Chapter 8. Natural Resources Implementation

8.1 Natural Resource Implementation Objectives

- Develop and update this Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) annually and report on progress
- Acquire personnel necessary to fully implement this INRMP
- Acquire equipment and supplies necessary to fully implement this INRMP
- Obtain funding and prioritize projects necessary to fully implement this INRMP

8.2 Conservation Implementation

8.2.1 Conservation Implementation Plan

The purpose for the US Army Alaska (USARAK) Conservation Implementation Plan (1998) was to gain approval and provide programmatic guidance to USARAK conservation program managers on the future structure of the conservation program. The Sikes Act, as amended in 1998, stipulates that planning level surveys, integrated natural resources management plans, and implementation of these plans are required for all Department of Defense (DOD) lands. Implementation of these plans required a higher level of effort than had occurred prior to 1998 and was not possible because of low priority for funding. This plan outlined the steps and identified the resources necessary to comply with the Sikes Act by supplementing the USARAK conservation program. The five objectives of the conservation implementation plan are:

- Prepare streamlined INRMP and Integrated Cultural Resources Mangement Plan (ICRMP) to make them the basis for project management for Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area, Fort Richardson, and Fort Wainwright.
- Realign current staff and request additional staff to implement INRMP and ICRMP.
- Develop program management mechanisms to implement INRMP and ICRMP.
- Update Environmental Program Requirement (EPR)to reflect realistic requirements outlined in INRMP and ICRMP.
- Obtain Command Support.

These five objectives are now the basis for natural resources implementation at Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area.

8.2.2 Conservation Program Management

Description and Justification: Conservation program management includes all the tasks required to plan, organize, implement, and operate the natural resources program on Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area. Program management funds provide for staff positions, travel between the installations (Forts Richardson, Wainwright and Greely), and travel to the Major Command at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. Program management funds include travel associated with job sites, conferences and meetings. Funds also provide for required supplies to perform the mission. Conservation program management also includes all the tasks associated with completing, maintaining, and updating all Memorandums of Understanding (MOU), Memorandums of agreement (MOA), and cooperative agreements.

Measures of Effectiveness:

- Prepare, update, and submit Conservation EPR on time twice per year during 2002-2006.
- Obtain and execute 100% of conservation funding annually during 2002-2006.

- Contribute to ISR and EQR report on time annually during 2002-2006.
- Execute Conservation Implementation Plan during 2002-2006.
- Recruit and train adequate staff to conduct natural resources management during 2002-2006.
- Prepare, update, and execute cooperative agreements, MOUs, and MOAs to accomplish natural resources management during 2002-2006.

Management History: Natural resources program management has been part of natural resources management since its inception in the 1950s. However, program management was defined in the Conservation Implementation Plan approved in 1998. As a result of implementation of the plan, the number of conservation staff has doubled since 1998.

Current Management: Current management actions for ongoing conservation program management will cease in 2002. If this INRMP is not approved and funded, no conservation program management will continue. Policies already in place for conservation program management will continue.

Proposed Management:

Table 8-1. Conservation Program Management.

OBJECTIVE	RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION	PRIORITY	IMPLEMENTATION				
			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Update EPR based on updated projects in this INRMP in 2002.	USARAK Conservation	High	x				
Conduct training for conservation personnel annually during 2002-2006.	USARAK Conservation	High	x	x	x	x	x
Execute all conservation funding based on the priorities listed in this plan during 2002-2006.	USARAK Conservation	High	x	x	x	x	x

Other Management Alternatives Considered and Eliminated: There are other potential methods for conducting conservation program management. The proposed management actions listed above carefully balance the needs of the military mission, recreation, and the ecosystem. Other actions would be too minimal or would be cost-prohibitive.

8.3 Project Management Planning and Reporting

8.3.1 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan

Description and Justification: Prepare, update, and implement an INRMP for Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area. The centerpiece of natural resources planning is the INRMP. Updates of the INRMP management plan are required by Public Law 106-65 (Military Land Withdrawal Act) as mitigation for the land withdrawal Legislative Impact Statement (LEIS) and Public Law 86-797 (Sikes Act) every five years. Per Memorandum DAIM-ED-N, 21 March 1997, this INRMP is a class 1 requirement.

Measures of Effectiveness:

- Complete, maintain, and update a current and Major Command (MACOM)-approved INRMP.
- Identify requirements for resourcing INRMP in the EPR.
- Involve public in the review of INRMP updates.
- Involve US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G), and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as cooperators in the INRMP.
- INRMP components are clearly identified and compatible with the Installation's Master Plan, Range Development Plan, Endangered Species Management Plan, and ICRMP.

Management History: The first INRMP, 1998-2002, was completed in 1999.

Current Management: Integrated natural resource planning is accomplished through preparing and updating the INRMP at least every five years. Integrating the many components of natural resources can be a complex challenge. One of the objectives of ecosystem management in USARAK is to develop a process to objectively identify requirements for all species and users of the environment. In addition, natural and cultural resource projects can only be classified as a military use (and therefore a valid expenditure of military funds) if there is a direct link back to the accomplishment of the overall military mission.

