



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, DC 20240



DEC 19 2006

Mr. Gerald Nicholia, Chair
Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence
Regional Advisory Council
101 12th Avenue, Room 110
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Dear Mr. Nicholia:

Thank you for your letter of September 22, 2006, to Secretary Dirk Kempthorne requesting that the process to implement an intensive management program with the State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game on Federal public lands within the Eastern Interior Region of Alaska, be started immediately. I have been asked to respond to you directly.

I take the responsibility, as mandated in the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), of protecting the opportunity for continued subsistence uses in Alaska seriously; as well as that of conserving the nation's fish and wildlife and other natural resources on Alaska's Federal public lands, as directed by ANILCA and other Federal statutes. Each of the Department of the Interior (DOI) land management agencies within your region manage the resources entrusted to them according to these statutory mandates and the implementing regulations and policies. Consistent with these mandates, the DOI agencies will address your concerns.

I understand that staff from the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) gave presentations to your council at its October 2006 meeting in Delta Junction. They explained the legal requirements and policy guidelines each agency follows when considering requests for intensive management, including predator control. In addition, your council was provided written responses from the Refuge Managers of the Arctic, Yukon Flats, and Tetlin National Wildlife Refuges to your request to the Service Regional Director to initiate studies leading to control of predators of moose and caribou on these refuges.

Each DOI land management agency has differing legal requirements and policy guidelines regarding intensive management, including predator control, which are summarized below:

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

The BLM manages its Alaska lands primarily under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and ANILCA. While the agency manages land uses and habitat on its lands, management of fish and wildlife on BLM lands is conducted by the State of Alaska, consistent with the traditional role of the State in managing resident species of fish and wildlife. Essentially, predator control activities by the State of Alaska may take place on BLM lands, as long as they do not conflict with on-going or anticipated BLM authorized actions. The BLM views predator control as a State function and the agency neither supports nor condemns the predator control methods approved by the Alaska Board of Game.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)

The Service manages the national wildlife refuges in Alaska under the mandates of ANILCA and the Refuge Administration Act. There is nothing in ANILCA, or other applicable federal laws, regulations and policies, nor in the refuge comprehensive conservation plans, which specifically precludes predator control on national wildlife refuges in Alaska. However, these laws, regulations and policies do require comprehensive analyses prior to considering a predator control program to ensure that the action is both appropriate and biologically justified. The following are some of the general prerequisites for considering predator control on Alaska refuges.

Foremost, management actions must be biologically justified and used in a prudent and ecologically sound manner to conform to the agency's Policy on Maintaining the Biological Integrity, Diversity, and Environmental Health of the National Wildlife Refuge System (System). This policy requires that the agency 1) *identify the refuge purpose(s), legislative responsibilities, refuge role within the ecosystem, and System mission*; 2) *assess the current status of biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health through baseline... surveys and studies...*; 3) *assess historic conditions and compare them to the current condition ... This will provide a benchmark... for the relative intactness of ecosystem functions and processes; and 4) consider the refuge's importance to refuge, ecosystem, national and international landscape scales of biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health....* A thorough evaluation must be given to substantiate intended benefits of the control efforts, and alternatives to direct control must be evaluated, attempted, and exhausted as a practical means of achieving management objectives.

Because predator control of wolves and/or bears on national wildlife refuges is highly controversial, it would be considered a major Federal action subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements which would include preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) or, at a minimum, an environmental assessment

(EA). As part of an EIS or EA, the Service would evaluate predator control in the context of the purposes of the refuge and in consideration of the biological integrity policy. Additionally, the agency would evaluate the effects of the proposed predator control on subsistence uses and needs, as required by Section 810 of ANILCA. Section 810 requirements would be incorporated into the NEPA process and documents.

In addition, if predator control is proposed to be carried out on a refuge by an agency or others not acting as agents of the Service, the refuge manager must find the proposed control program to be consistent with the Service compatibility regulations implementing the Refuge Administration Act. These regulations require that permitted uses of the refuge be compatible with the purposes of the refuge, the mission of the national wildlife refuge system, and the resource management objectives identified in the refuge comprehensive conservation plans.

