SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892
Explore, enjoy and protect the planet

Sierra Borealis
alaska report

SIERRA CLUB ALASKA CHAPTER
JUNE 2018

National Preserves threatened:

Trump/Zinke move to nix key Alaska wildlife protection

Your comment needed by July 21

On May 22 Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke proposed a rule that would cancel an existing National Park Service rule for the national preserves that now prohibits:

- Baiting brown and black bears at bait stations;
- Hunting and trapping wolves and coyotes (including pups) from May 1 through August 9;
- Using artificial light in hunting black bears at den sites and in dens, including cubs and sows with clubs;
- Using dogs to hunt big game; and
- Shooting big game that is swimming.[1]

The purpose of the Secretary's proposal is to restore recent Alaska Board of Game (BOG) regulations that allowed sport hunters and trappers to engage in the above practices while in the preserves.

Background

The proposed rule follows Zinke's two 2017 Secretarial Orders directing the Interior Department to increase access for hunting and fishing on the public lands and collaboration with the states, tribes, and territories. In his September order Zinke directed the Department to:

> work in close coordination and cooperation with the appropriate state wildlife agency to begin the necessary process to modify regulations in order to advance shared wildlife conservation goals/objectives that align with predator management programs, seasons, and methods of take permitted on all Department-managed lands and waters with corresponding programs, seasons, and methods established by state wildlife management agencies.

Of Alaska's ten national preserves totaling 22 million acres, seven adjoin national parks.

The NPS adopted its existing rule in 2015 in response to the Board of Game's intrangisence:

> "While the NPS prefers a state solution to these conflicts, the [State] has been mostly unwilling to accommodate the different management directives for NPS areas. In the last 10 years, the NPS has objected to more than 50 proposals to liberalize predator harvest in areas that included National Preserves and each time the BOG has been unwilling to exclude National Preserves from state regulations designed to manipulate predator/prey dynamics for human consumptive use goals."

-- continued on page 2

1 Shooting big game that is swimming is prohibited by the State, with an exception that allows shooting a swimming caribou from a boat under power or otherwise, and shooting a caribou that has made it to the shore while the hunter is still in the boat under power. State law also bans using dogs to hunt big game, except that dogs can be used to hunt black bears. The existing NPS rule does not allow these exceptions.

NPS Wildlife Protection Rule *-- from page 1*

Action Alert

The NPS's different management objectives" for the protection of wildlife in the preserves and parks are found in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), the NPS Organic Act, other laws on wildlife management in the park system, and NPS policy.

When the NPS finalized its existing rule, it summarized the reasons for prohibiting baiting brown and black bears:

"The NPS proposed prohibiting the harvest of brown bears over bait to avoid public safety issues, to avoid food-conditioning bears and other species, and to maintain natural bear behavior as required by NPS law and policy. Baiting tends to occur in accessible areas used by multiple user groups, which contributes to public safety concerns associated with baiting ."

Flawed Environmental Assessment Procedure

The proposed rule comes with a 60-day review period that began May 22, with an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the rule delayed. The regular procedure makes an EA available when the proposed rule is announced. For example, an EA accompanied the Service's 2016 rule when it was first proposed in 2014.

According to the NPS in Alaska, "We hope to put an EA analyzing the impacts of the proposed rule on public review within the next couple of months, preferably within the 60 day rule comment timeframe." The Federal Register notice of the proposed rule makes no mention of extending the comment period when an EA is eventually issued]. This indicates that the new rule is being fast-tracked, probably in order to have a new final rule in place for this fall's hunting season.)

WHAT YOU CAN DO:

- Let the NPS know that you strongly oppose the proposed rule.
- Cite the NPS's reasons for adopting the existing rule.
- Urge the NPS to include a new 60-day comment period when it eventually unveils the promised EA.

Address:

National Park Service, Alaska Regional Office
240 W. 5th Avenue, Anchorage, AK 99501

How to send your comments on the EA -- two ways

1. Go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: http:// www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the EA electronically:
2. Mail or hand deliver to: National Park Service, Regional Director, Alaska Regional Office, 240 West 5th Ave., Anchorage, AK 99501.

Instructions for BOTH methods:

Comments will not be accepted by fax, email, or in any way other than those specified above. All submissions received must include the words "National Park Service" or "NPS" and must include the docket number or RIN (1024–AE38) for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided.

• FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Herbert C. Frost, Regional Director, Alaska Regional Office, 240 West 5th Ave., Anchorage, AK 99501. Phone (907) 644–3510. Email: AKR_ Regulations@nps.gov.

To access the Docket: to read background documents or comments received, go to http:// www.regulations.gov ❖

-- Jack Hession

.Political training opportunity in Anchorage and Fairbanks

Learn to be an Effective Advocate for Wildlife and for Conservation of Wildlands in Alaska

Ariel Hayes, Deputy Political Campaign Director for the Sierra Club, will give practical political training presentations to interested environmentalists in both Anchorage and Fairbanks in late June.

Arial will be in Anchorage Sunday, June 24 and in Fairbanks Monday, June 25. Both events are from 4-6 pm, then continuing from 6:30 to 8 pm after a dinner break.

Anchorage location is the Alaska Chapter office at 601 W 5th Ave, Anchorage, AK 99501. In **Fairbanks,** it's at the Noel Wien Library auditorium, 1215 Cowles Street.

Some Alaska state legislators may also be present as participants.

Ariel Hayes works in the Club's legislative office in Washington DC and gives staff support to the Club's volunteer-led National Political Team. The Team's website says:

" The mission of the Sierra Club Political Team is to preserve the environment through bipartisan grassroots political action."

The goals of the Political team are: "to elect candidates who will support and promote environmental protection, to raise public awareness about environmental protection, to raise public awareness about environmental issues and elevate the priority of these issues for decision-makers; to encourage Club members and other environmentalists to participate in the political process; to advance the Club's conservation agenda by building relationships with legislators and other elected officials, and to strengthen the Sierra Club as an organization."

The June political training events will also offer a good chance for Alaskans to let Sierra Club's political experts know of our special political challenges in this state in our efforts to protect wildlife, wildlands, and in dealing with our own state legislators, especially the Alaska State Senate.

If you can volunteer in either Anchorage or Fairbanks in calling potentially interested local residents during the week before the training events, please let me know. I will welcome help in notifying people who might be interested. ❖

-- Susan Hansen,
Fairbanks, Alaska
Chapter wildlife
chair
(818) 614-2734

A big day for the Arctic Refuge

Pressure against drilling ramps up at two big events

May 30th was a big day for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In two separate much-publicized events—one in California and one in Alaska—Sierra Club demonstrated and elevated widespread opposition to drilling in the Arctic Refuge by publicly calling on Chevron to disavow drilling and turning out Sierra Club Alaska Chapter activists to one of several public hearings. Our work with grassroots activists, led by the Defend the Sacred-Alaska Coalition, at the Anchorage Bureau of Land Management (BLM) scoping hearing on proposed Arctic Refuge drilling and our presence at the Chevron Corporation's annual meeting in San Ramon, California—in the suburban San Francisco Bay Area—aimed to support the vehement opposition to drilling of the Gwich'in Alaska Native people.

Ben Cushing, Sierra Club Beyond Dirty Fuels Campaign Representative, spoke on behalf of the Club and read a statement from the Gwich'in Steering Committee at Chevron's annual shareholders meeting at their California headquarters--calling on the company not to pursue any oil and gas development in the Arctic Refuge. In response to a direct question from Ben on the company's position on the Refuge, Chevron officials indicated they are "obligated" to explore the potential but are watching public comment and review periods closely.

photo: Alli Harvey

May 30 rally in Anchorage outside Arctic-leasing hearing

This ties into the ongoing scoping period on proposed leasing in the coastal plain, where Arctic activists have also been demonstrating widespread public opposition. In Anchorage on May 30, more than 100 Alaskans marched outside in front of the BLM's scoping hearing to stand with the Gwich'in in opposing drilling. The hearing itself was in a windowless, cavernous convention center filled with BLM staffers intent on following Administration direction; - outside was where the public action took place. Families held colorful banners, signs, and wooden multicolored caribou cutouts. The rally was organized by the Defend the Sacred Alaska Coalition based in Alaska. Indigenous elders and youth were at front and center of the entire event, which after the rally ended up inside to offer the formal public testimony. Eighteen people testified in favor of drilling in the coastal plain versus 43 opposed—an unbalance significant in Alaska.

Press coverage in Alaska of the May 29 Fairbanks and May 30 Anchorage scoping hearings emphasized the "big crowd" and the "heated opposition" .

