

Appendix B

Consultation and Coordination with Others

B. Consultation and Coordination with Others

B.1 Coordination with State Agencies

Consistent with the principles of ecosystem management and the laws and policies described in this section, effective management of Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (Arctic Refuge, Refuge) must be done in close coordination with the State of Alaska. This appendix is not intended to be a comprehensive list of State agencies but rather describes the primary State agencies that share concern and responsibilities for fish, wildlife, and other natural resources.

B.1.1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) has the primary responsibility for managing resident fish and wildlife populations in Alaska, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has final authority for managing all fish and wildlife on Refuge lands and waters. On Refuge lands, the Service and ADFG share a mutual concern for all fish and wildlife resources and their habitats, and both are engaged in extensive fish and wildlife conservation, management, and protection programs. In 1982, the Service and ADFG signed a Master Memorandum of Understanding (dated March 13, 1982) that defines the cooperative management roles of each agency. This memorandum sets the framework for cooperation between the two agencies (see section B.1.1.1).

Through the direction of the Boards of Fisheries and Game, the State of Alaska establishes fishing, hunting, and trapping regulations throughout the State. These regulations apply to



Federal public lands unless found to be inconsistent with Refuge purposes, goals, and objectives, and they are superseded by Federal subsistence regulations. The State is divided into 26 Game Management Units (GMUs); most of these are further divided into subunits. Management objectives are developed for populations within the GMUs. All Refuge lands lie within GMU 25A, 25B, 26B, and 26C.

The State process for developing regulations involves substantial public input to the Alaska Board of Fisheries and Game concerning changes in regulation and allocations. Input may be directly to the boards through testimony and proposals or indirectly through participation in local fish and game advisory committees. The advisory committees assist the boards in assessing local fish and wildlife issues and proposed regulations. ADFG biological staff also provides data and analysis of proposals to the boards. Regulations may be changed by the boards at regular meetings, by emergency regulation, or by emergency order.

Although many biologists within ADFG have law enforcement authority, Refuge law enforcement officers and officers of the Alaska Department of Public Safety, Division of State Fish and Wildlife Protection, carry out most enforcement of fishing and hunting regulations.

The Division of Wildlife Conservation works to conserve and enhance Alaska's wildlife and to provide for a wide range of uses for the greatest benefit of current and future generations of the people through management of wildlife populations and habitat, research, information transfer, regulatory activities, and public service.

The ADFG Division of Commercial Fisheries manages, protects, rehabilitates, enhances, and develops fisheries and aquatic plant resources in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the State, consistent with the sustained-yield principle and subject to allocations established through public regulatory processes. It is responsible for management of the State's commercial, subsistence, and personal-use fisheries.

The Division of Sport Fish is responsible for the State's recreational fishery resource. Responsibilities include the conservation of self-perpetuating populations of fish; management of sport fisheries in salt and fresh water; management of hatchery reproducing populations of sport fish species to provide a diverse mix of sport fishing opportunities; and optimizing the social and economic benefits of Alaska's recreational fisheries.

The Division of Subsistence is the research branch of ADFG responsible for providing comprehensive information on the customary and traditional use of wild resources. Information is provided to meet management goals, aid in regulation development, facilitate collaborative agreements, assess environmental impacts, and describe the unique role of wild resources in Alaska.

B.1.1.1 Master Memorandum of Understanding

MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
 BETWEEN
 THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 Juneau, Alaska
 AND
 THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
 Anchorage, Alaska

This Master Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, hereinafter referred to as the Department, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, hereinafter referred to as the Service, reflects the general policy guidelines within which the two agencies agree to operate.