This INRMP is structured to demonstrate direct support of the overall military mission, which includes stewardship of natural and cultural resources, compliance, quality of life, and military training support. Every single project and task in the INRMP is focused to add to the accomplishment of one or more of these natural resources goals.

Proposed Management:

Table 8-2. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.

OBJECTIVE	RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION	PRIORITY	IMPLEMENTATION				
			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Conduct annual updates of the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan.	USARAK Conservation	High	x	x	x	x	x
Prepare and update the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for the planning period of 2007-2011.	USARAK Conservation	High					x
Complete NEPA documentation for update	USARAK Conservation	High					x

Other Management Alternatives Considered and Eliminated: There are no alternatives to maintaining a current INRMP in terms of updates at least every five years as required by the Sikes Act. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation is also legally mandated.

8.3.2 Management Activity Plans

Project management planning is accomplished through the INRMP, activity plans and work plans. Ten activity plans and two annual work plans provide the project details necessary to implement each post's INRMP. Each activity plan contains five years of detailed projects. Each detailed project can be used as a guide for in-house staff to accomplish or as a scope of work if the project is to be contracted out. Activity plans that are components of this INRMP (Appendix D) include the ecosystem management action plan, special interest areas management action plan, wetlands management action plan, forest

management action plan, fire management action plan, habitat management action plan, soil resources management action plan, aviation monitoring action plan and the outdoor recreation management plan.

8.3.3 Conservation and ITAM Work Plans

The USARAK Conservation Annual Work Plan was created to track funding, obligations, and execution for natural resource projects and tasks. Each project contains the following information: project name, priority, EPR number and name, description, funding required, funding allocated, funding obligated, year funded, agency (in-house or contractor), NEPA requirements, Section 106 requirments, other permit requirements, primary USARAK point of contact, project status, and comments. The Conservation Annual Work Plan does not replace the EPR, rather it enhances the planning and execution of projects.

The ITAM Work Plan is created by the ITAM Coordinator, submitted by Dirctorate of Plans, Training, Security, and Mobilization (DPTSM), validated by US Army Pacific (USARPAC), and turned in to Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations, and Plans (ODCSOPS) as the basis for Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) funding. The purpose of the ITAM workplan is to:

- Define individual project and work activities.
- Designate, prioritize, and identify a cost to execute those projects.
- Track project execution during a fiscal year.
- Describe multiyear ITAM programs and requirements at installations, MACOM HQ, and supporting agencies.
- Report all ITAM resource requirements, based on the set of standard work categories.
- Capture program execution and adjustments over the course of a fiscal year.

The installation work plan is developed in the early spring of each year to reflect ITAM program requirements in detail for the following five fiscal years. The work plan reflects all ITAM activities for the installation. Once projects are identified, they are prioritized from most to least important. Approval of these projects and priorities is obtained from the DPTSM prior to completing the work plan. Once the projects are approved, they are entered into the Installation Work Plan Analysis Module (IWPAM) database.

Each project is described to convey the scope of work. Costs should include all labor, material, and equipment necessary to execute the work. Once the DPTM/G3 or equivalent approves the installation submission package, the entire package is submitted electronically to the MACOM ITAM Program manager. The MACOM ITAM Program manager, in conjunction with his environmental staff counterpart, will review and validate, by project, the installation work plans using the MACOM version of the WAM, or MWAM. Once validated, the work plan becomes a MACOM-recognized ITAM resource requirement.

8.3.4 Environmental Program Requirement

The Environmental Program Requirements (EPR), an annual report submitted by USARAK, serves as both an environmental project status report and a project requirement submission detailing environmental projects required to obtain or remain in compliance with environmental laws. The conservation portion of the report covers all natural and cultural resources projects and program areas. The EPR is used as a planning tool for integrated natural resources management and is the basis for funding conservation projects (except ITAM). EPR natural resources projects are based on projects presented in this INRMP.

8.3.5 Environmental Quality Report

The EQR is an annual report submitted by USARAK that meets a Congressional mandate for the Army to report on the environmental quality of their installations. USARAK must report on the status of meeting DOD Measures of Merit targets.

8.3.6 Installation Status Report

The Installation Status Report (ISR) is a senior decision-maker system designed to provide standardized reporting of installation capabilities and condition based on uniform Army-wide criteria. The system provides executive level information on the condition of installations. ACSIM is the proponent for ISR, however, each agency should proactively work to ensure that its facilities and programs are accurately portrayed. The system includes three parts: Part I – Infrastructure; Part II – Environment; and Part III – Services. Together these three sections are designed to provide an overall picture of an installation's status and show how deficiencies in installation condition affect the environment and mission performance.

ITAM is contained in Part I of the ISR. (i.e., the evaluation of maneuver land). ISR Part I is both a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of all major facility groups, including ranges and maneuver land. The ISR uses RPLANS and IFS data as the basis for quantitative measurements of facility shortfalls and/or excesses at the installation level, with MACOM and Army-wide roll-ups. User evaluations, based on standard criteria, determine the qualitative portion of the ISR. Because ranges and maneuver lands are included in this section of the ISR, the accuracy and effectiveness of the evaluation is of importance to the ITAM community. In fact, the establishment of an effective ITAM program is included as a qualitative factor for maneuver land.

