

# **Environmental Assessment for the Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program**

**Katmai National Park and Preserve, Alaska**

---

Prepared by:  
United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
Katmai National Park and Preserve

November 2001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Purpose and Need .....	1
Background.....	1
Issues Considered for Further Evaluation.....	3
Issues Eliminated from Further Consideration .....	4
Alternatives .....	5
Alternative A: No-Action .....	5
Alternative B: Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program.....	5
Mitigating Measures .....	9
Affected Environment.....	10
Impact Analysis .....	11
Alternative A: No-Action .....	11
Alternative B: Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program.....	12
Consultation and Coordination .....	14
List of Preparers.....	14
Bibliography .....	14
Appendix A - ANILCA Section 810 (a) Subsistence Evaluation .....	15

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Location of Grosvenor Camp .....	2
Figure 2: Alternative 2: Grosvenor Camp Facilities Layout.....	6

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Purpose and Need**

The National Park Service (NPS) is considering a facilities improvement program at Grosvenor Camp in Katmai National Park And Preserve (Figure 1) to improve health and safety conditions as well as visitor satisfaction at the facility. In accordance with the National Park Service Concessions Management Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-391) and National Park Service Concessions Contract Regulations 36 CFR Part 51, the NPS has entered into a concessions contract with Katmailand, Inc. (Concessions Contract CC-KATM001-01). Section 9(d) of the contract requires the concessioner to implement a concession facilities improvement program that includes the following construction activities:

- Dismantle and remove two employee housing units
- Construct new utility building
- Convert existing bathhouse into employee housing unit
- Construct one new employee housing unit
- Construct new bathhouse
- Construct new wastewater system
- Remove existing wastewater system
- Upgrade and install electrical distribution system
- Remove existing generator shed and dry storage building

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve health and safety conditions at Grosvenor Camp as well as improve visitor satisfaction of the facility. The existing facilities at Grosvenor Camp have not been upgraded since their initial construction. The bathhouse was constructed in 1981; the employee housing units were constructed in 1950 and are considered substandard by the National Park Service; the generator shed is dated 1950; and the dry storage unit was built in 1954. The current sewer system does not meet Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) requirements. Occasionally, the system overflows when the water table is high which causes sanitation problems and creates an attraction for bears. The current electrical distribution system does not meet OSHA standards and the generator is located too far from the buildings it services to provide electricity efficiently. Therefore, this project would enable Grosvenor Camp to be in compliance with OSHA requirements and electric codes as well as NPS standards for employee housing and satisfactory visitor services.

This environmental assessment has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1508.9).

### **Background**

The NPS Organic Act and the General Authorities Act prohibit impairment of park resources and values. The NPS Management Policies and Director's Order #55 use the terms "resources and values" to mean the full spectrum and intangible attributes for which the park is established and



are managed, including the Organic Act's fundamental purpose and any additional purposes as stated in the park's establishing legislation. The impairment of park resources and values may not be allowed unless directly and specifically provided by statute. The primary responsibility of the National Park Service is to ensure that park resources and values will continue to exist in a condition that will allow the American people to have present and future opportunities for enjoyment of them.

Originally established as a national monument in 1918, Katmai was designated a park and preserve in 1980 under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). Section 202 (2) of this act states that the park and preserve will be managed for the following purposes, among others: "to protect habitats for, and populations of, fish and wildlife including, but not limited to, high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears and their denning areas; to maintain unimpaired the water habitat for significant salmon populations; and to protect scenic, geological, cultural and recreational features."

Under NPS Director's Order #89A: Concession Management, any concession facilities improvement program must be necessary and appropriate for public use and enjoyment; further the protection, conservation and preservation of the environment and park resources and values; incorporate sustainable principles and practices in planning, design, siting, construction, utility systems, selection and recycling of building materials, and waste management; and enhance visitor use and enjoyment of the park without causing unacceptable impacts to park resources or values.

The proposed facilities improvement program for Grosvenor is not included in the 1986 Katmai *General Management Plan* (GMP). However, at the time the GMP was written, the current health and safety issues currently found at Grosvenor were not anticipated nor was the substandard employee housing considered. Given current NPS concession policy and standards, a required facilities improvement program is considered the most reasonable and prudent action.

### **Issues Considered for Further Evaluation**

To focus the environmental assessment, the NPS selected specific issues for further analysis and eliminated others from evaluation. Subsequent discussions of the affected environment and environmental consequences related to each alternative focus on these issues. A brief rationale for the selection of each topic is given below.