Be assured that the Service is giving serious consideration to the concerns you have raised relating to the effects of predation on subsistence uses. By copy of this letter I am requesting that the Service's staff in Alaska to explore available options to conduct the studies necessary to fully evaluate the need for and potential benefits of predator reductions to refuge resources and subsistence users, as well as alternatives to direct agency-conducted reduction of predators. In this evaluation, the Service will closely coordinate and, where possible, cooperate with the State of Alaska in its efforts to provide sustainable, harvestable surpluses for subsistence use.

National Park Service (NPS)

The NPS lands in Alaska are managed according to ANILCA and the underlying 1916 Organic Act, which established and continues to guide NPS management. The ANILCA, per sections 802(1), 808(6) and 815(1)(3), established a standard of "conservation of healthy populations" for wildlife management in Alaska's parks, monuments, and preserves. The legislative history to ANILCA clearly expresses congressional intent in regards to intensive management, including predator control. On page 171 of Senate Report 96-413, November 1979, it states:

In authorizing subsistence uses within National Parks, Monuments, Preserves, and National recreation Areas, it is the intent of the Committee that certain traditional National Park Service management values be maintained. It is contrary to the National Park Service concept to manipulate habitat or populations to achieve maximum utility of natural resources. Rather, the National Park System concept requires implementation of management policies which strive to maintain the natural abundance, behavior, diversity, and ecological integrity of native animals as part of their ecosystem, and the Committee intends that that concept be maintained... Accordingly, the Committee does not expect the National Park Service to engage in habitat manipulation or control of other species for the purpose of maintaining subsistence uses within the National Park System units.

The same report goes on to state (pages 232-233):

The Committee recognizes that the management policies and legal authorities of the National Park System and the National Wildlife Refuge System may require different interpretations and application of the "healthy population" concept consistent with management objectives of each system. Accordingly, the Committee recognizes that the policies and legal authorities of the managing agencies will determine the nature and degree of management program affecting ecological relationships, population dynamics, and manipulations of the components of the ecosystem.

As you can see, the Congress understood and expected that the policies of the NPS were to play a significant role in interpreting how the mandate for "conservation of healthy populations" is carried out.

One of the first major actions the Secretary completed was a long and thorough review of draft NPS management policies. On August 31, 2006, the Secretary was satisfied that the policies were appropriate and struck the correct balance for NPS guidance. Those policies contain several sections (in Chapter 4) that relate to your request. In all, those sections direct the NPS to, in a manner consistent with ANILCA and its Senate history, maintain the natural population fluctuations and processes that influence the dynamics of individual plant and animal populations within their ecosystems. Section 4.4.3, *Harvest of Plants and Animals by the Public*, directly deals with the issues you have raised. Among other things, that section states: *The (National Park) Service does not engage in activities to reduce the number of native species for the purpose of increasing the number of harvest species (i.e. predator control), nor does the (National Park) Service permit others to do so on land managed by the National Park Service.*

To summarize, undertaking intensive management practices, including predator control activities as conducted by the State of Alaska, is not allowed on NPS lands.

I hope this brief summary of the DOI agencies' legal frameworks for considering predator control on their respective lands is helpful to your council's understanding of the constraints they must conform to in addressing your concerns. I would encourage your council to continue to work closely with the Federal agencies and the State in developing management options to ameliorate, to the extent possible, the adverse effects of predation on wildlife resources utilized by subsistence users. In addition to seeking predator reduction programs on Federal lands which are consistent with the legal and policy mandates of the land managing agencies, opportunities for predator management on lands under State jurisdiction should be explored, as appropriate. Additionally, the council may be able to encourage increased harvests of predators by local residents under current State hunting and trapping regulations where applicable.

Mr. Gerald Nicholia

5

In closing, I support and applaud your efforts to ensure that subsistence uses and way of life in Alaska are protected. I appreciate your council's continuing contribution to the Federal Subsistence Program and your diligence in representing the interests of subsistence users in your region. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at (202) 208-5347.

Sincerely,


Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish
and Wildlife and Parks