WHEREAS, the Department, under the Constitution, laws, and regulations of the State of Alaska, is responsible for the management, protection, maintenance, enhancement, rehabilitation, and extension of the fish and wildlife resources of the State on the sustained-yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses; and

WHEREAS, the Service, by authority of the Constitution, laws of Congress, and regulations of the U.S. Department of Interior, has a mandated management responsibility for certain species or classes of wildlife, and is responsible for the management of Service lands in Alaska, and the conservation of fish and wildlife resources on these lands; and

WHEREAS, the Department and the Service share a mutual concern for fish and wildlife resources and their habitats and both are engaged in extensive fish and wildlife conservation, management, and protection programs and desire to develop and maintain a cooperative relationship, which will be in the best interests of both parties, the concerned fish and wildlife resources, and their habitats, and produce the greatest public benefit; and

WHEREAS, it has been recognized in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act and subsequent implementing Federal regulations that the resources and use of Service lands in Alaska are substantially different than those of other states; and

WHEREAS, the Department and the Service recognize the increasing need to coordinate resource planning and policy development;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto do hereby agree as follows:

THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME AGREES:

1. To recognize the Service as the agency with the responsibility to manage migratory birds, endangered species, and other species mandated by Federal law, and on Service lands in Alaska to conserve fish and wildlife and their habitats and regulate human use.
2. To manage fish and resident wildlife populations in their natural species diversity on Service lands.
3. To consult with the Regional Director in a timely manner and comply with applicable Federal laws and regulations before embarking on enhancement or construction activities on Service lands.

THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AGREES:

1. To recognize the Department as the agency with the primary responsibility to manage fish and resident wildlife within the State of Alaska.
2. To recognize the right of the Department to enter onto Service lands at any time to conduct routine management activities which do not involve construction, disturbance to the land, or alterations of ecosystems.
3. To cooperate with the Department in planning for enhancement or development activities on Service lands which require permits, environmental assessments, compatibility assessments, or similar regulatory documents by responding to the Department in a timely manner with requirements, timetables, and any other necessary input.
4. To manage the fish and wildlife habitat on Service lands so as to ensure conservation of fish and wildlife populations and their habitats in their natural diversity.
5. To consider carefully the impact of any proposed treaties or international agreements relating to fish and wildlife resources on the State of Alaska which could diminish the jurisdictional authority of the State and to consult freely with the State when these treaties or agreements have a primary impact on the State.
6. To review present U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service policies and any future proposed changes in those policies in consultation with the Department to determine if modified or special policies are needed for Alaska.
7. To adopt refuge management plans whose provisions—including provision for animal damage control—are in substantial agreement with the Department's fish and wildlife management plans, unless such plans are determined formally to be incompatible with the purposes for which the respective refuges were established.
8. To utilize the State's regulatory process to maximum extent allowed by Federal law in developing new or modifying existing Federal regulations or proposing changes in existing State regulations governing or affecting the taking of fish and wildlife on Service lands in Alaska.

THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME AND THE FISH AND WILDLIFE
SERVICE MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. To coordinate planning for management of fish and wildlife resources on Service lands so that conflicts arising from differing legal mandates, objectives, and policies either do not arise or are minimized.
2. To consult with each other when developing policy and legislation which affect the attainment of wildlife resource management goals and objectives or management plans.
3. To recognize that the taking of fish and wildlife by hunting, trapping, or fishing on Service lands in Alaska is authorized in accordance with applicable State and Federal law unless State regulations are found to be incompatible with documented refuge goals, objectives, or management plans.
4. To develop such supplemental memoranda of understanding between the Commissioner and the Regional Director as may be required to implement the policies contained herein.
5. That this Master Memorandum of Understanding shall become effective when signed by the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Alaska Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and shall continue in force until terminated by either party by providing notice in writing 120 days in advance of the intended date of termination.
6. That amendments to this Master Memorandum of Understanding may be proposed by either party and shall become effective upon approval by both parties.

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Fish and Game

/signed/ Ronald O. Skoog

Commissioner

March 13, 1982

Date

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

/signed/ Keith M. Schreiner

Regional Director, Alaska

March 13, 1982

Date

B.1.2 Alaska Department of Natural Resources

The Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR) and its subdivisions coordinate with the Service and other Federal and State agencies in managing public lands (Federal and State) in Alaska. ADNR manages all State-owned land, water, and surface and subsurface resources except for fish and game. The ADNR Division of Mining, Land and Water manages the State's water and land interests, including and within national wildlife refuges. This Comprehensive Conservation Plan (Plan, Revised Plan) was developed in consultation with the ADFG and ADNR.