Air Quality. Air quality in the Grosvenor Camp area could be affected by the open burning of unsalvaged lumber from dismantled buildings.

Soils. Soils would be disturbed during excavations for the waterline and leach field and by the installation, replacement and removal of electrical wiring.

Water resources including aquatic wildlife. Placement and installation of a new leach field in the preferred alternative could affect water resources and aquatic wildlife. The existing sewage pit could affect water quality under the no action alternative.

Vegetation. Vegetation in the proposed project area would be affected by the construction of new buildings and the wastewater and electrical systems. Ground surfaces exposed by the removal of buildings would revegetate.

Terrestrial wildlife. Noise and activities associated with facility construction could temporarily displace wildlife from the area. Construction of the leach field, bathhouse, and employee cabin would destroy grassy ground habitat. Building removal could allow for the creation of additional wildlife habitat.

Visitor experience. Visitation at the lodge is from early June to early October. The sights and sounds of construction and excavation efforts could diminish visitor's experience at Grosvenor Camp. The upgrade of Grosvenor Camp facilities would improve the experience for guests of the camp.

Wilderness. The 1964 Wilderness Act requires the NPS to protect the wilderness character and values (i.e., ecological, geological, scientific, educational, scenic, or historical values) of designated wilderness areas. The proposed action would occur within designated wilderness and, therefore, may impact wilderness characteristics or values.

Subsistence. The effects of the preferred alternative on subsistence uses and needs are examined in the ANILCA Section 810(a) summary evaluation and analysis found in Appendix 1.

Cultural resources. The National Historic Preservation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS *Management Policies*, and NPS *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* all require the NPS to consider effects of their actions on cultural resources. The preferred alternative could affect both archeological and historical cultural resources. A thorough cultural resource investigation would be conducted prior to implementation of the improvement project.

### **Issues Eliminated from Further Consideration**

A brief rationale dismissing specific topics from further consideration is included below.

Floodplains. There are no rivers or streams in the vicinity of the proposed project, thus no impacts to floodplains would occur.

Wetlands. There are no wetlands on the construction site of the proposed project, thus no impact to wetlands would occur.

Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Species. There are no known federal or state listed threatened or endangered species, federal candidate species, or state-listed species of special concern within the project area (per phone conversation 8/1/01, with Terry Antrobus, USF&W Ecological Services).

Park Operations and Management. Neither alternative would affect NPS operations or management because the concessionaire would complete the improvements.

Executive Order 12898, “Environmental Justice.” Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations*, requires all federal agencies identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs and policies on minorities and low-income populations and communities. This project would not be expected to result in significant changes in the socioeconomic environment of the project area, and, therefore, would not be expected to have any direct or indirect impacts to minority or low-income populations or communities.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

### **Alternative A: No Action (Environmentally Preferred Alternative)**

Under the no action alternative NPS would not require the facilities improvement program, and the facility improvements would not be completed. The current employee housing would remain substandard and a health hazard. The current wastewater system would continue to be unsafe and would be inadequate for the amount of wastewater generated at the camp. The current generator would remain inefficient because it is located too far from buildings that utilize electricity.

### **Alternative B: Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program (Preferred Alternative)**

Under the preferred alternative, the facilities improvement program at Grosvenor Camp would consist of the projects listed and described below:

- Dismantle and remove two employee housing units
- Construct new utility building
- Convert existing bathhouse into employee housing unit
- Construct one new employee housing unit
- Construct new bathhouse
- Construct new wastewater system
- Remove existing wastewater system
- Upgrade and install electrical distribution system
- Remove existing generator shed and dry storage building

Dismantle and remove two employee housing units: The two existing employee housing units which are each 9’x 9’ in footprint area would be dismantled (see Figure 2). Roll-roofing and any other material not salvaged would be flown out of the park via floatplane and disposed of in a facility approved by the Alaska DEC. Unused wood may be burned in a controlled setting in a fire pit. The exposed ground surface (162 ft<sup>2</sup>) resulting from the removal of the two structures would be scarified and allowed to revegetate naturally.

