

January 1997

ANILCA: A Different Legal Framework for Managing the Extraordinary National Park Units of the Last Frontier

Deborah Williams

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr>

Recommended Citation

Deborah Williams, ANILCA: A Different Legal Framework for Managing the Extraordinary National Park Units of the Last Frontier, 74 Denv. U. L. Rev. 859 (1997).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Denver Law Review at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

ANILCA: A Different Legal Framework for Managing the Extraordinary National Park Units of the Last Frontier

ANILCA: A DIFFERENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING THE EXTRAORDINARY NATIONAL PARK UNITS OF THE LAST FRONTIER

DEBORAH WILLIAMS*

Alaska's National Park units can be characterized by a long list of superlatives. Alaska contains the most acres of national parks—over 54 million acres, representing 66% of the total park land base in the entire United States.¹ The largest park unit, Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park and Preserve, is in Alaska.² Denali National Park and Preserve features Mt. McKinley, the tallest mountain in North America.³ There are over 32 million acres of national park wilderness in Alaska, compared to approximately 6 million acres in the remainder of the United States.⁴ And, of particular significance to the legal profession, national parks in Alaska are governed by laws unlike those found anywhere else in the United States.

On December 2, 1980, President Jimmy Carter signed into law the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), which created or enlarged 13 of Alaska's 15 national park units.⁵ ANILCA represented an extraordinary and unprecedented physical expansion of national park units. Furthermore, ANILCA sets forth a substantially different management scheme for the national parks in Alaska.

The purpose of this essay is to highlight the most important aspects of the

* Special Assistant to the Secretary for Interior for Alaska. B.A., Pomona College, 1975; J.D., Harvard Law School, 1978. The author wishes to thank Lauri Adams for her assistance on this paper. The author also gratefully acknowledges the patience and diligence of Ginny Kalbach in preparing this manuscript. The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Department of the Interior or the United States.

1. Interview with Diane Ross, Division of Realty, Alaska Field Office of the National Park Service (Aug. 19, 1996).

2. Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park and Preserve is over 13 million acres in size. *Id.* This makes it larger than the combined acreage of Maryland, Massachusetts and Delaware. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Dep't. of the Interior, Public Land Statistics 5 (1993).

3. The other national park units in Alaska are: Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, Bering Land Bridge National Preserve, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Katmai National Park and Preserve, Kenai Fjords National Park, Kobuk Valley National Park, Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, Yukon Charley National Preserve, Klondike Gold Rush and Sitka Historical Park. Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-487, 94 Stat. 2371 (partially codified in scattered sections of 16 U.S.C. and 43 U.S.C.) [hereinafter ANILCA].

4. Interview with Diane Ross, *supra*, note 1.

5. ANILCA, *supra* note 3. Prior to ANILCA, Alaska contained only five national park units—Glacier Bay, Katmai, Mt. McKinley, Klondike Gold Rush, and Sitka Historical Park. ANILCA expanded and redesignated Glacier Bay, Katmai and Mt. McKinley, and renamed Mt. McKinley as Denali National Park and Preserve. 16 U.S.C. § 410hh-1 (1994).

unique statutory framework pertaining to national parks in Alaska.⁶ The author urges legal scholars and others to scrutinize and assess ANILCA's legislative structure further to determine whether certain components of ANILCA should be exported to parks outside of Alaska, either nationally or internationally, particularly if major expansions are being considered. Additionally, the author opposes the amendments to ANILCA that would eviscerate ANILCA's carefully balanced approach.⁷

I. HUNTING

There are many dramatic management differences between national parks in Alaska and national parks in the remainder of the United States, but one difference stands out most starkly. Hunting is allowed on most of the acreage managed by the National Park Service (NPS) in Alaska.⁸ This is accomplished through two statutory mechanisms: the creation of "national preserves," and the authorization of subsistence uses on most park and preserve lands.

A. National Preserves

ANILCA created approximately 9.4 million acres of a distinct type of park unit known as national preserves.⁹ Pursuant to ANILCA, "hunting *shall* be permitted in areas designated as national preserves."¹⁰ ANILCA further provides that:

A National Preserve in Alaska shall be administered and managed as a unit of the National Park System in the same manner as a national park except as otherwise provided in this Act and except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes and subsistence uses, and trapping shall be allowed in a national preserve under applicable

6. From a Congressional perspective, Alaska's model is important to understand because of the unprecedented leadership positions of Alaska's Congressional delegation. Senator Ted Stevens is Chair of the Appropriations Committee; Senator Frank Murkowski is Chair of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee (the Senate Committee that oversees the National Park Service); and Congressman Don Young is Chair of the House Resources Committee (the House Committee that oversees the NPS).

