activities have been specified by the Board in section 225.4(a) of Regulation Y as permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of section 225.4(b).

Interested persons may express their views on the question whether consummation of the proposal can "reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices."

Any request for a hearing on this question must be accompanied by a statement of the reasons a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit views in writing to the Reserve Bank to be received not later than June 28, 1981.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 28, 1981.

D. Michael Manias,  
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 81-16524 Filed 6-2-81; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6210-01-M

**First York Banc Corp.; Proposed Acquisition of First Trust Company of York**

First York Banc Corp., York, Nebraska, has applied, pursuant to section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and section 225.4(b)(2) of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.4(b)(2)), for permission to acquire

voting shares of First Trust Company of York, York, Nebraska.

Applicant states that the proposed subsidiary would engage in the activities of a trust company as described in § 225.4(a) of the Board's Regulation Y. These activities would be performed from offices of Applicant's subsidiary in York, Nebraska, and the geographic areas to be served are York County and counties contiguous thereto. Such activities have been specified by the Board in § 225.4(a) of Regulation Y as permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b).

Interested persons may express their views on the question whether consummation of the proposal can "reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices." Any request for a hearing on this question must be accompanied by a statement of the reasons a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.

Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit views in writing to the Reserve Bank to be received not later than June 28, 1981.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 28, 1981.

D. Michael Manias,  
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 81-16528 Filed 6-2-81; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6210-01-M

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

[E-81-6]

**Delegation of Authority to the Secretary of Defense**

1. *Purpose.* This delegation authorizes the Secretary of Defense to represent in conjunction with the Administrator of General Services, the consumer interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government in proceedings before the

Public Utility Commission of Texas involving electric utility rates.

2. *Effective date.* This delegation is effective immediately.

3. *Delegation.*

a. Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 277, as amended, particularly sections 201(a)(4) and 205(d) (40 U.S.C. 481(a)(4), and 488(d)), authority is delegated to the Secretary of Defense to represent the consumer interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government before the Public Utility Commission of Texas involving the application of the Texas Power and Light Company for an increase in its electric rates. The authority delegated to the Secretary of Defense shall be exercised concurrently with the Administrator of General Services.

b. The Secretary of Defense may redelegate this authority to any officer, official, or employee of the Department of Defense.

c. This authority shall be exercised in accordance with the policies, procedures, and controls prescribed by the General Services Administration, and shall be exercised in cooperation with the responsible officers, officials, and employees thereof.

d. The Department of Defense shall forward to the General Services Administration copies of its testimony and briefs within 60 days of formal submission.

Dated: May 22, 1981.

Ray Kline,  
Acting Administrator, General Services.

[FR Doc. 81-16441 Filed 6-2-81; 8:45 am]

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
**Offices of the Secretary**

**Notice of Uniform Federal Transportation and Utility System Application for Use on Conservation System Unit Lands in Alaska**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Interior.  
**ACTION:** Notice of Uniform Federal Transportation and Utility System Application for use on Conservation System Unit lands in Alaska.

**SUMMARY:** This notice publishes a consolidated application form for use in applying for Federal approval of transportation or utility systems in the

*12 T. Manias 6/28  
please return!*

State of Alaska if any portion of the proposed system is within a Federal conservation system unit, national recreation area or national conservation area. This form is not required to be used until each affected Federal agency has secured the necessary clearance from the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) for information collection requirements.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 30, 1981.

**ADDRESS:** Any questions or suggestions should be sent to: Director (330), Bureau of Land Management, 1800 C Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20204.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert E. Mollohan, 202-343-5537 or the above address.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Pub. L. 96-487, 94 Stat. 2371, ("the Act"), specifically Section 1104(b)(1), directs the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, jointly to prescribe and publish, within 180 days of enactment (December 2, 1980), a consolidated application form. Such form is to be used for applying for the approval of all proposed transportation or utility systems in Alaska in any portion of the system is proposed to be within any Federal conservation system unit, national recreation area or national conservation area. The form is to be used by all Federal agencies which have jurisdiction to grant any authorization, including any right-of-way, permit, license, lease, or certificate, without which a transportation or utility system cannot, in whole or in part, be established. A "conservation system unit" is any unit in Alaska of the National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems, National Trails System, National Wilderness Preservation System, or a National Forest Monument.