Construct new utility building: Lumber salvaged from the housing units would be utilized to construct a new utility building that would have a footprint of approximately 9’x 18’ at the location of the existing water tanks (Figure 2). This structure would be used to house the lodge’s generator and six water pressure tanks. An area of approximately 190 square feet would be hand brushed to accommodate the building which would be seated on 7 to 8 treated wood pads and





placed directly on the ground surface. The building would not penetrate the subsurface. The purpose of the utility building would be to keep the generator dry and reduce its noise level. Furthermore, the building would provide a visual barrier for the water tanks. The exterior walls of the structure would be covered with cedar siding, and the roof would be metal.

Convert existing bathhouse into employee housing cabin: The existing bathhouse would be converted into an employee housing unit by removing the plumbed facilities inside the building. These bathroom facilities would be used in the new bathhouse. The exterior of the building would not change in appearance or size

Construct one new employee housing unit: A new employee cabin would be built on the small terrace to the southwest of the westernmost guest cabin (see Figure 2). Approximately 170 square feet would be hand brushed at the site of the new structure. The building would have a footprint of approximately 12' x 12' and would accommodate up to two lodge employees. The building would be either of Panabode design or of frame construction with cedar siding and a metal roof. The building would be seated on 6 to 8 treated wood pads placed directly on the ground surface. The building would not penetrate the subsurface. Construction materials not found on site would be flown in by floatplane.

Construct new bathhouse: A new bathhouse would be constructed between the guest cabins (see Figure 2). The framed building would have a footprint of approximately 16' x 20'. An area of approximately 360 square feet would be brushed of vegetation and 3 to 5 trees greater than 3 inches in diameter would be removed to accommodate the building. The structure would sit on 8 to 10 treated wood pads placed directly on the ground surface. The building would not penetrate the subsurface. It would contain two shower stalls, toilets, sinks and one washing machine in order to accommodate the use of eight people including two lodge employees. The exterior walls of the structure would be covered with cedar siding, and the roof would be metal. Construction materials not found on site would be flown in by floatplane.

The existing water lines extending from the well point via the current bathhouse to the water storage units in the new utility building would continue to be utilized as would the water line from the water storage tanks to the kitchen. However, a new water line from the kitchen to the new bathhouse would be installed. A trench would be dug with a hand shovel and plastic tubing of 1½-inch diameter would be buried at a depth above the Katmai Ash layer along the existing trail to the bathhouse.

Construct new wastewater system: A new wastewater system would be designed to meet Alaska DEC requirements and accommodate current estimated wastewater flow of approximately 253 gallons per day. The system would accommodate wastewater from the kitchen and the new bathhouse. The design would include a septic tank with a capacity up to 1,000 gallons and an infiltrator field. The septic tank would be located directly behind the new bathhouse with the infiltrator field running east to west (see Figure 2).

The area of disturbance would be approximately 250 square feet. The area would be brushed of vegetation, and up to 3 trees over 3 inches in diameter would be removed. The septic tank would be buried about 7 feet below the original ground surface. The infiltrator field with an absorption

area of about 216 ft<sup>2</sup> would be approximately 30 feet long, 3 feet wide, one foot in height and buried 3 feet below the original ground surface. The location of the new leach field would be over 150 feet from surface water. Sand and gravel would not be needed for the project because the infiltration field would be buried directly into an existing sand layer sufficient to drain the infiltration system. Approximately 675 cubic feet of soil would be removed during the installation of the leach field system. The excavated dirt would be used to bury the system in place and form a mounded soil cover about 2 feet deep. Remaining soil would be used to fill-in the old sewage pit.

Sewer lines would extend from the kitchen to the leach field and from the new bathhouse to the leach field. One and one half inch PVC tubing would be buried above the Katmai Ash Layer using a hand held shovel. The pipe from the kitchen would be located along the existing path to the cabins, and a 30-gallon pump station would be installed to drive wastewater approximately 130 feet up to the leach field. The pipe from the bathhouse would run approximately 10 feet to the septic tank.

Remove existing wastewater system: The existing sewage pit is approximately 6' x 12' x 4' deep and is lined with wood. It accommodates the wastewater resulting from a bathhouse that serves up to 8 people and one kitchen. The wooden framing of the hole would be removed and burned in a fire pit, and dirt from excavation for the new leach field area would be used to fill in the old wastewater site. Existing waterlines to the existing sewage pit from the kitchen and from the old bathhouse would be removed. Removed pipe materials would be flown out of the park by floatplane and disposed of in a facility approved by the Alaska DEC.