Conservation is contained in Part II of the ISR. The conservation portion of the ISR focuses on progress of natural resources programs, funding applied to all components of the program, and compliance with various natural and cultural resources related laws.

8.4 Staffing

USARAK natural resources personnel at Fort Richardson provide general support for implementation of this INRMP, while natural resources personnel at Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area and Fort Wainwright specifically implement most provisions of this INRMP. Positions at Fort Richardson specifically concerned with support to Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area natural resources include the USARAK Environmental Resources Division Chief, Fort Richardson Natural Resources Branch Chief, USARAK ITAM Coordinator and Conservation Team Leader, Fort Richardson ITAM Coordinator and lead scientist for USARAK, USARAK Cultural Resources Specialist, and two Geographical Information System (GIS) Specialists.

The Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area ITAM Coordinator/Conservation Leader and the Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area LCTA Coordinator are the only full-time employees stationed at Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area implementing this INRMP. The USARAK ITAM Coordinator is filling the role of Deputy Natural Resources Chief. Employees stationed at Fort Wainwright who have responsibilities at Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area include the USARAK NEPA Coordinator, USARAK Forester, USARAK Recreation Specialist, and the USARAK Aviation Specialist.

Table 8-3. Positions needed at Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area to implement the INRMP.

NUMBER	POSITION TITLE	CLASSIFICATION

1	Deputy Natural Resources Chief**	Natural Resources Specialist
1	ITAM/Conservation Coordinator	Natural Resources Specialist
1	LCTA Coordinator	Natural Resources Assistant
1	GIS Specialist**	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Forester*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Outdoor Recreation Coordinator*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Aviation Biologist*	Natural Resources Specialist
1	Cultural Resources Coordinator**	Cultural Resources Specialist
1	NEPA Coordinator*	Natural Resources Specialist
2	Conservation Officers	Conservation Enforcement Specialists

*Positions located at Fort Wainwright **Position located at Fort Richardson

Since the natural resources disciplines encompassed within this INRMP are the natural sciences, USARAK is mandated by Army Regulation (AR) 200-3 to establish the optimum staffing of natural resources management professionals, appropriate to the resources, to ensure necessary technical guidance in the planning and execution of the Natural Resources Program. USARAK will establish positions as needed and fill validated positions in accordance with current DOD/DA policy.

The management and conservation of natural resources under Army stewardship is an inherently governmental function. Therefore, the provisions of AR 5-20 (commercial activities program) do not apply to the planning, implementation, enforcement, or management of Army natural resources management programs. This includes all positions (for example, professional, technical, equipment operators, natural resources law enforcement professionals, laborers, and so on) that have been validated as a requirement to perform natural resources management. However, support to the natural resources program, where it is severable from management, planning, implementation or enforcement actions of natural resources, may be subject to the provisions of AR 5-20. Personnel positions associated with activities that support (on an as-needed basis), the natural resources program (for example, equipment operators or laborers from a pool or another shop) may be subject to the provisions of AR 520.

The ideal situation would be for all positions to be full-time, permanent federal positions. Considering current Army personnel policies, the addition of permanent full- time federal positions at Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area is not likely in the foreseeable future. A blendedwork force appears to be a necessity. USARAK is also directed by AR 200-3 to seek technical assistance from appropriate natural resources agencies (federal, state, and local). USARAK will pursue options to fill staff positions in a manner that will accomplish the most efficient blended workforce as possible.

Implementation of this INRMP requires assistance from USARAK's partners and cooperators, both signatory and otherwise. Specific needs from organizations external to Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area are indicated throughout this document. USARAK will require considerable expertise from universities, agencies, and contractors to accomplish some tasks, since hiring specialists is not an option. This assistance will be on a reimbursable basis in most cases.

In-house Capabilities. USARAK has limited in-house research or special project capabilities as a result of manpower restrictions and natural resources' management-oriented mission. Some studies and projects require specialized academic training while others require more trained staff than are available at USARAK. However, USARAK personnel do have access to extensive data on vegetation, wildlife populations, and range status. USARAK's GIS is a powerful in-house research asset. During the next five years, as GIS is expanded with relatively complete databases, it will be used to support projects described in this INRMP.

University Assistance. Universities are a good source of research assistance. USARAK has used several universities in recent years to help with specialized needs. Use of universities for research will continue in 2002-2006. The primary source of university personnel assistance will be from Colorado State University to help implement the USARAK Conservation and ITAM programs.

Another "borrowed personnel" option is through the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE). Oak Ridge Associated Universities manages and operates the ORISE research participation program for the U.S. Department of Energy. ORISE is a consortium of 88 doctoral-granting colleges and universities providing students and postgraduates opportunities to gain experience in their respective fields by working on Army installations. ORISE program coordinators at the US Army Environmental Center (USAEC) are points of contact for the program. ORISE personnel are appointed as research participants, gaining hands-on experience, and are assigned to complete multiple tasks for the duration of their employment. Stipends are equivalent to salaries for employees hired with similar educational backgrounds, with a 30% overhead added. ORISE personnel can be appointed for a maximum three-year term. ORISE is another option for securing manpower assistance during 2002-2006.