7. Senator Murkowski introduced a package of amendments during the 104th Congress: S.1920. *The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act Amendment Act of 1996: Hearings on S. 1920 Before the Senate Comm. on Energy and Natural Resources*, 104th Cong. (1996) (statement of Sen. Murkowski on June 27). The Committee held one hearing on the bill very late in the session, and neither the Senate nor the House took further action on the legislation. It is likely that amendments to ANILCA will be pursued in the 105th Congress.

8. 16 U.S.C. § 410hh-2.

9. In most instances, preserve lands are part of a combined park/preserve unit or national monument/preserve unit. For example, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve contains approximately 8,147,000 acres of national park and 4,171,000 acres of national preserve. Other combined units include Aniakchak, Gates of the Arctic, Lake Clark, Glacier Bay, Katmai and Denali. But in three instances, ANILCA created a stand alone preserve: Bering Land Bridge National Preserve (2,457,000 acres), Noatak National Preserve (6,460,000 acres), Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve (1,713,000 acres). ANILCA, *supra*, note 3.

10. 16 U.S.C. § 410hh-2 (emphasis added).

State and Federal law and regulation.¹¹

The public, particularly outside of Alaska, often has a difficult time accepting that hunting is permissible in National Parks in Alaska. For example, there have been numerous letter writing campaigns decrying wolf trapping in Denali National Park and Preserve. Since 1990, approximately four wolves a year have been legally killed in, or near, the preserve portion of the unit.¹² For floral and faunal protection and other prescribed reasons, however, the Secretary may designate zones where and periods when no hunting or trapping may occur in preserves.¹³

B. *Subsistence*

Subsistence hunting and fishing activities are authorized on all national preserve lands and on a large portion of national park lands where such uses are traditional.¹⁴ The term "subsistence uses" is defined as:

[T]he customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska residents of wild, renewable resources for the 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.¹⁵

"Subsistence [by rural Alaskans is] accorded [a] priority over the taking . . . of fish and wildlife for other purposes."¹⁶

As evidenced in the Purposes section of ANILCA, subsistence was singled out as a critical component of the Act. The third, of only four purpose statements, declares:

It is further the intent and purpose of this Act consistent with management of fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized scientific principles and the purposes for which each conservation system unit is established, designated, or expanded by or pursuant to this Act, to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence

11. 16 U.S.C. § 3201.

12. Alaska Department of Fish and Game Sealing Records. Memorandum from Ken Stahlnecker (Sept. 9, 1996) (on file with author). It is not currently possible to specify the numbers trapped solely within the Preserve because the reporting units include lands both within and outside the Preserve.

13. 16 U.S.C. § 3201.

14. 16 U.S.C. § 410hh-2. There are a few parks areas in Alaska where subsistence hunting is explicitly not authorized, e.g., Kenai Fjords, Glacier Bay, Katmai, a portion of Denali, and the Klondike Gold Rush and Sitka Historical National Parks. The Secretary has the authority to prohibit subsistence activities for several reasons, including to assure the continued viability of a fish or wildlife population. 16 U.S.C. 3126(b).

15. *Id.* § 3113.

16. *Id.* § 3114.

way of life to continue to do so.¹⁷

There is no other provision in ANILCA that has aroused, and continues to arouse, more controversy and litigation than subsistence.¹⁸ When Congress passed ANILCA, both the State of Alaska and the federal government anticipated that the State would be able to manage fish and wildlife consistent with a rural subsistence priority.¹⁹ Unfortunately, nine years after the passage of ANILCA, the Alaska Supreme Court, in a 3-2 decision disagreed, concluding that a rural subsistence priority is unconstitutional under Alaska's state constitution.²⁰ As a result, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture created a federal subsistence board, and have been managing subsistence hunting on public lands since 1989.²¹

For several reasons, subsistence provides tremendous challenges and opportunities for the National Park Service. Subsistence oversight requires considerable time and resources (which in Alaska are scarce, particularly for the NPS), and creates in Alaska a disfavored dual management regime for fish and wildlife.²² On the positive side, however, subsistence provides the NPS an opportunity to work closely with rural Alaskans on a matter of tremendous importance²³ and underscores the critical role of parks and preserves in sustaining Alaska Native physical, economic, traditional and cultural existence and non-Native physical, economic, traditional and social existence.²⁴ The Department of Interior continues to work with the State of Alaska on achieving the preferred resolution, State resumption of an excellent, responsive subsistence management program.