Upgrade and install electrical distribution system: The existing electrical distribution system would be upgraded to meet OSHA requirements and redistributed to the new buildings requiring electricity. A total of approximately 425 linear feet of new and replacement line would be needed. Old wire would be removed by hand and flown by floatplane outside of the park and disposed of in an Alaska DEC approved facility. New and upgraded wire would be buried up to 12" deep and above the Katmai Ash Layer. The trench would be excavated using a hand-held shovel.

Direct-burial wire would be buried approximately 12" from the surface in the following locations (see Figure 2):

From	To	Linear feet of wire (approximate)
Generator shed	Kitchen	40
Lodge	New boathouse location	30
Westernmost guest cabin	New employee cabin located on terrace	50

Total: 120 linear feet

Existing buried wiring would be replaced with direct-burial wire buried approximately 12" deep in the following locations (see Figure 2):

From	To	Linear Feet of Wire
Kitchen	Employee cabin (converted bathhouse)	65
Employee cabin (converted bathhouse)	Lodge	75
Kitchen	Easternmost guest cabin	90
Easternmost guest cabin	Middle guest cabin	25
Middle guest cabin	New bathhouse	25
New bathhouse	Southernmost guest cabin	25

Total: 305 linear feet

Remove existing generator shed and dry storage building: The existing generator shed and the dry storage building would be dismantled (see Figure 2). Roll-roofing, concrete slabs and any other material not re-used during the construction project with the exception of wood will be flown out of the park by floatplane and disposed of in a facility approved by the Alaska DEC. Unused wood may be burned in a controlled setting in a fire pit. Approximately 500 square feet of ground surface exposed from the removal of the two structures would be scarified and allowed to revegetate naturally with native plant species.

Schedule of construction:

The facilities improvement project would begin in the spring of 2002, with the majority of the construction occurring between the months of June and October. The project would be completed by December 31, 2003.

**Mitigation Measures:**

In order to avoid affecting archeological resources, the proposed leach field site would be investigated prior to excavation by the Lake Clark/Katmai Historic Preservation Coordinator. In the event that archeological resources are discovered, a Determination of Eligibility would be conducted. If a new leach field site cannot be identified, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that incorporates comments from consulting parties would be executed. The MOA would specify measures to mitigate adverse effects. Additionally, prior to removal, dismantling or alteration of any of the camp buildings, a Determination of Eligibility for the National Historic Register would be conducted by the National Historic Register Historian. The proposed facilities improvement program would incorporate mitigation measures in order to avoid adverse effects on eligible historic resources.

The leach field would be located and designed by to meet the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) requirements.

Newly exposed ground surfaces located at the sites of the removed employee housing units, the generator shed and dry storage building would be scarified and allowed to revegetate naturally. No non-native species would be introduced into the area.

Unusable wood from the project would be the only material burned on site. It would be burned in a fire pit in a controlled setting. Non-burnable materials would be disposed of at an ADEC approved disposal area.

## **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

**Soils:** The lesser-developed soil below the terrace is primarily beach gravel overlain by Katmai Ash Layer. Elsewhere the soil is primarily glacial till overlain by the Katmai Ash Layer and an organic layer.

**Water Resources:** Lake Coville and Lake Grosvenor lie adjacent to the construction area. The stream that joins these two water bodies also borders the proposed project site.

**Vegetation:** The vegetation community in the area of the proposed project is dominated by birch trees (*Betula papyrifera*), balsam poplar (*Populus balsamifera*), and spruce (*Picea sp.*). A scattered shrub layer includes willows (*Salix sp.*) and alder (*Alnus sp.*). Mosses (*Sphagnum sp.*, *Lycopodium sp.*) and grasses (family *Gramineae*) are also found in the area.

**Terrestrial Wildlife:** Moose, caribou, brown bear, wolves, and red fox are occasionally seen in the area, and lynx, porcupine, and coyotes are other wildlife possibly using the area. Small birds utilize the habitat, and two active bald eagle nests were documented in the year 2000 at a minimum distance of 1.25 miles from the project site.

**Visitor Experience:** Visitation at the lodge is from early June to early October. Grosvenor Camp can accommodate up to 6 guests at a time, and most visitors stay approximately one week.

**Wilderness:** The Katmai Wilderness was designated by Congress under the 1980 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). Among other things, designated wilderness is defined as an area of undeveloped Federal land which generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; and may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic or historical value.

