



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Alaska Region

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Sport Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves in Alaska Revised Environmental Assessment

INTRODUCTION

On October 23, 2015, the NPS published a final rule (2015 rule) to, among other things, amend its regulations for sport hunting and trapping in national preserves (NPS) in Alaska (80 FR 65325). The 2015 rule codified prohibitions on certain types of harvest practices that are otherwise permitted by the State of Alaska (State), and went into effect in January 2016. The prohibition of these practices is inconsistent with the State of Alaska's hunting regulations found at 5 AAC Part 85.

Since the publication of the 2015 rule, the Secretary of the Interior has directed the Department of the Interior to manage recreational hunting and trapping on the lands and waters it administers in greater collaboration with state, tribal, and territorial partners through its existing authorities. The NPS published a proposed rule in May 2018 that considered rescinding sections of the 2015 rule (83 FR 23621). The NPS has reviewed the public comments on the proposed rule, and will publish a final rule in the Federal Register implementing the proposed changes. Additional background information, including information related to the Secretarial Orders, is available in the proposed and final rules, both of which can be accessed at: <https://www.federalregister.gov/> by searching for “1024-AE38”.

The NPS released an environmental assessment on the proposed rule in September 2018 for a 60-day public review and comment period. Approximately 14,000 comments were received from the public. In response to the comments received, the NPS made a number of revisions to the document, and has issued a revised environmental assessment (Revised EA) containing those changes.¹

As stated in the Revised EA, action is needed at this time to more closely align sport hunting regulations in national preserves in Alaska with State regulations and to enhance consistency with harvest regulations on lands and waters surrounding national preserves in Alaska to the extent legally practicable, in furtherance of Secretarial Orders 3347 and 3356. The Revised EA analyzes two alternatives in detail. Alternative 1, the proposed action and preferred alternative, would remove the sections of the 2015 rule that prohibited certain sport hunting practices (see “Selected Alternative” below, for more detail). Alternative 2, the no-action alternative, would leave the provisions of the 2015 rule in place.

The NPS has prepared this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the 2019 Sport Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves in Alaska Revised Environmental Assessment. The statements and conclusions reached in this FONSI are based on documentation and analysis provided in the Revised EA and associated decision file. The Revised EA contains additional information on the current state of the resources analyzed and the impact analysis for each of the alternatives analyzed. The Revised EA is hereby incorporated by reference into this FONSI, and relevant sections are summarized below.²

SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

The NPS has selected Alternative 1 (hereinafter referred to as the “selected action”) for

¹ The EA released for public review evaluated the impacts of the proposed rule. And, although many comments were received on the proposed rule, which informed development of the Revised EA, no substantive changes will be made to the final rule. Therefore, the EA released for public review and the Revised EA appropriately consider the impacts of the final rule the NPS will publish.

² The Revised EA is currently available at <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/AKRO>.

implementation. Under the selected action, the NPS will remove the prohibitions in paragraphs (f) and (g) of 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13.42. Removing these paragraphs will rescind NPS restrictions on certain harvest practices, some of which have been authorized by the State. Paragraph (f) provides that State management actions or laws or regulations that authorize taking of wildlife are not adopted in park areas if they are related to predator reduction efforts, which is defined as efforts with the intent or potential to alter or manipulate natural predator-prey dynamics and associated natural ecological processes, in order to increase harvest of ungulates by humans. Paragraph (g) sets forth a table of prohibited actions related to taking wildlife for sport purposes in national preserves in Alaska. The full text of paragraphs (f) and (g) is included in Appendix A of the Revised EA.

Actions related to wildlife harvest that would occur in national preserves under the selected action, which are currently prohibited by 36 CFR 13.42(f) and (g), include the following (see Revised EA, Appendix B for details regarding which GMUs specific actions would be allowed in, and specific conditions that apply; see also Revised EA, Appendix E for a map that includes GMUs overlaid upon national preserves):

- The harvesting of black or brown bears over bait in accordance with State restrictions on this activity.
- Hunting black bears with the aid of a dog currently managed through a State permit.
- The taking of wolves (including pups) during an extended hunting season (current seasons would be extended between May 1 and August 9 pursuant to State regulations; see Appendix D of the Revised EA for specific dates per GMU).
- The taking of caribou (1) from a motor driven boat; and, (2) while the animal is swimming (both actions would be allowed in portions of Noatak NP, Bering Land Bridge NP, and Gates of the Arctic NP overlapping with GMUs 23 and 26). This provision will not alter subsistence regulations regarding swimming caribou.