17. 16 U.S.C. § 3101(c) (1994).

18. See e.g., *Alaska v. Babbitt*, 72 F.3d 698 (9th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 116 S. Ct. 1672 (1996); *Native Village of Quinhagak v. United States*, 35 F.3d 388 (9th Cir. 1994); *United States v. Alexander*, 938 F.2d 942 (9th Cir. 1991); *Kenaitze Indian Tribe v. Alaska*, 860 F.2d 312 (9th Cir. 1988); *Bobby v. Alaska*, 718 F. Supp. 764 (D. Alaska 1989); *Totemoff v. Alaska*, 905 P.2d 954 (Alaska 1995), cert. denied, 116 S. Ct. 2499, 135 L.Ed.2d 190 (1996); *Alaska v. Kenaitze Indian Tribe*, 894 P.2d 632 (Alaska 1995); *Alaska v. McDowell*, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989).

19. This expectation is embodied in 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

20. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 1.

21. The federal subsistence board regulations are set forth at 50 C.F.R. § 100.1-100.27 (1996). Currently the federal subsistence board does not manage fish in navigable waters. The Ninth Circuit recently ruled that the Title VIII subsistence priority applies to waters in Alaska in which the United States has a reserved water right. *Alaska v. Babbitt*, 72 F.3d at 703-04. The Department has published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking to define its expanded jurisdiction. Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, 61 Fed. Reg. 15,014 (1996) (to be codified at 36 C.F.R. pt. 242 and 50 C.F.R. pt. 100) (proposed Apr. 4, 1996). Because of continuing Congressional moratoria, the Department is precluded from publishing final regulations. 142 CONG. REC. H11,704 (daily ed. Sept. 28, 1996). (to be Omnibus Appropriations Act § 317 when a Public Law number becomes available).

22. The State of Alaska has tried on several occasions to formulate and place on a ballot a State constitutional amendment. Each attempt has failed in part because the threshold for placing a constitutional amendment on the ballot is so high: a two-thirds vote of the State House and State Senate independently.

23. In implementing the subsistence priority, the NPS works with two sets of councils: the regional advisory councils established by 16 U.S.C. § 3115, and, for park issues only, the subsistence resource commissions, 16 U.S.C. § 3118. The purpose of the park-specific advisory commissions is to "devise and recommend to the Secretary and the Governor a program for subsistence hunting" within the park unit. The regional advisory councils address subsistence issues on all Federal public lands in their areas and report to the Federal Subsistence Board. *Id.* § 3115.

24. 16 U.S.C. § 3111.

II. ACCESS, WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT AND PREFERENCES

There are many other important differences found in the statutory structure for national parks in Alaska.²⁵ The following discussion focuses on three significant differences: access, wilderness management and preferences.

A. Access

Recognizing that Alaska's transportation network in 1980 was largely undeveloped, Congress devoted an entire title of ANILCA to the issue of access, seeking to create "a single comprehensive statutory authority" for access concerns.²⁶ In Title XI, three primary types of access are discussed: special access,²⁷ access to inholdings,²⁸ and access associated with transportation or utility systems.²⁹ This note will briefly address the first two.³⁰

From a day-to-day management perspective, the special access provision has the broadest implications. ANILCA allows certain transportation based uses of park land unless there is a determination that such uses would be detrimental to the resource values of the park.³¹ Specifically, ANILCA provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, the Secretary shall permit, on conservation system units, [including Park Units] . . . the use of snowmachines (during periods of adequate snow cover, or frozen river conditions in the case of wild and scenic rivers), motorboats, airplanes, and nonmotorized surface transportation methods for traditional activities (where such activities are permitted by this Act or other law) and for travel to and from villages and homesites. Such use shall be subject to reasonable regulations by the Secretary to protect the natural and other values of the conservation system units . . . and shall not be prohibited unless, after notice and hearing in the vicinity of the affected unit or areas, the Secretary finds that such use would be detrimental to the resource values of the unit or area. Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the use of other methods of transportation for such travel and activities on conservation system lands where such use is permitted by this Act or other law.³²

There are very few instances in which park lands have been closed,³³ but

25. For example, the NPS is prohibited from charging entrance fees to any park in Alaska except Denali. *Id.* §§ 4601-6a(a)(12); *Id.* § 410hh-2.