**Cultural resources:** The National Historic Preservation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS *Management Policies*, and NPS *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* all require the NPS to consider effects of their actions on cultural resources. Although a comprehensive cultural resource inventory has not yet been conducted, it is known that archeological resources exist in the vicinity of Grosvenor Camp. Additionally, several of the buildings below the terrace may be eligible for the National Historic Register.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

### Alternative A: No-Action (Environmentally Preferred Alternative)

Air Quality. Air resources would not be affected under this alternative because there would not be any burning of wood.

Soils. Under this alternative no excavation would take place, thus soils would not be disturbed.

Water resources including aquatic wildlife. Water resources would continue to be affected under this alternative. Sewage from the current wastewater system, a sewage pit, could mix with the groundwater during times of high water table.

Vegetation. Under this alternative existing vegetation would not be affected, as there would be no ground disturbance or tree removal.

Terrestrial wildlife. Under this alternative there would be no additional change to current habitat conditions. However, when the water table is high, the current wastewater system occasionally overflows onto the ground surface causing an attraction to bears.

Visitor experience. Visitor experience would not improve under this alternative. Visitor safety, comfort and health would be compromised under current conditions. The existing wastewater system does not meet DEC requirements and occasionally an overflow causing a health and safety issues. The current electrical wiring system does not meet OSHA requirements also causing safety issues.

Wilderness. Wilderness and associated values would not be impacted under the no- action alternative.

Subsistence. Subsistence use and resources would not be affected in the no-action alternative.

Cultural resources. The National Historic Preservation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS *Management Policies*, and NPS *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* all require the NPS to consider effects of their actions on cultural resources. Both archeological and historic resources exist at Grosvenor Camp. Under the no-action alternative cultural resources would not be disturbed.

Cumulative Effects. Cumulative impacts are defined as the *incremental impacts* on the environment resulting from adding the proposed action to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The Grosvenor Camp site was affected by the initial development of the camp. The no-action alternative would not add any incremental impacts to the conditions that already exist at this location.

Conclusion. The no-action alternative would not have any additional impact on park resources, however; sewage from the current wastewater system, a sewage pit, could mix with the groundwater during times of high water table. The level of impacts to park resources anticipated

from this alternative would not result in an impairment of park resources that fulfill specific purposes identified in the establishing legislation or key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park.

### **Alternative B: Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program (Preferred Alternative)**

Air Quality. Air resources would be affected under this alternative. Unused wood from the project would be burned. However, the volume of wood burned would be limited and the smoke would dissipate quickly. The wood smoke would have minimal, localized, short-term effects on air quality.

Soils. Soils would be disturbed during excavation for the leach field. Approximately 675 cubic feet of soil would be excavated for the installation of the septic tank and infiltration units of the leach field. Approximately 425 linear feet of soil to a depth of up to 12" would be disturbed by the installation, replacement and removal of electrical wiring. Approximately 130 feet of soils would also be disturbed down to the Katmai Ash layer during the installation of the 1-1/2" sewer lines from the kitchen and bathhouse to the leach field and by the 1" water line from the kitchen to the bathhouse. Given the total area of disturbed soil, however, these impacts would be considered minor.

Sewer lines would extend from the kitchen to the leach field and from the new bathhouse to the leach field. One and one half inch PVC tubing would be buried above the Katmai Ash Layer using a hand held shovel. The pipe from the kitchen would be located along the existing path to the cabins, and a 30-gallon pump station would be installed to drive wastewater approximately 130 feet up to the leach field. The pipe from the bathhouse would run approximately 10 feet to the septic tank.

Water resources including aquatic wildlife. Placement and installation of a new leach field would be located and designed to meet state DEC requirements. It is, therefore, expected to have negligible impacts on surrounding resources. The new wastewater system would eliminate the potential for wastewater entering groundwater during times of high water.

Vegetation. Vegetation would be affected by the preferred alternative. During the construction of the leach field and bathhouse, 3 to 8 trees of 3 inches in diameter or greater would be cleared from the area. Approximately 970 square feet (0.02 acre) of ground vegetation would be removed in order to construct the leach field, bathhouse, utility building and employee cabin. Approximately 734 square feet of exposed ground surfaces at the site of the dismantled housing, the removed generator shed and dry storage shed, and the old sewage pit would be allowed to revegetate. The overall effects on vegetation would be negligible since the area cleared would be offset by revegetation on reclaimed land.