A number of the currently prohibited actions in 36 CFR 13.42 (g) remain prohibited by the State or other authorities and will not occur under the selected action. Some other actions currently prohibited by 36 CFR 13.42(g) will occur only in limited cases under State regulations, and will result in minimal environmental impacts. See Appendix B of this FONSI for a list of those actions.

Under the selected action, the NPS will continue to work with the State of Alaska to obtain relevant data related to hunting, trapping, and wildlife populations on national preserves, and will continue to monitor wildlife, as appropriate and practicable. The NPS could take actions in the future if necessary to protect NPS resources and values, including implementing specific, local hunting and trapping closures pursuant to ANILCA Section 1313. For any such actions, the NPS will complete additional NEPA reviews, as appropriate. Before proposing NPS actions, the NPS will attempt to address any issues with the State of Alaska Board of Game (BOG) to the maximum extent allowed by federal law.

RATIONALE FOR DECISION

The NPS has chosen to implement the selected action because it is consistent with applicable law and best meets the policy direction in Secretarial Orders 3347 and 3356. The selected action will more closely align sport hunting regulations in national preserves in Alaska with State

regulations and enhance consistency with harvest regulations on lands and waters surrounding national preserves in Alaska. Under the selected action, the NPS retains the authority to implement specific local hunting and trapping closures, if necessary in the future, to protect NPS resources and values.

The NPS recognizes that implementing the selected action represents a change in management direction from the 2015 rule. As explained more fully in the final rule, in light of new policy direction, newly available harvest data which shows low levels of take, and a review of the impacts permitting these hunting methods on national preserves in Alaska would have, the NPS has determined that its 2015 determination that the hunting practices violated the Organic Act was more restrictive than required by applicable law. Further, the NPS has also determined that implementing the selected action will not violate NPS management policies for a number of reasons, including the low levels of additional take anticipated under this rule, retention of the NPS's closure authority under ANILCA Section 1313, and the State's November 2018 letter stating that the methods that would be allowed under the selected action serve to provide opportunity rather than to reduce predators or increase prey.

In addition to the change in policy direction, the NPS notes that some conclusions regarding environmental impacts have changed between the EA prepared for the 2015 rule and the EA prepared to support the current rulemaking process. The primary changes are to the conclusion in the 2014 EA that localized impacts to wildlife would be "substantial," and to the analysis of bear baiting with regard to food conditioning. The EA prepared to support the 2015 rule stated, "[l]ocalized effects on individual animals, family groups, and packs may be substantial (e.g., direct mortality, increased mortality risk due to loss of family or group members, and food conditioning)." The EA supporting the current rule reaches a similar conclusion in regards to mortality risks; however, the term "substantial" has been omitted. As documented in the EA, the NPS considered harvest data from 2012 – 2016 provided by the State that was unavailable in 2015 and determined that there is likely to be only a low level of additional take of predators from preserves under the proposed action. Therefore, the NPS determined that the term "substantial" should not be included in its conclusions in the EA.

With regard to impacts related to bear baiting, data not included in the 2015 effort (cited in Hristienko and McDonald 2007) suggest that, when managed correctly, there is no evidence to suggest that black bears exposed to baits are destined to become problem bears. The EA supporting the current rule clarifies that food-conditioned bears are those that become habituated to humans first, then learn to associate food with humans and thereby become a potential nuisance and public safety risk (Herrero 2002). Therefore, baiting that is conducted in a manner consistent with required mitigations (e.g., signage, setback, cleanup) is unlikely to result in food conditioning.

These and other issues related to interpretation and application of applicable laws and NPS policies are more fully addressed in the comment responses contained in the associated final rule at (XX FR XXXX). Those comment responses explain the rationale for the changes that will be made to the 2015 rule as part of the selected action and demonstrate that the selected action is consistent with applicable laws and policies. The comment responses in the final rule are hereby incorporated by reference into this FONSI.