26. 16 U.S.C. §§ 3161-3173.

27. *Id.* § 3170(a).

28. *Id.* § 3170(b).

29. *Id.* §§ 3164-3173.

30. The provisions governing access associated with transportation and utility systems are worth reviewing, particularly for scholars in this area. However these provisions have been applied only infrequently in Alaska, since capital project budget constraints have minimized the possibilities for building major new systems.

31. 16 U.S.C. § 3170(a).

32. *Id.*

33. For example, NPS recently closed certain areas to Glacier Bay National Park to motor-

those instances are the exception. Virtually all of Alaska's park units are open to the types of special access described above. On the whole, Alaskans have vigorously defended and continue to vigorously defend their ability to use boats, airplanes, and snowmobiles on park units to engage in hunting, berry picking, camping and other activities.

Insuring adequate access to inholdings within parks has been the second major access issue in the implementation of ANILCA. ANILCA specifies that inholders "shall be given by the Secretary such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate and feasible access for economic and other purposes."³⁴ However, such rights shall be subject to reasonable regulations issued by the Secretary to protect the natural and other values of such land.³⁵ There are sizable "inholdings" in national park units, particularly lands owned by Alaska Native Corporations created by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA).³⁶

Achieving access to these lands while minimizing environmental damage will be one of the most important management issues facing parks in the future as development of these Native lands becomes more economic.³⁷

A. Wilderness Management

ANILCA explicitly establishes different rules with respect to wilderness management.³⁸ Perhaps most significantly, the provisions in ANILCA governing special access apply to wilderness areas.³⁹ In other words, ANILCA au-

ized access. See Glacier Bay National Park, Alaska: Vessel Management Plan Regulations, 61 Fed. Reg. 27,008 (1996) (to be codified at 36 C.F.R. pt. 13).

34. 16 U.S.C. § 3170(b).

35. *Id.* One of the more interesting questions presented by this provision is known as the Denali lemonade stand quandary. Currently, there is a single developed road into Denali, Alaska's most popular and famous park. Measuring approximately 90 miles in length, this road not only serves as the basis of most visitor's wildlife and mountain viewing experience in Denali, but it also leads to the Kantishna area, an area of private property in the middle of the park. To protect wildlife resources, the Park carefully restricts the number of vehicles on the road and requires virtually everyone to ride a bus. The demand for spots on the buses exceeds the supply. Additionally, the Park must allow reasonable access to inholders in Kantishna, including lodge owners. Here is the dilemma: what if someone sets up the equivalent of a lemonade stand in Kantishna and provides a day trip over the Denali Road, featuring the wildlife viewing opportunities and views of North America's largest peak, serves the bus passengers a glass of lemonade on their inholding and turns around to spend the remaining time watching wildlife and the mountain. Should the NPS under § 3170(b) be required to provide access for this purpose?

36. Passed in 1971, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) created two primary types of Alaska Native owned corporations: Village Corporations and Regional Corporations. 43 U.S.C. §§ 1601-1629 (1994). As a result of ANCSA, Alaska Native Village and Regional Corporations are entitled to receive approximately 44 million acres of land, a significant amount of which is within the boundaries of Alaska's national park and refuge units.

37. The regulations implementing these special access provisions are found at 43 CFR §§36.10 (access to inholdings); 36.11 (special access); see also 36 CFR Part 13 (Closure Procedures found at §13.30).

38. In recognizing the differences, Congress clearly provided that "[t]he provisions of this section are enacted in recognition of the unique conditions in Alaska. Nothing in this section shall be construed to expand, diminish, or modify the provisions of the Wilderness Act or the application or interpretation of such provisions with respect to lands outside of Alaska." 16 U.S.C. § 3203(a) (1994). The extensive park wilderness areas created by ANILCA are in eight park units. See *supra* note 5 and accompanying text.