B.1.3 Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) is also a key partner regarding Refuge management efforts, in light of its mission of “conserving, improving, and protecting Alaska’s natural resources and the environment.” For example, ADEC has direct statewide responsibility for monitoring and maintaining air and water quality. Some of the interagency coordination agreements and mechanisms involving ADEC also involve ADNR and ADFG; others are specific to ADEC. Issues of interest to the Service and Arctic Refuge that may include authorizations from or cooperation with ADEC include air and water quality monitoring, invasive species management, and hazardous material spills.

B.1.4 Coastal Zone Management***B.1.4.1 Alaska Coastal Management Program***

Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (Public Law 92-583), states that “each Federal agency conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the coastal zone shall conduct or support those activities in a manner which is, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with approved State coastal management programs.” Federal agency consistency requirements are addressed in 15 CFR 930.

The Alaska Coastal Management Program was terminated on July 1, 2011, per AS 44.66.030. Prior to its termination, the Refuge contacted the Alaska Coastal Management Program in November 2010. We were informed that a consistency determination is not required for this Plan. No additional coordination regarding coastal zone management is needed.

B.1.4.2 North Slope Borough Coastal Management Plan

The Final Draft Plan Amendment of the North Slope Borough Coastal Management Plan (2007) revised the 1988 Coastal Management Program for the North Slope Borough. It incorporated new requirements for district coastal management plans required by State legislation passed in 2003 and revisions to the Alaska Coastal Management Program regulations effective in 2004. It further established enforceable policies of the North Slope Borough Coastal Management Program.

The Alaska Coastal Management Program was terminated on July 1, 2011, per AS 44.66.030. Prior to its termination, Arctic Refuge contacted the North Slope Borough Coastal District in November 2010, and we were informed that a consistency determination is not required for this Plan. No further coordination regarding coastal zone management is needed.

B.1.5 State Historic Preservation

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires review of any project funded, licensed, permitted, or assisted by the Federal government for impact on significant historic properties. The agencies must allow the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal agency, to comment on a project. The Alaska Historic Preservation Act contains a provision similar to Section 106, which mandates that any project with State involvement be reviewed in a similar manner.

Through the Section 106 review process, Office of History and Archeology staff work with Federal and State agencies during the early stages of project planning to protect cultural resources. They do this by providing information on the location of sites and on cultural resources surveys previously done in an area. If the potential to discover unknown sites is high, a survey may be recommended. When there are sites in a project area, the Service consults with State Historic Preservation Officer on National Register eligibility, on how the project will affect sites, and on ways to lessen unavoidable damage.

In January 2011, the Service's regional archaeologist spoke with staff in the Office of History and Archeology about the pending draft Plan. This office is particularly interested in the Plan's goals, objectives, and management guidelines and policies (Chapter 2). On October 13, 2011, the State Historic Preservation Office provided formal comments on the draft Plan in which they stated their support for the Service's stated objectives with respect to cultural resources. The regional archaeologist continued to consult with the Office of History and Archeology between the release of the draft Plan and Revised Plan.



B.2 Consultation with Federal Agencies

B.2.1 Federal Agency Coordination

In late October 2009, the Refuge invited four Federal agencies to participate in the comprehensive conservation planning process. One of these agencies, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), asked to participate as a member of the extended planning team. The agencies contacted were:

- National Park Service (NPS)
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

The Refuge has engaged in periodic information exchange and informal coordination with the NPS, especially pertaining to the Gates of the Arctic National Park General Management Plan planning process; the Bureau of Indian Affairs, especially relating to Native allottees; and the BLM (for Arctic region planning coordination, cumulative effects, and climate change). The USGS Alaska Science Center provided us with a consultation and coordination point of contact for the Refuge planning effort.

In a December 14, 2011, letter to the Service's director, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) requested cooperating agency status on the Revised Plan (see Section B.5). In January 2012, NASA assigned a representative to participate on the core planning team. As such, NASA has had the opportunity to participate in all core team meetings held since early January 2012, review internal drafts of the Plan, and represent NASA's views regarding Refuge-level decisions associated with the Revised Plan. NASA provided the Refuge with text and analyses that are included in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Plan.