This FONSI is not the final agency action for those elements of the selected action which require promulgation of regulations to be effective. Promulgation of such regulations will constitute the final agency action for those elements of the selected action.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA REVIEW

The selected action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. This conclusion is based on the following examination of the relevant significance criteria defined in 40 CFR Section 1508.27.

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

Under the selected action, there is the potential for localized³ effects to predator and prey species in the form of direct mortality and increased mortality risk due to loss of family or group members. While localized impacts are expected on individual animals, family groups, and packs, meaningful impacts are not expected at the population level. As discussed in the Revised EA, the NPS expects only a low level of additional take of black bears, brown bears, wolves, and caribou compared to current conditions, and review of relevant studies indicates that population-level effects are unlikely. Similarly, increased take of predator species could increase localized abundance of prey, but is not expected to have population level impacts. Hunters taking brown bears over bait will need to comply with State seasons and bag limits for brown bears, and the State has committed to monitoring brown bear harvest and taking appropriate action if sustainable harvests are threatened (SOA 2014). As discussed in the Revised EA, while impacts could be more intense along access corridors than remote areas, the NPS will be able to ensure no meaningful, adverse population level effects will occur through its ability to enact specific closures, if necessary in the future, under ANILCA Section 1313.

With regard to wildlife behavior, studies suggest that habituated and food-conditioned bears are more likely to become a nuisance and be taken in defense of life and property, and thus pose an elevated public safety risk (Herrero 1970, 1976, 2002). However, as discussed in the Revised EA, bears do not necessarily associate baits with humans, and thus may not become food conditioned. State regulations for bear bait stations serve to mitigate risk to public safety and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, which has registered thousands of bait stations per year for many years statewide, has not detected problems that could be directly attributed to the practice of bear baiting. Therefore, habituation and safety issues related to bear baiting are expected to be rare, although such incidents could potentially lead to take of individual bears.

Use of dogs to aid with black bear hunting could result in adverse impacts to other wildlife that is present when dogs are used, in the form of harassment or killing. However, as discussed in the Revised EA, this activity is expected to be rare under the selected action and any impacts to wildlife related to using dogs to hunt black bears would be localized and minimal. Similarly, while taking of swimming caribou and taking of caribou from a motor driven boat could result in increases to the number of caribou taken in Bering Land Bridge, Gates of the Arctic, and Noatak

³ The territory of Alaska was divided into 26 geographical units in 1956, based on considerations of wildlife habitat, proximity and density of human population centers, wildlife distribution, and anticipated hunting pressure (DOI memo, June 24, 1957). These became known as Game Management Units (GMUs), and are the typical basis for wildlife management in Alaska. GMUs represent the best available construct upon which to base a geographic boundary for populations on an extremely large landscape such as the State of Alaska. Throughout the impact analysis in the Revised EA, "population-level effects" are those expressed at the scale of the GMU, and localized effects as those only detectable at finer spatial scales.

National Preserves, no meaningful population-level effects are expected due to the low level of additional take expected under the selected action.

In general, due to the low level of additional take expected under the selected action, the NPS expects healthy populations of wildlife will continue to exist in a manner consistent with the range of natural variability. As part of the proposed action, the NPS will continue to work with the BOG to protect NPS resources and values. The NPS will be able to ensure no meaningful adverse population level effects would occur through its ability to enact specific hunting and trapping closures, if necessary in the future. For these reasons, there will not be significant adverse impacts to wildlife in Alaska national preserves as a result of implementing the selected action.

With regard to federal subsistence use, there could be small decreases in opportunities for subsistence users to take predators and small increases in the opportunities to take prey species due to the expected increase in take of predators from sport hunting and trapping. However, any reductions in opportunities for take of predator species or increases in prey species are expected to be minimal and localized, because the level of additional take of predators under the selected action is expected to be low. As discussed in the Revised EA, there is a small potential for encounters between bears and subsistence users at their hunting and fishing camps and in and near their communities where baiting occurs. Federal subsistence users could see some beneficial impacts under the selected action because non-rural family members would be able to help their rural family members hunt by methods of take that are currently prohibited for sport hunters. Overall the opportunities for subsistence users to harvest wildlife under the selected action are expected to remain similar to the opportunities currently available, and therefore no significant adverse impacts will occur to federal subsistence users.

