

Denali National Park and Preserve

Question: Mr. Horn, why did Congress add all these new parklands to old Mt. McKinley (New Denali)?

Answer: According to the Senate Energy Committee, "The prime resource for which the north addition is established is the critical range necessary to support populations of moose, wolf, and caribou as part of an integral ecosystem."

(Senate Committee Report 1979, p.166)

According to the House Interior Committee,

"Lowland areas in the southern addition provide ecologic diversity and opportunity for recreation and access. The Chelatna Lake area would provide much improved access for the people of Anchorage to the area in a setting that is extremely scenic and educational. A possible cooperative development site with the State at the foot of the Tokasitna Glacier would provide similar opportunities. Activities originating at these sites can include scenic viewing, camping, hiking, backpacking, nature study, photography, and mountain climbing. Also included in the southern lowlands is a small unit of critically important caribou habitat."

Question: Mr. Horn, how would you describe the Park landscape left in the Park additions by S. 49?

Answer: S. 49 converts all of the north park addition to preserve and leaves only very high ice and rock in the park on the south side. For all practical purposes, S. 49 does away with all of the usable parkland and wildlife habitat added by Congress.

Question: On the south side, the Administration changes most of the key park lowland habitat to preserve too. In view of the Park Service's plan to develop the Tokasitna Kahiltwa park area as the park's primary visitor use area, and the Administration's goal of avoiding hunter/non-hunter conflicts in areas slated for major visitation, why are you proposing to create just such a conflict with your recommendation?

Answer: No satisfactory answer possible to the Administration's contradictory position.

Question: What is the extent of subsistence in the park additions (The ANILCA Mt. McKinley was and remains closed to subsistence)?

Answer: Some trapping along Fairbanks-Anchorage Highway by residents along road and in Cantwell. About a dozen subsistence permits issued to people outside "subsistence residence zones." Also trapping by the handful of residents of Lake Minchumina in the existing Preserve, and to a lesser extent in the north Park addition, but mainly on the edge of the park. Overwhelmingly, the park additions are core sanctuaries for wildlife.

Question: In view of the insignificant amount of subsistence hunting in the park additions, can subsistence be used to justify letting the sport hunters into the core park sanctuaries?

Answer: Clearly, no.

Question: In your statement, you justify your massive park to preserve change in the north addition by noting that "preserve status would facilitate the trapping operations that had been conducted there for years, mostly by people from the Lake Minchumina area."

But isn't Lake Minchumina a "subsistence residence zone," that allows all of the residents to continue trapping, (and hunting) where traditionally done, in the new park addition?

Answer: Changing the designation of these lands from park to preserve status will not benefit and can only hurt subsistence hunting and trapping which are already permitted.