Other Agency Support. The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1972 (IPA) is a means to accomplish research or obtain personnel assistance. IPA is a system where a federal (or state) agency "borrows" other federal or state agency personnel for a limited time to do a specific job. Any state or federal agency is authorized to participate. The installation pays the borrowed employee's salary and administrative overhead. Major advantages are that personnel are directly supervised, and manpower authorizations are not required.

Contractor Support. USARAK may also turn to outside contractors for completion of studies and projects. Contractors give ERD access to a wide variety of expertise. Contractors may be used for projects such as plan preparation, NEPA documentation, aerial census and photography, Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance (LRAM) implementation, and similar activities. In 2002-2006 they will be used as needed to implement this INRMP.

8.5 Program Management Mechanisms

USARAK has six formal mechanisms to obligate funding, enhance partnerships, enable management decisions, enhance communication, and increase efficient dissemination of information regarding the natural resources program. These mechanisms, which are explained in further detail in the following sections, include the following:

- Mechanisms to partner and obligate funds
- The conservation newsletter
- The conservation web site
- In-Progress Review
- Conservation and ITAM Work Plans
- Conservation team

8.5.1 Partnering and Obligation Mechanisms

USARAK will implement this plan using five means, placed in the following priority:

- Perform work in-house
- Cooperative agreements with other natural resource agencies
- GSA environmental services contracts
- Job Order Contracts
- Open Bid Contracts

8.5.1.1 In-House

The first priority for implementation of this plan will be to use the USARAK in-house work force. USARAK in-house capabilities include permanent natural resource employees, other Public Works organizations (such as roads and grounds, carpentry shop, etc) and troop projects. These methods are usually the least expensive, but also tend to be the least flexible. All funds obligated toward in house work must be expended in the current fiscal year. Due to the reduction of federal in-house positions, the amount of work that can be accomplished in-house dwindles every year.

8.5.1.2 Cooperative Agreements

The next priority for accomplishing work to implement this plan is through cooperative agreements. AR 200-3 directs that, where applicable, an installation should enter into Cooperative Plans, in accordance with 16 USC 670a, with state and federal conservation agencies for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, soil, outdoor recreation, and other resources. Furthermore, when entering into contracts for services that implement wildlife management objectives or enforce natural resources laws (that is, wildlife management and endangered species plans and surveys), priority will be given to contracts with federal, state, and local agencies with responsibility for natural resources conservation. In these cases competitive bids are not required.

8.5.1.2.1 Department of Defense Agreements

Memorandums of Understanding (MOU), between DOD and other resource agencies provide the authority for installations to develop their own cooperative agreements in attainment of mutual conservation objectives with these agencies.

MOUs have been established between the Department of Defense and the Departments of Agriculture (March 27, 1963) and Interior (April 7, 1978), which are applicable to Continental United States (CONUS) installations.

- Department of Agriculture, functioning through the Agriculture Research Service, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the Forest Service for the use, development, protection, and conservation of forest and other vegetative cover resources, for soil and water conservation, and for research relating thereto.
- The Department of the Interior (DOI) functioning through the USFWS for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources.
- The DOI, functioning through the National Park Service for the development and management of outdoor recreation activities.
- The Department of Agriculture, functioning through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and Animal Damage Control (ADC) for animal damage control on military installations. A formal Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Defense and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, was signed May 15, 1990. This MOU establishes procedures for planning, scheduling, and conducting animal damage control activities, exclusive of routine vertebrate pest control operations, on U.S. military installations within the United States and its territories.

Assistance may also be obtained from other government agencies not specifically included in the above memorandums of understanding (for example, Agricultural Extension Service, Bureau of Land Management, Environmental Protection Agency, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), universities, state, and local conservation agencies).

A Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service and the DOD (December 1990) exists for the conduct of insect and disease suppression on lands administered by DOD. Section 5 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to protect trees and forests, wood products, stored wood and wood in use from insects and diseases. The U.S. Forest Service has been delegated the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act. Annual appropriations, based on estimated suppression costs developed by the Forest Service, DOD, other federal and state agencies, and other cooperating entities, are necessary to implement this responsibility.

The DOD and the Department of Agriculture (September 1988) have a Master Agreement establishing the standards for the use of national forest system lands for military activity.

A Cooperative Agreement between the DOD and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) (December 13, 1988), declared a policy of cooperation, establishes procedures for planning and conducting cooperative efforts between TNC and DOD on DOD lands. Under this agreement, installation commanders can obtain technical assistance from TNC and State Natural Heritage Programs, as well as allowing TNC to study significant ecosystems under the Army's control.

8.5.1.2.2 USARAK Cooperative Agreements

USARAK has developed the following cooperative agreements to implement this plan and the Conservation Program. These cooperative agreements are found in Appendix C.