The selected action could result in increased sport hunting opportunities in certain localized areas of the preserves, as authorized under ANILCA. It could also result in reduced opportunities for some visitors to observe predators in certain locations, especially opportunities to view wolves and bears along access corridors, and a corresponding increase in opportunities to view prey species. The avoidance of areas around bear baiting stations by recreational visitors could result in a reduction in other public uses and experience of those areas, and safety issues related to bear baiting by sport hunters could also affect public use and experience. As discussed in the Revised EA, food conditioning and safety issues related to bear baiting could potentially lead to injury or death, but such incidents are expected to be rare based on the State's experience, and due to the State's regulations for bear bait stations. The NPS will work with the State to take actions to ensure compliance with State regulations and will attempt to address any site-specific issues related to bear baiting with the BOG, to the maximum extent allowed by federal law. The NPS maintains the ability to enact specific closures, if necessary in the future, under ANILCA Section 1313. Overall, due to the low level of additional take expected under the selected action compared to current conditions, most opportunities to view wildlife—including predators—and opportunities for scientific studies will remain similar to those that currently exist in most areas of Alaska national preserves. For the reasons discussed in this paragraph, there will not be significant adverse impacts to public use and experience as a result of implementing the selected action.

The selected action will adversely impact the natural and untrammelled qualities of wilderness by affecting numbers of predators and prey in localized areas and intentionally altering wildlife behavior through bear baiting. In addition, while State regulations require that all bait, litter, and equipment be removed from the bait site when hunting is completed, while present and prior to removal, bear bait stations and associated debris will degrade the undeveloped quality of

wilderness while present on the landscape. However, ANILCA Section 1316 includes a special provision for wilderness areas that authorizes the establishment and use of temporary facilities and equipment directly and necessarily related to the taking of wildlife, and the establishment and use of bait stations in wilderness areas for the purpose of taking bears under State laws and regulations qualifies as an allowed, non-conforming use under this provision. Overall, as discussed in the Revised EA, due to the low level of additional take expected under the selected action and the large areas of wilderness and eligible wilderness in national preserves in Alaska, wilderness character will continue to exist in a manner similar to current conditions. Therefore, there will not be significant adverse impacts to wilderness character as a result of implementing the selected action.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

As discussed in the Revised EA, under the selected action some bears attracted to bait stations but not harvested could pose a threat to public safety in the form of injuries or death. However, due to State regulations for bear bait stations and based upon State experience with bear baiting, food conditioning and safety issues related to bear baiting are expected to be rare. State regulations for bear bait stations are designed to prevent user conflicts by prohibiting stations within one-quarter mile of maintained roads or trails and within one mile of a house, cabin, campground, or other developed recreational area. In addition, State regulations require that stations be signed and that all bait, litter, and equipment be removed from the bait site when hunting is completed. Furthermore, the State maintains that it has registered thousands of black bear bait stations per year for many years, and has not detected problems that could be directly attributed to the practice of bear baiting. The NPS will work with the State to take actions to ensure compliance with State regulations and will attempt to address any site-specific issues related to bear baiting with the BOG. The NPS maintains the ability to enact specific closures, if necessary in the future, under ANILCA Section 1313. While the potential for habituation, food conditioning and other safety issues related to bear baiting exist, because such issues are expected to be rare, there will not be significant adverse impacts to public health or safety as a result of implementing the selected action.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

No historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas will be significantly affected by implementation of the selected action. The selected action will adversely impact the natural and untrammeled qualities of wilderness by affecting numbers of predator and prey in localized areas and intentionally altering wildlife behavior through bear baiting. In addition, while present and prior to removal, bear bait stations and associated debris will degrade the undeveloped quality of wilderness. However, bait stations and associated debris would occur in small and scattered locations within large areas of designated wilderness. Furthermore, ANILCA Section 1316 includes a special provision for wilderness areas in Alaska. It authorizes the establishment and use of temporary facilities and equipment directly and necessarily related to the taking of wildlife. These special provisions are referred to as "non-conforming" uses. The establishment and use of bait stations in wilderness areas for the purpose of taking bears under State laws and regulations qualifies as an allowed, non-conforming use under this provision. Overall, as discussed in the Revised EA, due to the low level of additional take expected under the selected action and the large area of wilderness and eligible wilderness in national preserves in Alaska, wilderness character will

continue to exist in a manner similar to current conditions. Therefore, there will not be significant adverse impacts to wilderness character as a result of implementing the selected action.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