The consolidated application is required to be used for the following types of systems:

1. Canals, ditches, flumes, laterals, pipes, pipelines tunnels, and other systems for the transportation of water.
2. Pipelines and other systems for the transportation of liquids other than water, including oil, natural gas, synthetic liquid and gaseous fuels, and any refined product produced therefrom.
3. Pipelines, slurry and emulsion systems and conveyor belts for the transportation of solid materials.

4. Systems for the transmission and distribution of electric energy.

5. Systems for transmission or reception of radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and other electronic signals, and other means of communication.

6. Improved rights-of-way for snow machines, air cushion vehicles, and all-terrain vehicles.

7. Roads, highways, railroads, tunnels, tramways, airports, landing strips, docks, and other systems of general transportation.

All of the systems listed above include those minimally necessary related structures and facilities, temporary and permanent, along the routes of such system.

Once the consolidated application form is approved by the Office of Management and Budget for use, no action by any Federal agency under applicable law with respect to the approval or disapproval of the authorization of any of the listed transportation or utility systems shall have any force or effect unless this consolidated application form is used.

The applicant will be required to file the consolidated application form simultaneously with each Federal agency having jurisdiction to grant the authorizations needed for the proposed system. Title XI of the Act provides a special procedure, including time limitations for the review and approval or disapproval of these systems. Other applicable law, including existing agency regulations, applies with respect to the authorization and administration of the transportation and utility systems in the same way it applies to non-Title XI applications.

Both regulatory and land managing Federal agencies are included in the consolidated application procedure. After consultation with many affected agencies, the Departments of Interior, Transportation and Agriculture developed the Uniform Federal Transportation and Utility System Application. Departments and independent agencies that participated are as follows: The Departments of Defense, Energy, Commerce and State, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Communications Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency.

An attempt has been made to solicit only basic information which is required under current applicable law in determining whether to authorize a proposed system. The scope of response to the questions will vary for each applicant, depending on the simplicity or complexity of the project. In many instances, if the proposed form is

completed properly, little or no further information will be required in order for the agency to approve or disapprove the system.

However, because of the highly specialized nature of most regulatory agency responsibilities, in some instances, these agencies may require additional information from the applicant. Applicants will also be urged to contact all relevant agencies prior to an application submission to learn of any additional or unique submission requirements which have not been incorporated into the consolidated form.

Comments on the consolidated form were requested in the Federal Register of March 12, 1981 (46 FR 16 342). Comments were received from 23 sources.

#### General Comments

Overall the comments received on the draft application form expressed the opinion that the form was clear, concise, and met the intent of Title XI of the Act. Out of 23 respondents, only one opposed the form in its entirety. By and large, the comments were of an editorial nature, i.e., word or phrase changes which provide for a clearer understanding of what information is being requested. Most of these suggestions have been incorporated into the form.

#### Specific Comments

One respondent suggested that an additional item entitled "resident of Alaska" be added to the citizenship requirement. The suggestion was not adopted in that there is no requirement of law for this information.

Several respondents made various suggestions relating to the "Project Description" section of the form. Most wanted additional items listed. We did not feel that it was necessary to add these requests to the Project Description section of the form. Most of these suggestions were, however, included in the instructions that accompany the form.

Two respondents asked that the word "exact" be removed from the section of the form pertaining to map requirements. This has been done.

Several respondents requested that an additional statement be included in the section on State or local government approval. An additional statement indicating that the applicant has applied for State or local government approval has been included.

Several respondents commented on item 13 of the form. In line with these comments we have replaced the word "chosen" with the word "rejected."

Also, we have broken this item into three parts for clarity.

Four respondents commented on item 15. These comments ranged from eliminating the item to minor word changes. We have removed the phrase "net revenue" and have reworded the instructions for completing this item which are in line with the comments received.

The largest number of comments were directed at items 16 through 18 on the form. Again, these comments ranged from total elimination of the items to minor word changes. Most of the suggested word changes were made and have been incorporated into the form. Other suggestions for clarity were incorporated into the instructions for completing each one of these items. The suggestions for eliminating these items have not been accommodated.

John R. Block,  
Secretary of Agriculture.  
June 1, 1981.

Andrew L. Lewis,  
Secretary of Transportation.  
May 29, 1981.

James G. Watt,  
Secretary of the Interior.  
May 29, 1981.