- *Cooperative Agreement for Management of Natural and Cultural Resources on Army Lands in Alaska*. This agreement is part of this INRMP and details cooperative management between USFWS, BLM, and ADF&G.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Fire Suppression on Army Lands in Alaska.* The Army has an agreement with BLM – Alaska Fire Service (AFS) - whereby AFS is provided facilities on Fort Wainwright in exchange for fire protection on all Army lands in Alaska.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Natural, Cultural, and Environmental Support*. This agreement with the Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands (CEMML) at Colorado State University provides support for natural and cultural resources, as well as environmental management.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Vegetation Management Support.* USARAK has entered into a cooperative agreement with ADNR, Plant Materials Center (PMC) to conduct revegetation projects and provide plant materials advice.
- *Cooperative Agreement for Erosion Control and Habitat Management.* USARAK has entered into a cooperative agreements with both the Delta Soil and Water Conservation District (DSWCD) and the Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District (PSWCD) for enhancing, rehabilitating, and maintaining USARAK training lands to ensure their continued long-term use and effectiveness. The districts partner with USARAK to conduct LRAM, erosion control, and habitat management projects.
- *Cooperative Agreement for the Conduct of Soil Surveys on Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area.* USARAK has entered into an agreement with the Department of Agriculture, Natural

Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), for the purpose of conducting soil surveys on Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area.

- *Cooperative Agreement for the Management of Cultural Resources on Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area.* USARAK has entered into an agreement with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. (TCC), for the purpose of providing cultural resources management services.

8.5.1.3 Other Obligation Mechanisms

When in-house staff or cooperating agencies cannot perform work, USARAK looks to one of three contract mechanisms. The GSA environmental services schedule provides companies that have already gone through an open bid process to be on the GSA contract. Contracting to one of these companies is relatively simple and fast. The Job-Order Contract (JOC) in place in USARAK provides quick and efficient service. However, when none of these other options is available, USARAK can use the open bid process through Directorate of Contracting.

8.5.2 Conservation Web Page

The USARAK conservation web site is the official means for obtaining the most current natural and cultural resources information such as publications available for public review; published documents; hunting, fishing, and trapping information; firewood and Christmas tree information; and conservation personnel telephone and e-mail addresses. All information on this site is unclassified and accessible by the public via the Internet. Everything on the site may be distributed and reproduced. Maintenance includes adding new features and links to other web sites, and updating, adding, or deleting content. Anyone may request an update to the Conservation web site. To request an update to the web site, send an e-mail to the Conservation webmaster via the email address provided on the site. The web site can be accessed at http://www.usarak.army.mil/conservation.

8.5.3 Conservation Newsletter

The conservation newsletter is an official USARAK publication, and is a means by which conservation personnel can share information about trends, events, and current thoughts related to the conservation program with the public. The newsletter will also be used to inform the public about upcoming conservation-related events, and will serve as a reminder that documents are available on the web site. Installation success in the conservation program depends on involvement of the public. The submission deadlines for the conservation newsletter are included in each issue and are also posted on the conservation web site. Unless articles appearing in the newsletter are copyrighted, they may be reproduced and shared.

8.5.4 In-Progress Review

The USARAK Conservation / ITAM In-Progress Review (IPR) process is the forum by which conservation personnel report annual accomplishments and brief future plans and requirements to the USARAK Environmental Chief, USARAK Range Manager, and Range Officers from each post. The IPR provides an opportunity for discussion between the conservation personnel from each post and the USARAK range and environmental staff. MACOM Conservation and ITAM personnel are invited to participate.

The Deputy Natural Resources Chief hosts the IPR on a semi-annual basis. IPRs are identified as IPR FY XX-1, held in October, and IPR FY XX-2, held in April. The Deputy Natural Resources Chief chairs the IPRs.

The purpose of IPR FY XX-1 is to conduct the following:

- Report on accomplishments from each post and functional area.
- Provide an after-action review of projects that includes lessons learned.
- Set current fiscal year project tasks and deadlines.
- Develop future fiscal year goals and objectives.
- Obtain approval for future endeavors.

Based on the IPR FY XX-1 discussions, the Deputy Natural Resources Chief formulates a plan of action for accomplishing current and future fiscal year projects.

The IPR FY XX-2 is held prior to the upcoming field season. The purpose of IPR FY XX-2 is for project managers to brief their plans for summer field projects. This allows project managers to ensure integration among the many field projects. This also allows NEPA and cultural resources coordinators to ensure that proper project documentation has been completed or is in progress.

8.5.5 Conservation Team

The USARAK conservation team exists to promote integration and enhance project execution. All natural and cultural resources employees of USARAK are members of the conservation team. The conservation team was created to allow free exchange of ideas and information amongst the members on all three posts. The conservation team also exists to tackle technical scientific issues necessary to carry out projects. There are three permanent components of the USARAK conservation team: the conservation team - north of the Range (Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely), the conservation team - south of the Range (Fort Richardson), and the conservation steering committee. Ad hoc committees are created and convened as necessary. Ad hoc committees include the ecosystem management team and the LCTA/ATTACC team. Conservation personnel often serve on a number of these permanent and ad hoc teams.

The conservation teams north and south of the Range meet monthly or bi-monthly. Each conservation team elects a team leader who is responsible for scheduling meetings, setting an agenda, and moderating meetings. The north and south of the Range conservation teams conduct project coordination and track project execution based on the Conservation Work Plan. Teams also develop new requirements for future projects. All members have the authority to raise or discuss issues in the team forum. The conservation steering committee meets as needed to prioritize program and project requirements as developed from the teams. The conservation steering committee is responsible preparing and updating the Conservation Work Plan.