In the context of determining significance, “controversial” refers to circumstances where a substantial dispute exists as to the environmental consequences of the proposed action and does not refer to the existence of opposition to a proposed action, the effect of which is relatively undisputed” (43 CFR 46.30).

Although it is difficult to gather data and assess impacts across large remote landscapes such as those included in national preserves in Alaska, the Revised EA makes use of the best available data. While the vast majority of those who commented on the environmental assessment opposed implementing the selected action, a relatively small number of commenters pointed to instances where they believed the NPS conclusions regarding impact analysis were incorrect. The NPS reviewed all comments received and additional sources of information cited by commenters. A number of changes were made and included in the Revised EA in response to relevant public comments. However, a number of sources cited by commenters were inapplicable, or did not provide conclusive information.

The NPS reached its conclusions in the Revised EA by evaluating the management implications of available scientific literature and other data. Some of the literature appears to present conflicting conclusions. However, the existence of conflicting scientific conclusions does not in itself create a high degree of controversy giving rise to the need to prepare an environmental impact statement. Where conflicting conclusions exist in the literature, the NPS considered the conflicting information and reached reasonable conclusions regarding impacts based on the best professional judgement of NPS personnel. The primary studies that reached conflicting conclusions related to bear baiting. The 2014 EA relied upon Herrero 2002 for the proposition that animals exposed to, but not taken over bait, could become food conditioned. However, new data not included in the 2014 EA (cited in Hristienko and McDonald 2007) suggest that when managed correctly, there is no evidence to support that black bears exposed to baits become problem bears. The EA supporting the current rule clarifies that food-conditioned bears are those that become habituated to humans first, then learn to associate food with humans and thereby become a potential nuisance and public safety risk (Herrero 2002). Therefore, baiting that is conducted in a manner consistent with required mitigations (e.g., signage, setback, cleanup) is unlikely to result in food conditioning.

Furthermore, as stated in the EA, a review of the literature indicates that, in some instances, bear baiting can have population-level effects other than those related to public safety. For example, a study of artificial feeding for tourism in Quebec concluded that a feeding station may decrease the annual and seasonal ranges of bears and lead to a local increase in bear density that may exceed the social carrying capacity (Masse et al. 2014). However, an analysis of black bear baiting on Alaska national preserves from 1992-2010 concluded that, “Little to no population-level effects arose from the practice of bear baiting on NPS lands. Rather, the complexity surrounding the practice of bear baiting is centered on the management goals of minimizing food-conditioning of bears, fostering public safety, preventing defense of life and property killing of individual bears, and maintaining natural processes and behaviors” (Hilderbrand et al. 2013b). While the NPS acknowledges the results of Masse et al. (2014), Hilderbrand et al. (2013b) is more directly applicable to the bear baiting activities under the proposed action. Based on the results of the Hildebrand study, and in light of the ADFG

regulations for bear bait stations noted above, the NPS does not expect meaningful population-level effects to occur as a result of bear baiting.

As discussed in the Revised EA, while a number of localized impacts are identified, overall, the NPS has determined that meaningful population-level impacts to wildlife will not occur under the selected action, primarily due to the low level of additional take expected. Furthermore, the overall conclusion in this FONSI - a determination that the selected action will not result in significant adverse impacts - is consistent with NPS statements made in the 2015 FONSI, which noted how neither of its alternatives was "likely to have a significant effect on park resources."