#### General Information to Applicant

The Uniform Federal Transportation and Utility System Application form contained in this package is provided for your convenience in applying for a right-of-way, permit, license, lease, or certificate for the use of Federal lands that lie within conservation system units and National Recreation or Conservation Areas as defined in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. Conservation system units include the National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Trails System, National Wilderness Preservation System, National Forest Monuments. Any individual, business, or governmental entity desiring to establish and operate a transportation system over, upon, under, or through any one of these units must apply for this use by completing the application form contained in this package.

Transportation system uses for which this application is to be used are as follows:

1. Canals, ditches, flumes, laterals, pipes, pipelines, tunnels, and other systems for the transportation of water.
2. Pipelines and other systems for the transportation of liquids other than water, including oil, natural gas,

synthetic liquid and gaseous fuels, and any refined product produced therefrom.

3. Pipelines, slurry and emulsion systems and conveyor belts for the transportation of solid materials.

4. Systems for the transmission and distribution of electric energy.

5. Systems for transmission or reception of radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and other electronic signals, and other means of communication.

6. Improved rights-of-way for snow machines, air cushion vehicles, and all-terrain vehicles.

7. Roads, highways, railroads, tunnels, tramways, airports, landing strips, docks, and other systems of general transportation.

When filing for any of the above types of transportation systems within any conservation system unit, the applicant is required to file the application contained in this package with each Federal agency on the same day. Federal agencies with whom you must file an application include any agency that must issue a right-of-way, permit, license, lease, or certificate without which the proposed transportation system cannot, in whole or part, be established or operated. For example, if you are filing an application for an airport, you must file with the agency responsible for administering the land and with the Federal Aviation Administration. If you need assistance in determining with which Federal agency(ies) you must file, you should contact any local office of the Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, or National Park Service.

After you have completed your application, please check to be sure the information you have provided is complete and correct, sign it and return it to all appropriate Federal agencies on the same day.

Thank you for your cooperation.

#### Steps for Completing the Application Form

We have set up the instructions in this package using 4 steps:

- (1) Pre-Application Meeting;
  - (2) General Application Instructions;
  - (3) General Instructions for Supplemental and
  - (4) Filing Instructions.
- If you follow each step in the order that they are set out and read the line-by-line instructions, your application will generally be found to be complete by the Federal agency(ies) with which you have filed. However, in some instances, the Federal agencies may find it necessary to request additional information from you before application processing can proceed. By carefully following the instructions set out below,

requests for additional information can be held to a minimum with the net result being a reduced timeframe for processing an application and issuing the appropriate authorization(s).

#### (Step 1)—Pre-Application Meeting.

You are encouraged to contact any Federal agency office with which you will be required to file an application to establish or operate the proposed project, prior to completing and filing the application. For your convenience, we have provided a listing of agencies and their locations under STEP 4 of these instructions. This early contact, for the purposes of these instructions, is identified as the *Pre-Application Meeting*. The *Pre-Application Meeting* has been integrated into this process primarily for your benefit. The purpose of the meeting is to afford you the opportunity to explain your proposed project to the affected Federal agency(ies). In return, the agency(ies) will provide you with assistance and information in completing the attached application form. In view of the fact that the Federal agencies with which you may end up filing an application with have no way of knowing what your plans are, it becomes your responsibility to request a *Pre-Application Meeting* with the agency(ies).

It is at this *Pre-Application Meeting* with the Federal agency(ies) that you can acquire specific information to complete each requirement of the application contained in this package. The importance of a *Pre-Application Meeting* cannot be overemphasized. In many instances, you will find it necessary to file the application for the proposed use with two or more Federal agencies. To assist you in determining which Federal agencies you should contact for *Pre-Application Meetings*, the following guidelines are provided:

1. As a minimum you should contact either the Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, or the U.S. Forest Service. If your proposal crosses land under the administration of only one of these land managing agencies, then only that land managing agency needs to be contacted. However, if your proposal crosses lands under the jurisdiction of two or more of the above mentioned land managing agencies, then you should contact each affected agency.

2. If your proposed project contemplates construction of any kind in navigable waters of the United States or putting structures of any description into or adjacent to these waters, then as a minimum you should contact the land managing agency and either the Coast

Guard or the Corps of Engineers or both. In some instances, and depending upon your project, it will be advisable to contact a representative of the Environmental Protection Agency.

3. Proposed projects involving the installation of air or water navigation aids, you should in addition to contacting the land managing agency, contact the Coast Guard and Federal Aviation Agency. If the navigation aid emits an electronic signal, then the Federal Communications Commission should be contacted along with the other agencies noted above.