8.6 Project Priorities and Funding

8.6.1 Project/Program Priorities

The Sikes Act and DA policy require preparation and implementation of this INRMP, and therefore, this is a high funding priority according to OMB Circular A-106 rules. This INRMP is a Federal Facilities Compliance Agreement with action required in a published NEPA document, which also qualifies it for high priority funding. There are programs within this INRMP that are required for compliance with other laws and executive orders, especially involving pollution prevention, restoration, wetlands, etc.

The following table (Table 8-4) defines relative importance of projects and programs specifically included within this INRMP. Each category's programs are listed in the order they are first mentioned in this document. USARAK will fund all high priority projects. There are no medium and low priority projects in this INRMP because full implementation is required as mitigation for the Land Withdrawal EIS.

Table 8-4. Project Priorities.

High Project Project	Reference	Area *
Ecosystem Management Plan	Section 3.2.1	All Units
Ecosystem Aerial Monitoring Management Plan	Section 3.2.2	All Units
Training Requirements Integration	Section 4.1.2	All Units
Land Condition-Trend Analysis	Section 4.1.3	1, 2, 3
Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance	Section 4.1.4.1	1, 2, 3
Environmental Awareness	Section 4.1.4.2	All Units
Soil Resources Management Plan	Section 4.2.2.1	1, 2, 3
Soils and Water Quality Management Plan	Section 4.2.2.2	All Units
Monitor Soil and Water Quality	Section 4.2.3.1	1, 2, 3
Soils Planning Level Surveys	Section 4.2.3.2	1, 2
Floristics Planning Level Surveys	Section 4.2.3.3	1, 2
Vegetation Planning Level Surveys	Section 4.2.3.4	1, 2, 3
Topography Planning Level Survey	Section 4.2.3.5	All Units
Surface Water Planning Level Survey	Section 4.2.3.6	All Units
Manage Soil and Water Quality	Section 4.2.4.1	1, 2, 3
Erosion Control and Stream bank Stabilization	Section 4.2.4.2	1, 2, 3
Wetland Management Plan	Section 5.1.2	All Units
Wetlands Monitoring	Section 5.1.3.1	All Units
Wetlands Planning Level Surveys	Section 5.1.3.2	1, 2, 3
Wetlands Management	Section 5.1.4	All Units
Forest Management Plan	Section 5.2.2	1, 2, 3
Forest Inventory	Section 5.2.3	1, 2, 3
Forest Management	Section 5.2.4	1, 2, 3
Fire Management Plan	Section 5.3.2	1, 2, 3
Fire Inventory	Section 5.3.3	1, 2, 3
Fire Management	Section 5.3.4	1, 2, 3
Habitat Management Plan	Section 5.4.2	1, 2, 3
Fish and Wildlife Monitoring	Section 5.4.3.1	1, 2, 3
Fauna Planning Level Surveys	Section 5.4.3.2	1, 2
Fish and Wildlife Management	Section 5.4.4.1	1, 2, 3

High Project Project	Reference	Area *
Habitat Management	Section 5.4.4.2	1, 2, 3
Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Species Management	Section 5.5.4	All Units
Special Interest Areas Management Plan	Section 5.6.2	1, 2
Manage Special Interest Areas	Section 5.6.4	1, 2
Installation Pest Management Plan	Section 5.7.2	1, 2, 3
Natural and Cultural Resources Education and Awareness	Section 6.1.4	All Units
Outdoor Recreation Management Plan	Section 6.2.2	1, 2, 3
Monitor Recreational Use	Section 6.2.3	1, 2, 3
Manage Recreational Use	Section 6.2.4	1, 2, 3
Conservation Enforcement	Section 6.3.4	1, 2, 3
Geographic Information Systems	Section 7.2.4.1	All Units
Program Management	Section 8.2.2	All Units
Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	Section 8.3.1	All Units

* 1 = Donnelly East Training Area
2 = Donnelly West Training Area
3 = Gerstle River Training Area
4 = Black Rapids Training Site
5 = Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area/Fort Wainwright Land Bridge

8.6.2 Funding

Until the latter part of the 1980s, natural resources funding was primarily Operations and Maintenance (O&M) dollars within DPW. As Environmental Funds (internally "fenced" O&M) increased and regular O&M funding decreased, natural resources projects came to rely more heavily upon other sources. Below are general discussions about different sources of funding to implement this INRMP.

8.6.2.1 Forestry Funds

Forestry funds are generated from sale of forest products on military lands and are centrally controlled by the Department of the Army. USARAK may be reimbursed for all costs associated with the maintenance and disposition of forest products. Forestry funds must be used only for projects directly related to forest ecosystem management. Such projects include timber management, reforestation, timber stand improvement, inventories, fire protection, construction and maintenance of timber area access roads, purchase of forestry equipment, disease and insect control, planning (including compliance with laws), marking, inspections, sales preparations, personnel training, and sales. AR 200-3 (Chapter 5) outlines collection and expenditures systems.

Proceeds from forest product sales that exceed reimbursable expenses will be split 60:40 between the local government and the DOD Forestry Reserve Account. Forestry Reserve Account funding requested by USARAK during 2002-2006 is shown in Table 8-5. The forestry reserve account, administered by the Secretary of Defense, may be used for the following:

- Improvements of forest lands.

- Unanticipated contingencies in the administration of forest lands and the production of forest products for which other sources of funds are not available in a timely manner.
- Natural resources management that implements approved plans and agreements; the state of Alaska may use its portion of proceeds for the benefit of public schools and public roads.