5. Degree to which the possible effects on the quality of the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

Overall, the NPS has determined that meaningful population-level impacts to wildlife will not occur under the selected action due to the low level of additional take expected. The NPS will be able to ensure no meaningful, adverse population-level effects will occur through its ability to enact specific closures, if necessary in the future, under ANILCA Section 1313.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

The selected action applies to the current proposed revisions to 36 CFR 13.42 and does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

The NPS considered the selected action's contribution to cumulative effects when combined with other ongoing and future actions that could affect the resources analyzed in detail in the Revised EA. Based on the analysis in the Revised EA, the selected action does not add to the impacts of other activities to the level that will produce significant adverse effects.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect items listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or other significant scientific, cultural or historic resources.

The selected action will not adversely affect items listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or other significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources. As discussed in the Revised EA, opportunities to conduct research on or observe relatively un-manipulated predator species and their relationships with other species and the ecosystem functions would be adversely impacted under the selected action due to the potential localized impacts to predators and prey. However, these impacts would be minimal in most cases because predators and prey in preserves are already subject to regulated harvest and because, in general, only low numbers of additional take are expected under the proposed action.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

The selected action will have no effect on endangered or threatened species, or their habitat. The rule does not address harvest of any listed species, and there would be no impacts to any

listed species from implementation of the rule.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The selected alternative does not violate any federal, State, or local environmental protection laws. Comment responses addressing application of the NPS Organic Act, ANILCA, and the Wilderness Act are included in the associated final rule. As demonstrated in those comment responses, which have been incorporated by reference, the selected action is consistent with applicable laws and NPS policies.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based on the review of the facts and analysis contained in the Revised EA and associated decision file, the NPS has selected Alternative 1 for implementation. Based on the information in the Revised EA and associated decision file, as discussed above, it is my determination that the selected alternative does not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA and the CEQ regulations at 40 CFR Parts 1500-08, an environmental impact statement is not required.

Appendix A: Non-Impairment Determination

Appendix B: Additional Actions that Would Occur Under the Selected Action

Approved:



10/18/19

Date

APPENDIX A: NON-IMPAIRMENT DETERMINATION

A non-impairment determination is made for any impacted resource analyzed in detail in the Revised EA that is subject to the Organic Act “non-impairment” standard. This non-impairment determination does not include discussion of impacts to federal subsistence use, public use and experience, or wilderness character, as these do not constitute impacts to park resources and values and therefore are not subject to the Organic Act “non-impairment” standard.

Wildlife

Under the selected action there is the potential for localized impacts to individual predators, family groups, and packs (e.g., direct mortality and increased mortality risk to predators due to loss of family or group members), and corresponding localized effects on predator-prey systems. However, meaningful impacts are not expected at the population level for predator or prey species. As discussed in the Revised EA, the NPS expects only a low level of additional take of black bears, brown bears, wolves, and caribou compared to current conditions. While impacts could be more intense along access corridors than remote areas, overall, the NPS expects healthy populations of wildlife will likely continue to exist in a manner consistent with the range of natural variability. If the NPS detects issues of concern related to wildlife abundance, diversity, or distribution, it will first attempt to address any issues with the BOG if appropriate and practicable, and maintains its ability to enact specific closures, if necessary in the future, under ANILCA Section 1313. Because populations of wildlife will likely continue to exist in a manner consistent with the range of natural variability in Alaska national preserves in a manner that can continue to be enjoyed by current and future generations, no impairment to wildlife will occur as a result of implementing the selected action.

APPENDIX B: Additional Actions that Would Occur Under the Selected Action

The following actions could occur under the selected action in addition to those listed in the “Selected Alternative” section in the FONSI. These actions were dismissed from detailed analysis in the Revised EA because they would occur in only limited cases and would result in only minimal impacts to NPS resources and values.

- Using any poison or other substance that kills or temporarily incapacitates wildlife. (36 CFR 13.42 (g)(2))
- Taking wildlife from an aircraft, off-road vehicle, motorboat, motor vehicle, or snowmachine. (36 CFR 13.24 (g)(3))
- Use of communications equipment for safety
- Using snares, nets, or traps to take any species of bear or ungulate (36 CFR 13.42 (g)(9))
- Taking black bears (including cubs and sows) with or without use of artificial light under customary and traditional uses at den sites from October 15 through April 30
- Taking coyotes (including pups) during an extended hunting season (current seasons would be extended from May 1 through August 9 per State regulations)