4. In the establishment or alteration of any airport runway or taxiway, the Federal Aviation Administration should be contacted in addition to the land managing agency. The Federal Aviation Administration should also be contacted if any construction of a new structure is within a 5 mile radius of an existing airport or if the proposed structure is 200 feet or higher regardless of its proximity to the existing airport.

5. Generally, any project that contemplates transporting water by canals, ditches, flumes, pipeline or tunnels will require you to contact only the land managing agency. However, in some instances involving a water transportation system of if the water system serves the purpose of discharging waste water, then the Environment Protection Agency, Corps of Engineers, or Coast Guard should be contacted.

6. If the proposed project involves a pipeline for transporting substances other than water including any slurry or emulsion, the land managing agency(ies) should be contacted, and in instances where the pipeline will be a common carrier, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Department of Transportation should be contacted.

7. In the establishment of any type of communication facility, the land managing agency(ies) on whose land the facility will be situated should be contacted along with the Federal Communications Commission.

8. Any improvement or new construction contemplated for general transportation purposes will require you to contact the land managing agency(ies) across whose land the system affects. Depending on the proposed project, its location, and various other factors, you may need to contact other agencies such as the Corps of Engineers Coast Guard, Federal Aviation Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, etc.

9. Any system for the transmission and distribution of electrical energy will

require contact with the land managing agency(ies) whose land is crossed by the system. In instances where a powerline interconnects an electric utility and a qualifying cogenerator or small power producer, or where powerlines qualify as primary transmission lines leading from hydroelectric facilities to an interconnection point on the Alaskan distribution grid, you should contact the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

10. If the proposed project involves a facility that will emit pollutants into the air, water or land, the land managing agency should be contacted along with the Environmental Protection Agency.

11. If the proposed project involves disturbance to marine life or marine mammals or to their habitat you should check with the National Marine Fisheries Service.

#### [Step 2]—General Application Instructions

In this step, we have listed *Line-by-Line Instruction* for completing the application form contained in this package. At this point, we caution you that if you have not taken the time to thoroughly read the General Instructions and the instructions set out in STEP 1, you should, before proceeding any further, go back and read those instructions. If you need additional space to complete any line in the application, please put the information on a separate sheet of paper and identify it as follows: "Continuation of Line —, Project Description."

#### Line-by-Line Instructions

[Line 1]—Give your complete name and address. Some agencies require the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of property owners located adjacent to the proposed project. If you must include this information in your application, identify this information as follows: "Continuation of Line 1, Identification of Adjacent Property Owners."

[Line 2]—If you plan to designate an authorized agent, you must complete this line with the name and address of your designated agent.

[Line 3]—Provide the appropriate telephone number(s).

[Line 4]—You must check at least one block. If you checked "Individual or Federal Agency" you do not have to complete the "Supplemental." If you check any block other than "Individual or Federal Agency," you must complete the entire form including the "Supplemental."

[Line 5]—You must check at least one block. If you checked the block Existing use for which no authorization

received," you must provide information relating to the date use began, type of use, structures or facilities constructed, and vegetative or mineral materials removed or used along or within the area of use. This information should be put on a separate sheet of paper and identified as "Continuation of Line 5, Unauthorized Use Information." If you checked the block for "Other," please explain. This information should be put on a separate sheet of paper and identified as "Continuation of Line 5, Other."

[Line 6]—There are some laws which require the applicant to be a citizen of the United States before a Federal agency can permit the use of Federal lands or issue an authorization, thus the reason for this requirement. Check the appropriate block.

[Line 7]—Before you complete this line, we caution you that if you have not discussed your proposed project with the appropriate Federal agency or agencies are suggested under Step 1 of these instructions, you should do so at this time. Many of the affected agencies have very specific and/or unique requirements, particularly the regulatory agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, etc. To list each of these, agency-by-agency, on the form or in these instructions, would not lend assistance to you. Therefore, after you have completed your *Pre-Application* consultation with the various agencies, give as a complete description of the proposed project as possible. If additional space is needed, the information should be put on a separate sheet of paper and identified as "Continuation of Line 7, Project Description." Examples of the type of information to be included are type of use—power transmission, transport oil or gas, vehicular transportation, etc.; units or volume of product to be transported—kilowatts, megawatts generated, cubic feet, barrels, gallons, thousands of board feet of timber, acre feet or water, etc.; the interrelationship of the proposed project with similar existing facilities; physical description of proposed facility—diameter of pipeline, all-weather surfaced road and width of running surface, and generating and transmission capacity of power projects; approximate date use will be terminated or construction completed; if the project involves dredging or filling in bodies of water, the volume and type of material is to be noted along with the name of the body of water. In addition, you may be required to furnish cost estimates of the project to some