Terrestrial wildlife. Construction activity associated with the proposed project would occur over a period of 2 years during the months of June through October. Animals could be temporarily displaced; however, any impacts on wildlife in the area would be temporary. Construction of the leach field, bathhouse, utility building and employee cabin would disturb approximately 970 square feet (0.02 acre) of grassy ground habitat and 3 to 8 trees of 3 inches in diameter or

greater. These impacts would be considered minimal, as the area cleared is small and would not be appreciably disruptive to wildlife.

Visitor experience. Visitors could be present during the implementation of the preferred alternative and could observe or hear construction and excavation efforts; however, the construction of a new bathhouse and improved electric system would provide improved facilities for guests of the camp, so long-term effects would be beneficial.

Wilderness. The preferred alternative would occur in wilderness. A Minimum Requirement/Minimum Tool analysis has been completed to assess the necessity of the project and determine that minimum tools would be utilized. Effects on wilderness would be minimal.

Subsistence. The effects of the preferred alternative on subsistence uses and needs are examined in the ANILCA Section 810(a) summary evaluation and analysis found in Appendix 1.

Cultural resources. The National Historic Preservation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS *Management Policies*, and NPS *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* all require the NPS to consider effects of their actions on cultural resources. Because both archeological and historic resources exist at Grosvenor Camp, a comprehensive cultural resource investigation would be conducted prior to any project work that would potentially affect those resources.

In order to avoid affecting archeological resources, the proposed leach field site would be investigated prior to excavation by the Lake Clark/Katmai Historic Preservation Coordinator. In the event that archeological resources are discovered, a Determination of Eligibility would be conducted. If a new leach field site cannot be identified, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that incorporates comments from consulting parties would be executed. The MOA would specify measures to mitigate adverse effects. Additionally, prior to removal, dismantling or alteration of any of the camp buildings, a Determination of Eligibility for the National Historic Register would be conducted the National Historic Register Historian. The proposed facilities improvement program would incorporate mitigation measures in order to avoid adverse effects on eligible historic resources.

Cumulative Effects. In the cumulative case, development and use of Grosvenor Camp has affected the Lake Grosvenor and Lake Coville area. The preferred alternative would add negligible incremental impacts to the conditions that already exist at Grosvenor Camp. Overall, the long-term impacts would be beneficial.

Conclusion. The Facilities Improvement Program would have a minimal effect on the resources in the Grosvenor Camp area. The new wastewater system would eliminate the potential for groundwater contamination. The level of impacts to park resources anticipated from this alternative would not result in an impairment of park resources that fulfill specific purposes identified in the establishing legislation or key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park.

## **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**

### **Persons, Organizations and Agencies Contacted**

#### U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Ecological Services:

Biologist Terry Antrobus was contacted by telephone on August 1, 2001, for Endangered Species Act, section 7 consultation.

#### Eagle River Engineering Services/Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation:

Consulting engineer, Lou Butera, is coordinating the design and permitting of the leach field in order to meet the Alaska DEC requirements.

#### State of Alaska Division of Governmental Coordination

Project Review Coordinator Sue Magee was mailed the ACMP Consistency Determination information on October 22, 2001.

## **LIST OF PREPARERS**

#### Katmai National Park and Preserve:

Amanda Austin, Resource Management Specialist  
Dale Vinson, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
Becky Brock, Concessions Specialist

#### Alaska Support Office:

Glen Yankus, Environmental Protection Specialist

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

National Park Service. 1986. *General Management Plan, Wilderness Suitability Review, Land Protection Plan, Katmai National Park and Preserve, Alaska*, Denver Service Center.



## **Appendix A**

### **ANILCA Section 810 (a) Subsistence Evaluation**

#### **BACKGROUND**

Subsistence uses, as defined by the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act (ANILCA), section 803, means "the customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska residents of wild, renewable resources for direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation; for the making and selling of handicraft articles out of non-edible byproducts of fish and wildlife resources taken for personal or family consumption; for barter, or sharing for personal or family consumption; and for customary trade." Subsistence activities include hunting, fishing, trapping, and collection berries, edible plants, and wood or other materials.

Subsistence uses are allowed within Katmai National Preserve in accordance titles II and VIII of ANILCA. Lands and waters within Katmai National Park are not available to subsistence uses.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This section was prepared to comply with title VIII, section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980. It summarizes the evaluations of potential restrictions to subsistence activities that could result from the proposed implementation of a facilities improvement program at Grosvenor Camp under the NPS contract with Katmailand, Inc. (Concessions Contract CC-KATM001-01). The *Environmental Assessment for the Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program* describes a no action alternative and a preferred alternative for consideration.