B.2.2 Section 7 Compliance

The Service is required to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out on the Refuge, including the Revised Plan, does not jeopardize the continued existence of species listed under the Endangered Species Act or modify their critical habitat. Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, consultation within the Service and with the National Marine Fisheries Service is required.

In January 2011, a programmatic Section 7 consultation was completed in consultation with the Service's Endangered Species and Marine Mammals Management divisions. The programmatic consultation covers field activities on Arctic Refuge or authorizations for on-the-ground activities in polar bear critical habitat and those portions of the Refuge where a polar bear encounter is possible.

Because the programmatic Section 7 consultation does not apply to the Plan, in January 2011, the Refuge contacted the Service's Endangered Species Division and the National Marine Fisheries Service about the pending draft Plan. Both agencies provided the Refuge with a list of species and critical habitat. Four species listed under the Endangered Species Act occur in or near Arctic Refuge: polar bear, bowhead whale, Steller's eider, and spectacled eider. Four candidate species also occur in or near the Refuge: yellow-billed loon, Pacific walrus, bearded seal, and ringed seal. Polar bear critical habitat has been designated, including parts of Arctic Refuge.

On May 14, 2012, the Refuge completed informal consultation with the Service's Endangered Species Division. The Service concurred that implementing the Revised Plan—including the goals, objectives, management policies, and guidelines—would not be likely to adversely affect candidate or listed species or their designated critical habitat. The Refuge completed informal consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service on July 16, 2012. The National Marine Fisheries Service stated that while the proposed alternatives might affect bowhead whale, bearded seal, and ringed seal, their assessment found any such effects to be insignificant or discountable. They concurred that implementing the Revised Plan is not likely to adversely affect listed or candidate species.

B.2.3 Essential Fish Habitat

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996, requires all Federal agencies to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service on all actions permitted, funded, or undertaken by the agency that might adversely affect essential fish habitat. The Service consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service on essential fish habitat in January 2011. The Service determined that none of the alternatives or objectives presented in the Plan would adversely affect essential fish habitat, and there would be no effect to the habitat as a result of the Plan. The National Marine Fisheries Service concurred with this finding on January 18, 2011. No additional consultation on essential fish habitat is required.

B.3 Consultation with Tribal Governments

In early October 2009, Refuge staff initiated consultation with phone calls and formal letters to leaders of nine federally-recognized tribes with geographic and cultural ties to Arctic Refuge. These tribes are:

- Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich'in Tribal Government, Fort Yukon
- Native Village of Kaktovik, Kaktovik
- Native Village of Stevens Tribal Government, Stevens Village
- Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government, Venetie
- Naqsrarmuit Tribal Council, Anaktuvuk Pass
- Beaver Traditional Council, Beaver
- Denduu Gwich'in Tribal Council, Birch Creek
- Chalkyitsik Traditional Council, Chalkyitsik
- Circle Traditional Council, Circle

Arctic Refuge requested tribal participation in the planning process and invited the tribes to participate in any way that would be meaningful to them, including (but not limited to) participation on any of the core, extended, or advisory teams.

Refuge staff placed follow-up phone calls to each of the tribes in late November and again in mid-December 2009 to determine what level of involvement each tribe wished to have and whether they wanted to engage in formal government-to-government consultation. One tribe, the Native Village of Kaktovik, opted to participate on the extended team; another tribe, the Naqsrarmuit Tribal Council of Anaktuvuk Pass, appointed a representative to the advisory team. Refuge staff mailed follow-up letters to each tribe in early January 2010 informing them that the process to revise the Plan was underway and planning involvement teams had been formed. However, because of the tribe's special governmental status, they were welcome to contact the Refuge or the planning teams at any time and make recommendations or comments.

Public scoping meetings were held in tribal or council buildings at Arctic Village, Fort Yukon, Kaktovik, and Venetie, as well as in Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Barrow during spring and summer of 2010. In October 2010, the Refuge telephoned and then mailed a letter and preliminary draft planning documents to the First Chiefs of each of the nine tribes and to each of the tribal council members for Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich'in Tribal Government, Native Village of Kaktovik, and Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government requesting consultation with the Native councils on an internal review draft of the Revised Plan. We also sent these materials to the First and Second Chiefs and First Council for the Arctic Village Council and Venetie Village Council. These contacts were made out of courtesy to our tribal partners and were not available to the general public.