agencies, and periods of use if the use will be on an interrupted basis. The above examples are not meant to be all-inclusive for a complete project description, but are only examples. Again, you are cautioned that the pre-application meeting described in STEP 1 will assist you in completing this important part of your application.

[Line 8]—Depending upon the proposed project, the mapping requirement may be satisfied with a relatively simple map or plan, or you may be required to submit a map or plan which shows the project in great detail. Generally, as a minimum, you must show the section, township and range within which the project is to be located and indicate the location of the project on the map as accurately as possible. These requirements are to be considered the minimum. Some agencies, depending upon the project, may require additional data; therefore, prior to preparing your map or plan, please check with the appropriate agencies for their specific mapping requirements. In addition, and depending on the type of use and associated structures to be constructed you may have to provide special maps and/or detailed structural or construction drawings. You should also provide, if required, technical data for specific navigational aids for both water and air travel. Again, you are cautioned to check with any affected agency to see if they require any type of special map or drawing for the type of project and facilities you propose.

[Line 9]—You are to check the appropriate box on this line if your proposed project requires State or local government approval. The various Federal agencies may only require you to furnish proof of application with the State or local government, while others may need the final approval document. For example, some Federal agencies require you to file a copy of the application you have filed with the State for water rights before they will process your application for a water pipeline. There are many variations for this requirement among the Federal agencies, therefore, please check with the agency or agencies with which you are filing this application.

[Line 10]—Some agencies require a nonreturnable application fee at the time of filing, while others do not. The amount or method of computing fees are not uniform among the agencies that do require a fee. Therefore, please check with each agency with which you must file this application for a determination of the fee that must accompany the application.

[Line 11]—If your project crosses the Canadian Boundary, the crossing must

be shown on the map prepared to comply with Line 8. If your project affects any international waterway, the waterway must be identified on the map with a complete project description to be included in Line 7.

[Line 12]—Depending upon which law your proposed use will be authorized under, you may have to submit data on your technical and/or financial capability to construct, operate, maintain, and terminate the proposed project. Therefore, you should check with the affected agencies, to see if they require information of this type.

[Line 13]—Providing the requested information on alternate routes and modes in as much detail as you can and discussing in your analysis why certain routes or modes were rejected and why it is necessary to cross a conservation system unit, will in many cases assist the agency(ies) in processing your application and reaching a final decision within a shorter timeframe than normal. Your analysis should consider only reasonable alternative routes and modes as they relate to current technology and economics. For example, if your project is for a high voltage electric transmission line, you need not analyze the underground modes as an alternative.

[Line 14]—If you have applied for and received authorizations for similar projects in Alaska, please list these authorizations by their identifying number, date, code, or name. Information contained in these files may be useful in analyzing and processing the application you have just filed.

[Line 15]—The objective of this item is to provide information needed to evaluate the benefits, both tangible economic benefits and intangible public interest benefits, of a proposed transportation system for comparison with the magnitude of its detrimental effects on conservation units. The amount of specific information needed will depend on the nature and size of the transportation system. This item should always begin with a simple statement of the purpose of the system, including indications of the quantities of materials to be transported. In many cases, this will be sufficient, since the importance of the purpose would be obvious. However, this is only an abbreviated approximation of a full analysis of the total public and private costs of the proposed system and its next best alternative system. Major systems will require a full analysis for which additional specific information is needed. For transportation systems which will serve a new commercial enterprise, the expected net revenue of the enterprise will be a measure of the

benefits of the transportation system. If there are public benefits in excess of expected revenues, these should be identified. For improved transportation systems to existing enterprises, the saving in transportation cost would be a measure of the economic benefits as well as the public benefits.