#### **EVALUATION PROCESS**

Section 810(a) states:

"In determining whether to withdraw, reserve, lease, or otherwise permit the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands... the head of the head of the federal agency... over such lands ... shall evaluate the effect of such use, occupancy, or disposition on subsistence uses and needs, the availability of other lands for the purposes sought to be achieved, and other alternatives which would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy or disposition of such lands which would significantly restrict subsistence uses shall be effected until the head of such Federal agency-

- (1) gives notice to the appropriate State agency and the appropriate local committees and regional councils established pursuant to Section 805;
- (2) gives notice of, and holds, a hearing in the vicinity of the area involved; and
- (3) determines that (A) such a significant restriction of subsistence uses is necessary, consistent with sound management principles for the utilization of the public lands, (B) the proposed activity will involve the minimal amount of public lands necessary. . . and (C) reasonable steps will be taken to minimize adverse impacts upon subsistence uses and resources resulting from such actions."

ANILCA created new units and additions to existing units of the national park system in Alaska. Katmai National Park was created by ANILCA Section 202(2) for the following purposes (among others): "to protect habitats for, and populations of, fish and wildlife including, but not limited to, high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears and their denning areas; to maintain unimpaired the water habitat for significant salmon populations; and to protect scenic, geological, cultural and recreational features."

A proclamation by President Woodrow Wilson in 1918 created Katmai National Monument from a reservation of approximately 1,700 square miles. Three major purposes of the monument designation were: 1) to preserve an area important to the study of volcanism, 2) to preserve the Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes, and 3) to conserve an area potentially popular with persons seeking unique scenery and for those with scientific interest (ALASKA Travel Publications 1974). Increased in 1931 to include Lake Brooks, Grosvenor Lake, Lake Coville and part of Naknek Lake, in 1942 to include offshore islands within five miles of the monument coastline, and again in 1969 to include the remainder of Naknek Lake, the monument grew to contain 4,361 square miles.

With the passage of ANILCA in 1980, the designation of 3.7 million acres of the monument was changed to a national park, and an additional 308,000 acres was included as a national preserve. In addition, 3.4 million acres of the park and preserve were designated as wilderness. The taking of fish and wildlife for subsistence uses is allowed by ANILCA within Katmai National Preserve, pursuant to Section 203; however, subsistence activities are not authorized within Katmai National Park.

The potential for significant restriction of subsistence uses must be evaluated for the proposed action's effect upon "...subsistence uses and needs, the availability of other lands for the purposes sought to be achieved and other alternatives which would reduce or eliminate the use" (Section 810, ANILCA).

## **PROPOSED ACTION ON FEDERAL PUBLIC LANDS**

The National Park Service (NPS) is proposing the implementation of a facilities improvement program at Grosvenor Camp in Katmai National Park. The project would include the removal of 4 buildings, the construction of 3 buildings, construction of a wastewater system, and renovation of the electrical wiring system. The project would enable Grosvenor Camp to be in compliance with health and electric codes, NPS standards for employee housing and satisfactory visitor services and additional OSHA requirements. A detailed discussion of the project and the no action alternative is provided in the *Environmental Assessment for the Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program* which is being prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Briefly, the *Environmental Assessment* proposes the following alternatives:

Alternative A (No Action) - The no-action alternative proposes no change from the current management direction.

Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) – Under the preferred alternative, the required facilities improvement program at Grosvenor Camp would consist of the projects listed and described below:

- Dismantle and remove two employee housing units
- Construct new utility building
- Convert existing bathhouse into employee housing unit
- Construct one new employee housing unit
- Construct new bathhouse

- Construct new wastewater system
- Remove existing wastewater system
- Upgrade and install electrical distribution system
- Remove existing generator shed and dry storage building

## **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

This section summarizes the affected environment as it pertains to subsistence resources and use. The proposed action will affect a small area of land between Lake Coville and Lake Grosvenor located completely within Katmai National Park (USGS Quadrangle, Mt. Katmai C-5, T17S, R38W). Lands within Katmai National Park are closed to subsistence uses. However, ANILCA authorized subsistence uses within Katmai National Preserve, and on adjacent federal public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Becharof National Wildlife Refuge shares a common boundary with the park and is the closest Federal public land to the project site where Title VIII subsistence occurs.