On February 8, 2011, the Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich'in Tribal Government passed Resolution 11-L-02 along with recommended changes for the internal review draft of the Plan. The Resolution included a request for government-to-government consultation. Resolution 11-L-02 was not sent to Arctic Refuge until April 13, 2011. On April 22, 2011, the Refuge manager responded to the Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich'in Tribal Government acknowledging their request and stating, "If the Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich'in Tribal Government wishes to have formal Government to Government consultation meetings with members of the council, independent of the scheduled

public meetings, please let me know and we will schedule a meeting as appropriate.” The Refuge requested through various Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich’in Tribal Government officials to be put on the tribal council’s meeting agenda either before or during the public review period of the draft Revised Plan.

In August 2011, Refuge staff met with members of the Council of Athabaskan Tribal Government Chiefs at their annual meeting in Arctic Village; the members include many of the tribes we have engaged through our planning process. At the meeting, we discussed the Plan’s progress, an Arctic Village Sheep Management Area hunting proposal, and the desire to have more involvement from local Native communities.

Additional meetings on the Plan were scheduled with tribal and village councils during fall 2011 to present and take comments on the public review draft of the Revised Plan. One or more meetings were held in Arctic Village, Fort Yukon, Kaktovik, and Venetie between October 4 and November 15, 2011. During the meeting in Fort Yukon, Mike Peter (First Chief, Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich’in Tribal Government) requested the Refuge wait until after the annual tribal council elections were completed on October 29, 2011, and new members seated and officially sworn in before meeting with the Refuge and the full tribal council. The Refuge asked to be notified upon completion of the election process; we were especially interested in learning when the next official tribal council meeting was scheduled in which the Refuge could be on the agenda.

Between February 27 and July 10, 2012, the Refuge submitted planning materials to the First Chiefs of each of the nine federally-recognized tribes and to each of the council members of Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich’in Tribal Government, Native Village of Kaktovik, and Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government. We also sent materials to the First and Second Chiefs and First Councils of the Arctic Village Council and Venetie Village Council. Materials provided included: samples of public comments on the draft Plan and draft Service responses; a list of key changes made to the Plan based on public and internal agency comments; a revised planning process timeline; bound copies of the internal review draft of the Plan; and a letter repeating our availability to meet with the tribes and to accept their comments.

The Refuge manager participated in government-to-government consultation with three federally-recognized tribes in 2012. He met with the Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich’in Tribal Government in Fort Yukon on May 10; with the Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government in Venetie on June 6; and with the Native Village of Kaktovik on June 27 in Kaktovik. During the meeting with the Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich’in Tribal Government, the tribe said they will be passing a resolution for formal tribal consultation on any final decision made regarding the Revised Plan and that they want to consult at the highest government level. The tribe is prepared to send a tribal representative to Washington, D.C., to be part of any decision-making discussions. In addition to the federally-recognized tribes, the Refuge manager met with the Arctic Village Council on May 29 in Arctic Village, and he met with members of the Venetie Village Council during the June 6 meeting in Venetie. Consultation with all nine federally-recognized tribes and the two village councils was again initiated with the release of the Revised Plan and final EIS.

On August 10, 2012, the Secretary of the Interior supplemented the December 2011 Department of the Interior “Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes” with a requirement to consult with Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) corporations on actions or activities that may have a substantial direct effect on Alaska Native corporations, including corporation lands, waters, or resources. A representative from the Arctic Slope Regional

Corporation (ASRC) served on the planning team for the Revised Plan throughout the planning process (see Appendix L), and we periodically communicated with Doyon Limited. On August 20, 2012, the Refuge manager sent letters to the two regional corporations and to eight village corporations requesting consultation on the Revised Plan and Final EIS. Doyon Limited responded on September 4, 2012, with a request for formal consultation.

The Plan's mailing list includes nine tribes, two village councils, two regional Native corporations, and five village corporations that have land ownership, geographic, and/or cultural ties to Arctic Refuge (see Appendix K). They receive copies of any document distributed as part of our general public involvement strategy. Tribes and Native corporations shall be notified of pending final decisions prior to the decision going into effect.