Table 8-5. Forestry Reserve Account Funding Requirements 2002-2006.

Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
5.2.2 / Forest Management Plan	$0	$0	$75,000	$0	$0
5.2.3 / Forest Inventory	$55,000	$60,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000
5.2.4 / Forest Management	$55,000	$55,000	$60,000	$60,000	$65,000
TOTAL	**$110,000**	**$115,000**	**$195,000**	**$125,000**	**$130,000**

Forestry funds are generated from the sale of timber on lands where the military controls vegetation management. The sale of timber on withdrawn PL106-65 lands is managed by the BLM, with sales receipts deposited in the U.S. Treasury. USARAK will generate a very small amount of forestry funds from Main Post and Gerstle River in 2002-2006 through its firewood, Christmas tree, and salvage sales program.

8.6.2.2 Agricultural Outlease Funding

Military land will be routinely examined to determine what areas, if any, can be made available for outleases. In accordance with the concept of multiple land use, areas that are required to support the military mission may also be outleased for agricultural purposes. Leasing of land for uses that are compatible with mission requirements can reduce installation maintenance efforts, provide opportunities for accomplishing land maintenance by the lessee at no cost to the installation, provide funds that the Army can use to support leasing efforts and other natural resources requirements, and support community relations and local economy.

All revenues from agriculture and grazing outleases will be deposited to the Army account established for that purpose and will be available through established budget procedures (section 2667, title 10, United States Code (10 USC 2667), Outleasing for Grazing and Agriculture on Military Lands) for:

- Administrative and operational expenses of agricultural leases.
- Initiation, improvement, and perpetuation of agricultural leases.
- Preparation, revisions, and requirements of integrated natural resources management plans.
- Implementation of integrated natural resources management plans.

Requirements for funds derived from lease proceeds are identified annually in the EPR. Agricultural outlease funding requirements are identified in Table 8-6.

Table 8-6. Agricultural Outlease Account Funding Requirements 2002-2006.

Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
4.2.4.1 Manage Soil and Water Quality	$55,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000	$70,000
TOTAL	**$55,000**	**$60,000**	**$60,000**	**$65,000**	**$70,000**

8.6.2.3 Fish and Wildlife Funds

DOD fish and wildlife funds are collected through sales of permits for hunting, trapping or fishing on military controlled lands. They are authorized by the Sikes Act and regulated via AR 200-3 (Chapter 6). These funds may be used only for fish and wildlife management on the installation where they are collected. They cannot be used for recreational activities. They are exempt from equipment purchase amount limitations, and they do not expire (unobligated funds carry over on 1 October). USARAK has not used this source of funding, but this option will be evaluated during 2002-2006.

8.6.2.4 Environmental Funding

Environmental funds are a special category of O&M's budget. The EPR process governs them. They are special in that they are fenced by DOD, but they are still subject to restrictions of O&M funds. "Must fund" classifications include mitigation identified within Findings of No Significant Impact (FNSI), items required within Federal Facilities Compliance Agreements, and planning level surveys. This INRMP is a Federal Facilities Requirement Agreement that contains projects and programs to mitigate various military activities.

Table 8-7 indicates environmental program requirements (including ITAM, other O&M, and Fort Wainwright projects that cover both installations) needed to implement this INRMP.

Table 8-7. Environmental Program Requirements.

EPR Number	Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
FGA01000	3.2.1 Ecosystem Management Plan					$40,000
FGA01000	3.2.2 Aerial Monitoring Management Plan					$25,000
FGA9800010	4.2.2.1 Soil Resources Management Plan	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$40,000
FGA01000	4.2.2.2 Soil and Water Quality Management Plan					$25,000
FGA9900006	4.2.3.1 Monitor Soil and Water Quality	$275,000	$275,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000
FGA9700001	4.2.3.2 Soils Planning Level Surveys	No funding required until FY07.				
FGA9700005	4.2.3.3 Floristics Planning Level Surveys					$75,000
FGA9700002	4.2.3.4 Vegetation Planning Level Surveys					$350,000
FGA01000	4.2.4.1 Manage Soil and Water Quality	Funding identified under agricultural outleasing section				
FGA9800012	4.2.4.2 Erosion Control and Stream bank Stabilization	$75,000	$80,000	$80,000	$85,000	$85,000
FGA9800013	5.1.2 Wetland Management Plan					$25,000