Regional subsistence activities that occur outside the park include hunting, fishing, trapping, berry picking and plant gathering. Caribou, moose, beaver, snowshoe hare, fox, lynx, mink, wolf, wolverine, river otter, ducks, geese, waterfowl, edible plants and berries, salmon, trout, pike, whitefish, and white spruce constitute the major subsistence resources used by local residents.

The area is used by large mammal species, particularly bear, moose, and to a limited extent caribou. Smaller mammals using the area could include wolverine, wolf, red fox, lynx, porcupine, snowshoe hare, mink, marten, weasel, beaver, river otter, and red squirrel. Small birds and raptors also utilize the area.

Both Lake Coville and Lake Grosvenor are within the Naknek River drainage system which provides spawning and rearing habitat for salmon (primarily sockeye) which migrate from Bristol Bay into the Naknek drainage system. Subsistence harvest of salmon occurs in the Naknek River downstream of the park boundary. Subsistence users harvested about 23,500 sockeye and 27,300 total salmon in the Naknek River system<sup>1</sup> downstream of the Park boundary in 1994 (Pippa Coiley, ADF&G Subsistence Resource Specialist). Subsistence harvest of sockeye in the Naknek-Kvichak district has been fairly stable over the last 20 years (ADF&G, 1991). Most salmon harvested in the Naknek River system have been produced within Katmai National Park.

The NPS recognizes that patterns of subsistence use vary from time to time and from place to place depending on the availability of wildlife and other renewable natural resources. A subsistence harvest in a given year may vary considerably from previous years because of weather, migration patterns, and natural population cycles.

## **SUBSISTENCE USES AND NEEDS EVALUATION**

To determine the potential impact on existing subsistence activities, three evaluation criteria were analyzed relative to existing subsistence resources which could be impacted.

The evaluation criteria are:

- the potential to reduce important subsistence fish and wildlife populations by (a) reductions in numbers; (b) redistribution of subsistence resources; or (c) habitat losses;

- what affect the action might have on subsistence fisherman or hunter access;
  - the potential for the action to increase fisherman or hunter competition for subsistence resources.
- 1) The potential to reduce populations:

The primary focus of the facilities improvement program would be located in the developed area of land on the north side of the stream that drains Lake Coville into Lake Grosvenor. No actions under the alternatives presented in the EA are expected to significantly redistribute or significantly impact fish or wildlife populations.

Provisions of ANILCA and NPS regulations provide the tools for adequate protection of fish and wildlife populations within the park and preserve while ensuring a subsistence priority for local rural residents. In addition, the superintendent may enact closures and/or restrictions if necessary to protect subsistence opportunities or to assure the continued viability of a particular fish or wildlife population.

2) Restriction of Access:

All rights of access for subsistence harvest on NPS lands are granted by Section 811 of ANILCA. The proposed development is not expected to significantly redistribute or significantly impact fish and wildlife populations. Provisions of ANILCA, Federal Subsistence Board, and NPS regulations provide the tools for adequate protection of fish and wildlife populations within the park and preserve while ensuring a subsistence priority for local rural residents. In addition, the superintendent may enact closures and/or restrictions if necessary to protect subsistence opportunities or to assure the continued viability of a particular fish or wildlife population.

3) Increase in Competition:

Under the alternatives, competition for subsistence fish, wildlife or other resources is not expected to significantly restrict subsistence users. NPS regulations and provisions of ANILCA mandate that if and when it is necessary to restrict taking of fish or wildlife subsistence users are given a priority over other user groups. Continued implementation of the ANILCA provisions should mitigate any increased competition concerns. In addition, the superintendent may enact closures and/or restrictions if necessary to protect subsistence opportunities or to assure the continued viability of a particular fish or wildlife populations.

## **AVAILABILITY OF OTHER LANDS**

Other lands outside the park and preserve have been considered. The preferred alternative is consistent with NPS mandates and occurs on federal lands that are not available for subsistence uses.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The evaluation has described and analyzed the alternatives of the *Environmental Assessment for the Grosvenor Camp Facilities Improvement Program* with emphasis on the preferred alternative.

## **FINDINGS**

This analysis concludes that the preferred alternative will not result in significant restriction of subsistence uses.

#### **REFERENCES CITED**

ADF&G Commercial Fisheries. 1991. Bristol Bay Annual Management Report.  
Annual Management Report.

---