[Lines 16 through 18]—Recognizing the fact that some applicants will not have either the expertise or financial resources or both to provide all of the detailed information requested in these lines, you are requested to complete each line to the best of your ability and knowledge. The advantage to you to provide as much of the requested information as possible is that any useful information supplied will assist the Federal agency(ies) in reaching a decision and in all probability speed up the decisionmaking process on your application. In addition, and when providing information requested in these lines, you should use sound judgment in deciding whether certain specifics needs to be addressed depending on what your proposed project is. For example, if your project does not encroach into a stream or other body of water, you need not address this item or simply state that it is not applicable.

[Line 19]—Please check the box with the corresponding initials of the agencies with which you are filing this application. By providing this information the affected Federal agencies will be able to begin their coordinating role shortly after you have filed your application. To identify the initials with the appropriate agency, please go to Step 4 of these instructions.

Upon completing Lines 1 through 19 and prior to submitting your application, be sure you have signed and dated it in the space provided.

#### *[Step 3]—General Instructions for Supplemental*

The instructions under this Step apply only to the "Supplemental." Only business or governmental entities except for Federal agencies must complete the Supplemental, and then only the appropriate section pertaining to that entity. Regardless of the type of business or governmental entity and if you have any of the required information on file with the agencies and it is still up to date and accurate, check the block entitled "Filed" and note the case number, name, or the appropriate identification code. If any of the required information is not on file with the agency, check the block entitled "Attached" and submit a copy of the required document or information.

Under Items "f" and "g" "Private Corporations" a block has been included to mark if you are not filing for an oil and gas pipeline. If, however, you are filing for an oil and gas pipeline, check either the "Attached" or "Filed" and follow the instructions noted in the first paragraph of this Step. The instructions of this paragraph also apply to items "e" under "Public Corporations" and "d" of "Partnership or Other Unincorporated Entity."

**[Step 4]—Filing Instructions**

Upon completing the application, you must file it with each affected Federal agency from whom you need a right-of-way, permit, license, lease, or certificate to establish and operate your proposed project. For your convenience, we are providing a listing of the participating agencies and their addresses with which you should file your application. In parenthesis following the name of the Federal agency we have included an initial which corresponds to the initials in Line 19 of the application form. Please use these identifying initials for your reference in completing Line 19.

**Department of Agriculture**

Regional Forester, Forest Service (USFS), Federal Office Building, P.O. Box 1628, Juneau, Alaska 99802; Telephone: (907) 588-7247 (or the appropriate Forest Service office)

**Department of the Air Force**

Alaskan Air Command (USAF), Headquarters AAC/DE—Bldg. 7000, Elemendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (or the appropriate installation commander); Telephone: (907) 752-2484

**Department of the Army**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Office of the District Engineer—Bldg. 21-700, Elemendorf Air Force Base, P.O. Box 7002, Anchorage, Alaska 99510; Telephone: (907) 279-1132

**Department of the Navy**

Western Division (USN), Naval Facilities Engineering Command, San Bruno, California 94066; Telephone: (415) 877-7601

**Department of Commerce**

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Director, Alaska Region, P.O. Box 1688, Juneau, Alaska 99802; Telephone: (907) 586-7221

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Director, Alaska Region, P.O. Box 1688, Juneau, Alaska 99802; Telephone: (907) 586-7221

**Department of Energy**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), Office of the Secretary, 825 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20428; Telephone: (202) 357-8400

**Department of the Interior**

Bureau of Indian Affairs (BLA), Juneau Area Office, P.O. Box 3-6000, Juneau, Alaska 99802; Telephone: (907) 586-7209

Bureau of Land Management (BLM), 701 (C) Street, Box 13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513; Telephone: (907) 271-5055

National Park Service (NPS), Alaska Regional Office, 540 West 5th Avenue, Room 202, Anchorage, Alaska 99501; Telephone: (907) 271-4196

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS), Office of the Regional Director, 1011 East Tudor Road, Anchorage, Alaska 99503; Telephone: (907) 283-3537

Note.—Filings with any Interior Agency may be filed with any office noted above or with the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, Regional Environmental Officer, Box 120, 1875 "C" Street, Anchorage, Alaska. This central filing point has been established for

your convenience and may be used in lieu of filing with the individual agencies.

