Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: Minor Amendment #2 to Backcountry Management Plan

PEPC Project Number: 64504

Description of Action (Project Description):

For the 2006 DENA Backcountry Management Plan, the Revised Draft Chapter 3 (Affected Environment) and the Appendicies (otherwise not replaced in the Final BCMP) are incorporated by reference into the Final BCMP. Map 3-3, Commercial Services Areas (p.166) in the Revised Draft shows areas closed to Commercial Use Authorizations (CUAs) (then Incidental Business Permits or

Backcountry Units 40,41, 42, 43, and 64 (area between Old Park boundary, McKinley River, northern new park boundary, and Toklat River, including the Kantishna Hills, though in practice excluding the Kantishna airstrip) are shown as closed to CUA opportunities. No current reasoning is given for this closure, though guided hiking has been allowed in the Kantishna Hills via concession contracts with the three main lodge operators in Kantishna. In an effort to increase visitor opportunities, and because no justification could be found for the exclusion, park management has decided to allow CUA use in all of

Decision: Alter map 3.3 from BCMP and update to remove the commercial use authorization activity exclusion covering BC units 40, 41, 42, 43 and 64 (Kantishna Hills).

Project Locations:

Location 1 County: Geo. Marker:	Denali Borough Kantishna area (Subsection)	State: Other:	AK	=	
Location 2 County: Geo. Marker:	Denali Borough Kantishna Hills (Subsection)	State: Other:	AK		

Mitigation(s):

No mitigations identified.

CE Citation: B.1 Changes or amendments to an approved plan, when such changes would cause no or Explanation:

Categorical Exclusion Form - Minor Amendment #2 to Backcountry Management Plan - PEPC ID: 64504

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Signature

Superintendent:

Date: 8/1/16

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal	V 0:	
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	Yes/No	Notes
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No No	
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?	No	
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		
. Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the available of the continuous continu		
Trave a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or mineria.	No	
C. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?		
. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of povinger	No	