39. See 16 U.S.C. § 3170. This section of ANILCA applies to all "conservation system

thorizes the use of snowmachines, motorboats, and airplanes for traditional activities in wilderness study areas in Alaska, unless, after a notice and a hearing process, the Secretary finds that such use "would be detrimental to the resource values of the unit or area."⁴⁰ Encountering motorized vehicles in a wilderness area, together with encountering a hunter on park lands, are the two most publicly apparent differences between authorized human activity on park lands in Alaska versus park lands in the rest of the nation.

Recently the Department established several motor-free zones in Glacier Bay National Park wilderness area as part of a larger rulemaking.⁴¹ The resource value being protected was natural quiet, and was balanced against increases in motorboat and cruise ship traffic in the rest of Glacier Bay. This rulemaking represents the first time a closure has occurred for wilderness value reasons in a park unit in Alaska.

There are other ANILCA specific wilderness provisions that affect management. The Secretary can construct new cabins in wilderness areas⁴² and hunters and fishermen can continue to use "temporary campsites, tent platforms, shelters, and other temporary facilities and equipment directly and necessarily related to such activities."⁴³ More generally, wilderness designations do not preclude subsistence hunting and fishing, or sport hunting and fishing, where such activities are otherwise permitted by statute.⁴⁴

B. Preferences

Because ANILCA vastly expanded parks and refuges, many Alaska Native groups feared that their economic opportunities would be jeopardized. To address this concern, and related concerns, Congress established three preference provisions that affect national parks. These involve administrative and visitor facilities, visitor services, and local hire.

Unlike in the continental United States, the Park Service in Alaska has the explicit authority to establish administrative sites and visitor facilities "*outside the boundaries of*" the park unit.⁴⁵ In fact, Congress went one step further and directed the Park Service in Alaska "[t]o the extent practicable and desirable" to "attempt to locate such sites and facilities on Native lands in the vicinity of the unit."⁴⁶ This provision not only protects the natural integrity of Park lands within the boundaries of a unit, but also encourages partnerships with local Alaska Natives.

units" and public lands designated as wilderness study. *Id.* "Conservation system unit" is defined to include "any unit in Alaska of the . . . National Wilderness Preservation System," including park system units. *Id.* § 3102(4).

40. 16 U.S.C. § 3170(a). Neither ANILCA nor departmental regulations define "traditional activities." See *id.* § 3102 (defining other applicable terms).

41. 61 Fed. Reg. 27,008 (1996) (to be codified at 36 C.F.R. pt. 13).

42. 16 U.S.C. § 3203(d).

43. *Id.* § 3204.

44. See definition of "public lands" at 16 U.S.C. § 3102(3), which includes lands designated as wilderness. See also *id.* § 3114.

45. *Id.* § 3196(a)(2) (emphasis added).

46. *Id.* § 3196(a).

Recently the Park Service published binding guidelines on how to implement this preference.⁴⁷ Since the publication of these guidelines, several projects have been initiated which have successfully used the preference. It is important to continue to utilize fully this preference when more administrative sites and visitor facilities are built to accommodate the growth of visitorship to Alaska's Parks. By this means, the economic benefits accompanying this growth will be proactively shared with adjacent Native land owners.

Pursuant to ANILCA, the Park Service in Alaska also has a two-tiered preference system for the awarding of visitor services.⁴⁸ Visitor Services are defined as: "any service made available for a fee or charge to persons who visit a conservation system unit [including parks], including such services as providing food, accommodations, transportation, tours, and guides excepting the guiding of sport hunting and fishing."⁴⁹

The highest preference is awarded to historic operators—persons who were previously engaged in providing the service within an area established as or added to a park unit by ANILCA.⁵⁰ The next highest preference goes to the Native Corporation most directly affected by the establishment or expansion of the park unit under ANILCA, and a co-equal preference goes to persons who are local residents.⁵¹ In October 1996 the Park Service published its first set of regulations implementing the visitor service preference provisions.⁵²

It is hoped and expected that the Section 1307 regulations will be enthusiastically applied as new visitor service opportunities arise, particularly in the less well known parks. For example, there are many guided sight-seeing opportunities to world class attractions, such as the Kobuk Sand Dunes, that, once initiated, would benefit the Park, the public, nearby Alaska Native Corporations, and local residents. It will be important, however, to insure that new visitor services are designed in such a manner that the underlying park values are protected, and that Alaska's unparalleled and unreplaceable wild, scenic and biological grandeur is sustained for future generations.