B.4 Consultation with Local Governments

B.4.1 Meetings

The Refuge engaged in several outreach efforts with local governments. Public scoping meetings were held in Anchorage, Arctic Village, Fairbanks, Fort Yukon, Kaktovik, and Venetie during spring 2010. Additional meetings were held in these communities in fall 2011 during the public review period for the draft Plan. During scoping meetings, the November and December 2010 tribal coordination period, and meetings on the public review draft of the Revised Plan, Refuge staff met informally with members of the tribal and village councils in Arctic Village, Fort Yukon, Kaktovik, and Venetie. The Refuge will continue to meet with these tribes throughout the planning process.

At the request of the North Slope Borough and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, a public scoping meeting was held in Barrow in June 2010. We also made an effort to meet face-to-face with representatives of the North Slope Borough and ASRC during fall 2011 but were unable to arrange a meeting date. The Refuge will continue to communicate with the North Slope Borough and ASRC during the remainder of the planning process.

B.4.2 Mailing List

The Refuge's mailing list includes the North Slope Borough, the Fairbanks North Star Borough, the cities of Fairbanks and North Pole, and several local Native corporations and organizations (e.g., Doyon Limited, ASRC, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Council of Athabaskan Tribal Governments, etc). The following village governments are also on the mailing list:

- City of Kaktovik
- City of Fort Yukon
- Venetie Village Council
- Arctic Village Council
- Chalkyitsik Traditional Council
- City of Anaktuvuk Pass
- Beaver Traditional Council
- Circle Traditional Council
- Birch Creek Village Council
- Native Village of Stevens

Please refer to Appendix K for a comprehensive list of corporations and organizations. All governments, organizations, and corporations on our mailing list received copies of documents distributed as part of our public involvement strategy. In addition, the Refuge manager sent letters to Doyon Limited, Tanana Chiefs Conference, and the Anchorage and Fairbanks chambers of commerce, specifically inviting their representatives to attend public meetings.

B.4.3 Wild and Scenic River Review

During the wild and scenic river review, Arctic Refuge identified a number of local governments, corporations, and organizations as stakeholders. The Refuge solicited information addressing the suitability criteria from these entities. For more information, please refer to Appendix I.

B.5 Formal Cooperating Agency Status

In late October 2009, the Refuge invited 11 potential cooperators to participate in the Revised Plan planning process. These were:

- Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG)
- Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR)
- Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
- National Park Service (NPS)
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC)
- Doyon Limited
- Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation (KIC)
- North Slope Borough

None of the agencies opted for formal cooperating agency status. However, ADFG and ADNR chose to assign representatives to participate as members of the core planning team. As such, they have had the opportunity to participate in all core team meetings and represent State views regarding Refuge decisions associated with the Revised Plan. An Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities representative was also appointed to the advisory team. Advisory team members received periodic updates on the status of the planning effort and have been included as document reviewers. The State participation has been mutually beneficial; however, the State does not endorse the Revised Plan. The BLM and Arctic Slope Regional Corporation also asked to participate as members of the extended planning team. They have been invited to all extended team meetings and have similarly had the opportunity to express their views about key Refuge planning decisions.

In December 2011, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) wrote a letter to Service director Dan Ashe requesting cooperating agency status. On January 31, 2012, NASA and the Service signed a Memorandum of Understanding by which NASA became a cooperating agency on the Revised Plan. NASA offered the Service specialized expertise on the potential conflicts between Sounding Rockets Program operations at the Poker Flat Research Range (Poker Flat) and alternatives under consideration in the Revised Plan and environmental impact statement. NASA has provided the Service with relevant information about NASA's operations at Poker Flat and an analysis of the potential consequences of the proposed alternatives on NASA's programs.

B.6 Additional Consultation

The Refuge sent informational Plan materials to over 2,000 individuals, businesses, organizations, etc. For the complete mailing list, see Appendix K. In addition to the publicized public involvement opportunities and consultation with public agencies, the Refuge responded to requests for meetings, discussion, or information from a wide variety of individuals, organizations, agencies, and other entities.

This page intentionally left blank.