**Department of State**

Department of State (STATE), Office of Canadian Affairs (EUR/CAN), Washington, DC, 20520

**Environmental Protection Agency**

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10 (EPA), Chief, Permits Branch, 1260 6th Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101, Telephone: (206) 390-1348

Federal Communications Commission (FCC), Office of the Secretary, 1918 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554

Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), Federal Building and Court House, 701 C Street, Box 7, Anchorage, Alaska 99513; Telephone: (907) 271-5004

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration**

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Station Director, NASA/STDN Alaska Station, P.O. Box 1307, Fairbanks, Alaska 99707; Telephone: (907) 452-1155

**Department of Transportation**

Federal Aviation Administration, Alaska Region AAL-4, P.O. Box 14, Anchorage, Alaska 99513

Note.—The Department of Transportation has established a central filing point for agencies within that Department. Affected agencies are: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Coast Guard (USCA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

BILLING CODE 4310-10-M

UNIFORM FEDERAL  
TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITY SYSTEM  
APPLICATION

FORM APPROVED  
BUDGET BUREAU NO.

FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

Application Number

Date filed

3. TELEPHONE (area code)

Applicant

Authorized agent

1. Name and address of applicant (include zip code)

2. Name, title, and address of authorized agent (if different from Item 1 (include zip code))

4. As applicant are you?

- Individual
- Corporation
- Partnership
- State Government (State Agency)
- Local Government
- Federal Agency

5. Specify why application is for:

- New authorization
- Renew existing authorization No.
- Amend existing authorization No.
- Assign existing authorization No.
- Existing use for which no authorization received
- Other (describe)

6. If an individual are you a citizen of the United States?  Yes  No

7. Project description (describe in detail): (a) Type of transportation system (i.e. canal, pipeline, road), (b) related structures and facilities, (c) physical specifications (length, width, grading, etc.); (d) term of years needed; (e) time of year of use or operation; (f) volume or amount of product to be transported; (g) duration and timing of construction; and (h) temporary work areas needed for construction. (Attach additional sheets, if additional space is needed.)

- 
8. Attach map covering project area and show approximate location on map.
- 
9. State or local government approval:  Attached  Pending/Applied for  Not required
- 
10. Nonreturnable application fee:  Attached  Not required
- 
11. Does project cross International Boundary or affect International waterways?  Yes  No
- 
12. Give statement of your technical and financial capability to construct, operate, and maintain the system for which authorization is being requested.
- 

13a. Describe in detail alternative routes and modes considered.

---

b. If routes or modes rejected, explain why.

---

c. Give explanation as to why it is necessary to cross Federal lands.

---

14. List your previous applications for similar projects which may provide additional information to authorizing agency.

---

15. Provide statement of need for project, including the economic feasibility. Statement should include items such as: (a) cost of proposed transportation/utility system (construction, operation, and maintenance); (b) estimated cost of next best alternative system; and (c) expected public benefits provided by the system.

---

16. Describe probable effects on the population in the area, including socioeconomic effects, and statement of effect on rural traditional lifestyles.

17. Describe likely environmental effects that the proposed project will have on: (a) air quality; (b) visual impact on the conservation unit; (c) surface and ground water quality and quantity; (d) the control or structural change on any stream or other body of water; (e) altering existing noise levels, and (f) altering the surface of the land, including vegetation, permafrost, soil, and effects on soil stability.

18. Describe the probable effects that the proposed project will have on: (a) populations of fish, plant, wildlife, and marine life, including endangered and threatened species; and (b) marine mammals, including hunting, capturing, collecting, or killing of these animals.

19. Check appropriate box to indicate agency(ies) with which you are filing. (For agency identification refer to Step 4 of the instructions.)

USFS  USAF  COE  USN  NMFS  FERC  NOAA  BIA  BLM  NPS  FWS  STATE  
 EPA  FCC  ICC  NASA  FAA  USCG  FHWA  FRA  Other (Specify)

I HEREBY CERTIFY, That I am of legal age and authorized to do business in the State and that I have personally examined the information contained in the application and believe that the information submitted is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature of Applicant

Date

Title 18, U.S.C. Section 1001, makes it a crime for any person knowingly and willfully to make to any department or agency of the United States any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations as to any matter within its jurisdiction.