The third provision in ANILCA that recognizes the value of involving local residents in the future of parks is Section 1308, which authorizes local hire.⁵³ Specifically, this section provides that the Secretary shall:

[E]stablish a program under which any individual who, by reason of having lived or worked in or near [a conservation system unit, including park units], has special knowledge or expertise concerning the natural or cultural resources of [such unit] and the management there-

47. *United States Department of the Interior Guidelines for Implementing Section 1306 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act Relating to the Establishment of Administrative Sites and Visitor Facilities in Alaska Conservation System Units* (Aug. 22, 1995). Unfortunately there were no guidelines published during the first 12 years of ANILCA's implementation under the Reagan/Bush administrations.

48. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 3197(b).

49. *Id.* § 3197(c).

50. *See id.* § 1397(a).

51. *See id.* § 3197(b)(1)-(2).

52. 61 Fed. Reg. 54,334 (1996) (to be codified at 36 C.F.R. pt. 13).

53. 16 U.S.C. § 3198.

of . . . without regard to . . . formal training [requirements] . . . [any other] . . . employment preference[s] . . . and any numerical limitation on personnel otherwise applicable.⁵⁴

To further reinforce the Congressional directive that local hire employees are not to be counted against "FTE ceilings," the section underscores that "[i]ndividuals appointed under this subsection shall not be taken into account in applying any personnel limitation[s]"⁵⁵ In this era of downsizing, and omnipresent FTE ceilings, this exemption is significant.

The local hire program in Alaska boasts many successes and demonstrates the value of incorporating into the ranks of the Park Service people who know and love the area in which the park unit is located. The full implementation of the program has been hampered, however, by static or declining budgets, precluding much new hiring.⁵⁶

The Park Service, nevertheless, is implementing new initiatives such as hiring on site at the widely attended Alaska Federation of Natives Convention.⁵⁷ Developing an effective and equitable way to convert local hires into permanent employees, after a certain length of meritorious service, is also a priority. This is necessary to attract, retain and promote good local hire employees.

III. CONCLUSION

The management structure for park units in Alaska represents a historic and delicately balanced compromise. When ANILCA was initially debated, the tradeoff was clear: if Alaska and the nation were to obtain over 35 million acres of new national park land in Alaska with the stroke of a pen, then there would have to be numerous compromises in how the land was to be administered. In 1980, many interest groups were dissatisfied with the compromises contained in ANILCA, feeling they went too far or not far enough in liberalizing traditional park management practices. Many still are disgruntled.

For over a decade, Congress intentionally refrained from re-opening ANILCA's provisions on park management, likening a Congressional re-examination to opening the proverbial Pandora's box. Unfortunately, the truce was broken with the introduction of S. 1920. Among other amendments, this bill proposed to significantly alter ANILCA's carefully achieved balances on access, cabins and wilderness-study management.

In each instance, the changes proposed by the amendments in S. 1920 lessened the protections afforded on-the-ground park resources. This is unacceptable. The park units in Alaska represent one of the earth's most extraordi-

54. *Id.*

55. *Id.*

56. Although the NPS in Alaska manages over 66% of the nation's park land, it only employs 2% of NPS's total work force. Communication from Paul Anderson, Deputy Field Director (Oct. 21, 1996). Most parks in Alaska are woefully understaffed. This will present an ever-greater problem as visitorship in Alaska increases and budgets remain static or decline in actual or real dollars. *Id.*

57. Over 3,000 Alaska Natives from throughout Alaska attend this annual convention. *Id.*

nary legacies. As trustees of that legacy, we must continue to respect the integrity of the law that created these national park units. These are, after all, *national* parks and were created for the entire nation to cherish. Attempts to weaken their protection must be met with a resounding "No." The children and grandchildren of the twenty-first century and beyond must be given the opportunity to enjoy, learn from and cherish the incomparable beauty and biological richness of the parks of the Last Frontier.