EPR Number	Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
N/A	5.1.3.1 Wetlands Monitoring	Funding identified under LCTA.				
FGA9100019	5.1.3.2 Wetlands Planning Level Surveys	$0	$0	$0	$0	$400,000
FGA9800013	5.1.4 Wetlands Management	$75,000	$80,000	$80,000	$85,000	$85,000
FGA9800021	5.2.2 Forest Management Plan	Funding identified in forestry section.				
FGA9800023	5.2.3 Forest Inventory					
FGA9800024	5.2.4 Forest Management					
FGA9800022	5.3.1 Fire Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$50,000
FGA01000	5.3.2 Fire Inventory	$50,000	$55,000	$55,000	$60,000	$60,000
FGA01000	5.3.4 Fire Management	$60,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000	$70,000
FGA9800014	5.4.2 Habitat Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$40,000
FGA9800017	5.4.3.1 Fish and Wildlife Monitoring	$35,000	$35,000	$40,000	$40,000	$45,000
FGA9800016	5.4.3.2 Fauna Planning Level Surveys	Funding required until FY07.				
FGA9800019	5.4.4.1 Fish and Wildlife Management	$40,000	$45,000	$45,000	$50,000	$50,000
FGA9800018	5.4.4.2 Habitat Management	$55,000	$60,000	$60,000	$65,000	$65,000
FGA01000	5.5.4 Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Species Management	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000
FGA9800011	5.6.2 Special Interest Areas Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$25,000
FGA01000	5.6.4 Manage Special Interest Areas	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000
FGA9900005	5.7.2 Installation Pest Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$50,000	$0
FGA9800030	6.1.4 Natural and Cultural Resources Education and Awareness	$35,000	$35,000	$40,000	$40,000	$45,000
FGA9800025	6.2.2 Outdoor Recreation Management Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$25,000
FGA9800026	6.2.3 Monitor Recreational Use	$45,000	$50,000	$50,000	$55,000	$55,000
FGA9800027	6.2.4 Manage Recreational Use	$80,000	$85,000	$85,000	$90,000	$90,000
FGA9800020	6.3.4 Conservation Enforcement	$205,000	$210,000	$210,000	$215,000	$215,000

EPR Number	Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
FGA01000	7.2.4.1 Geographic Information Systems	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000
FWA9800010	8.2.2 Program Management	$155,000	$160,000	$160,000	$165,000	$165,000
FGA9100018	8.2.3 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$250,000
	TOTAL	$1,460,000	$1,505,000	$1,320,000	$1,415,000	$2,675,000

Thus, the total environmental fund budget for this INRMP is estimated at $8,375,000 for 2002-2006. These estimates will be adjusted each year as needed.

8.6.2.5 Training Funds

In FY 95, proponency for the ITAM program was transferred from Environmental to Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations and Plans (ODCSOPS), the military training side of the Army. Training funds set aside for ITAM are not internally fenced as are environmental funds.

Fort Greely and Donnelly Training Area and the other two Alaska Army posts are classified together as a Category I installation. Category I installations are estimated to have average annual ITAM costs of $1,036,000 with the understanding that special circumstances may dictate changes in these numbers (which must be justified). Instructions for the ITAM budget submittal (ODCSOPS 1995a) state that ITAM funding requests will not contain projects that fall within Conservation Compliance. The total ITAM budget for this INRMP is estimated at $2,099,500 for 2002-2006. These estimates will be adjusted, as needed, each year.

Table 8-8. ITAM Funding Requirements during 2002-2006.

Section / Project	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
4.1.2 Training Requirements Integration	$83,750	$85,000	$86,250	$87,500	$88,750
4.1.3 Land Condition-Trend Analysis	$80,000	$81,000	$82,000	$83,000	$84,000
4.1.4.1 Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance	$61,000	$185,000	$362,000	$286,000	$357,000
4.1.4.2 Environmental Awareness	$1,000	$3,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
TOTAL	**$225,750**	**$354,000**	**$531,250**	**$457,500**	**$530,750**

8.6.2.6 Other Funding

The Legacy Program remains an additional source of funding. However, funding for the Legacy Program has been greatly reduced over past levels. The only types of Legacy projects available for funding are large projects, regional in scope, involving many other agencies as partners. While USARAK will continue to seek Legacy funding, it is not expected to be a viable source for implementing this INRMP. The law authorizing the program is still in effect, and this allows the DOD to enter into cooperative

agreements to conduct projects that "implement the purposes of the Legacy Resources Management Program" (see P.L. 101-511 [FY 91 Appropriations Act, Sec. 8120]), whether or not separately earmarked Legacy money is available. USARAK intends to use such cooperative agreements during 2002-2006.

8.6.3 INRMP Implementation Costs

Specific costs for each program and project are difficult to predict, especially considering that future events affect many programs. The average annual costs below are estimated by types of funding:

Forestry: $135,000
Agricultural Outleasing: $62,000
Fish and Wildlife: $0 unless a permit system is installed.
Environmental: $1,675,000 for projects that qualify for environmental funding.
Training: $419,850 for ITAM.

Average annual funding to implement this INRMP will be $2,291,850. The five-year cost of implementing this INRMP will likely be about $11,459,250.

Above costs do not include related organizations such as the Provost Marshal's Office (PMO) and Outdoor Recreation, nor do they include costs incurred by other agencies such as ADF&G and BLM. Some funds above, however, are planned to be used to support these programs run by other organizations and agencies. It is also noted that it is difficult to determine which costs are natural resources and which are environmental since the two are so closely related at USARAK. Pest management costs are not included.

8.7 Command Support

Command support is essential for implementation of this INRMP. Without this support, priority projects for natural resources management will not occur. Failure to execute these projects risks violation of environmental laws, reduced mission readiness, and negative public reaction to a lack of environmental stewardship. The Installation Commander is responsible for compliance with environmental laws and sets the tone for environmental stewardship. Command emphasis on this INRMP ensures a healthy environment, sustainable resources, and quality future training lands.