## SUPPLEMENTAL

Note: If file block is checked, give application number of file containing the requested information

I - PRIVATE CORPORATIONS (Check appropriate block(s))	ATTACHED	FILED
a. Articles of Incorporation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Corporation Bylaws	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. If not incorporated in the State of Alaska, a certificate from the Secretary of State showing corporation is in good standing and is entitled to operate in Alaska. If incorporated in Alaska, a certificate from the State Department of Commerce and Commercial Development is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Copy of resolution authorizing filing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The name and address of each shareholder owning 3 percent or more of the shares, together with the number and percentage of any class of voting shares of the entity which such shareholder is authorized to vote and the name and address of each affiliate of the entity together with, in the case of an affiliate controlled by the entity, the number of shares and the percentage of any class of voting stock of that affiliate owned, directly or indirectly, by that entity, and in the case of an affiliate which controls that entity, the number of shares and the percentage of any class of voting stock of that entity owned, directly or indirectly, by the affiliate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. If application is for an oil or gas pipeline, describe any related right-of-way or temporary use permit applications, and identify previous applications. (If does not apply check this block <input type="checkbox"/> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. If application is for an oil and gas pipeline, identify all Federal lands by agency impacted by proposal. (If does not apply check this block <input type="checkbox"/> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## II - PUBLIC CORPORATIONS

a. Copy of law forming corporation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Proof of organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Copy of Bylaws	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Copy of resolution authorizing filing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Information required by Items "1f" and "1g" above are required for public corporations. (If does not apply check this block <input type="checkbox"/> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## III - PARTNERSHIP OR OTHER UNINCORPORATED ENTITY

a. Articles of association, if any	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. If one partner is authorized to sign, resolution authorizing action is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Name and address of each participant, partner, association, or other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Information required by Items "1f" and "1g" above are required. (If does not apply check this block <input type="checkbox"/> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments/remarks (attach additional sheets, if necessary and specify items involved)

[PR Doc. 81-13637 Filed 6-2-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-10-C



# Alaska State Legislature

SENATOR  
**JOHN B. "JACK" COGHILL**  
Chairman

Senator Jan Faiks—Vice Chairman  
Senator Mitch Abood  
Senator Paul Fischer  
Senator Joe Josephson



POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
(907) 465-4921

## Senate Committee on


### MEMORANDUM      **Transportation**

To:            Don Dickey, Director  
                 Division of Tourism

From:          Senator Jack Coghill, Chairman  
                 Senate Transportation Committee

Date:          February 7, 1985

Re:            SB 49 - Kantishna Road Feasibility Study



---

As your division is charged with the development and promotion of the tourist industry in Alaska, we thought it appropriate to ask for your views on the attached legislation.

It is our intention with this bill to study three alternate routes from the Parks Highway into the Wonder Lake area, with the express purpose of relieving the steadily-growing pressure on the McKinley Park Road. Included in the study, along with the determination of the actual physical viability of each route, will be discussions with public officials in effected federal agencies to determine the reality of putting a road in through the park.

Attached you will find a copy of the bill, a map showing the alternate routes, and a proposal for the study from a Fairbanks engineering firm. The extension into Kantishna has been identified by the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce as a transportation priority, and has been listed by DOT/PF as a highly viable Interior road extension.

Although we realize you cannot endorse appropriations outside the Governor's proposed budget, we would appreciate your analysis of the value such a road extension would have to the tourist industry in Alaska.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request. If you need further information, please contact John Manly at the above number.

Alaska State Legislat

*Letter & Copy of Thomas  
& Assoc. Report sent  
Map also*

SENATOR  
JOHN B. "JACK" COGHILL  
Chairman



Senator Jan Faiks—Vice Chairman  
Senator Mitch Abood  
Senator Paul Fischer  
Senator Joe Josephson

Senate Committee  
on  
Transportation

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Tougas, Vice President  
Holland/America Tours

From: Senator Jack Coghill, Chairman  
Senate Transportation Committee  
Blake Call, Committee Secretary

Date: February 7, 1985

Re: SB 49 - Kantishna Road Feasibility Study

As your company is quite interested with the tourist industry in Alaska, we thought it appropriate to ask for your views on the attached legislation.

It is our intention with this bill to study three alternate routes from the Parks Highway into the Wonder Lake area, with the express purpose of relieving the steadily-growing pressure on the McKinley Park Road. Included in the study, along with the determination of the actual physical viability of each route, will be discussions with public officials in effected federal agencies to determine the reality of putting a road in through the park.

Attached you will find a copy of the bill, a map showing the alternate routes, and a proposal for the study from a Fairbanks engineering firm. The extension into Kantishna has been identified by the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce as a transportation priority, and has been listed by the Alaska Department of Transportation/Public Facilities as a highly viable Interior road extension.

Thank you for your prompt attention regarding this matter. If you need further information, please contact Blake Call at the above number.