The DC-based Energy & Environment News story quoted from Bernadette Demientieff, executive director of the Gwich'in Steering Committee; Lena Moffitt, Senior director of the Sierra Club's Our Wild America Campaign, and Ben Cushing, as follows:

"This place, the calving grounds of the Porcupine caribou herd and the sacred place where life begins, cannot be destroyed," Bernadette Demeienteff said in a statement. "We will not allow our last untouched ecosystem to be stolen for greed."

Lena Moffitt, Sierra Club's Our Wild America Campaign director, said Chevron and other oil companies eyeing oil investment in the Arctic refuge "are at a crossroads." She emphasized: "They can side with a growing number of investors, tribes, environmental advocates and climate justice groups by pledging to stay out of the Arctic Refuge and instead invest in the clean energy of the future, or they can risk losing their social license and trillions in funds in pursuit of the dirty fuels of the past."

The E&E News on May 30 also gave basic information on the planning process: "The Interior Department's current 60-day comment period on plans for a proposed lease sale ends on June 19. BLM plans to issue a proposed environmental impact assessment this fall, with a final version wrapped up in early 2019. Regulators want to offer leases in the Arctic Refuge coastal plain by late 2019.

"Drilling opponents petitioned the BLM to give the public at least 60 more days to comment on the impacts of drilling, and demanded that regulators schedule additional scoping meetings in several small Alaska Native villages and in the Canadian Yukon. Currently, the BLM has scheduled four public scoping meetings in Alaska villages, two in the state's major cities, and a final session on June 15 in Washington, D.C."

https://www.eenews.net/energywire/stories/1060083161

Leasing applications start

The following day saw the announcement that three companies, including two Alaska Native corporations, have filed a joint application to conduct seismic testing in the coastal plain. In coordination with the Gwich'in Steering Committee, Sierra Club issued a strong statement coming out against any seismic testing in the coastal plain and clarifying that Alaska Native corporations do not speak for Alaska Native Tribes.

Both the Anchorage Daily News and Washington Post pointed to Administration doubts *--continued p. 4*

Arctic Refuge fight against drilling -- *from page 3*

about the new applications: According to the Washington Post;

"The Interior Department's initial response to the consortium's permit application was scathing. 'This plan is not adequate,' Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service said in a reply to the seismic application, adding that it showed 'a lack of applicable details for proper agency review.' Copies of the permit application and the Fish and Wildlife Service reply were obtained by The Washington Post.

"The Alaska office of the Bureau of Land Management said in an email Wednesday that it was still reviewing the application. But the exchange over the permit highlights the difficulties of

"We will not allow our last untouched ecosystem to be stolen for greed."
-- Bernadette Demientieff, Gwich'in Steering Committee

bringing to fruition a signature energy project of Trump and his fellow Republicans.

"The oil services firm and project operator SAExploration said that 'this partnership is dedicated to minimizing the effect of our operations on the environment.' It said it would deploy sleds, smaller vehicles and biodegradable lubricants, and would construct ice roads.

"But the proposal for seismic work included two 150-strong teams of workers, airstrips, giant sleds and special vehicles that create vibrations similar to those created by dynamite to search for and map underground oil or natural gas reserves.

"The Fish and Wildlife Service complained that the permit application — the only one filed so far — failed to provide studies about the effects of the seismic work and equipment on wildlife, the tundra and the aquatic conditions in the refuge."

Photo: Fish and Wildlife Service/Wikipedia

Environmentalists and indigenous groups are pressuring Chevron Corp. not to drill for oil in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, located north of the Brooks Range mountains.

For background on the long-standing opposition of Sierra Club and others to allow oil development in this remote, wildlife-rich corner of northeast Alaska, sacred to the G'wichin people, see **sierra borealis**, March, Sept and Dec 2017, and many issues previously.) ❖

-- Alli Harvey

What you should know about the Arctic Refuge and ANILCA

(Chapter Chair Christin Anderson sent us this essay and said: "The article below was written as a public comment to the BLM by Julianne Warren, and she gave me permission to forward it to you for publication if you wish to use it. ")

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (PL 96-487 often abbreviated as ANILCA) expanded the pre-existing 8.9 million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Range, which included the coastal plain, to the 19.6 million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. All of the original Range except the coastal plain was designated "wilderness area". The coastal plain was left out because of potential oil and gas underneath it. The destiny of the coastal plain has been contested ever since.

The coastal plain is also sometimes called the 1002 Area because Section 1002 of ANILCA applies to it. Section 1002 calls for "Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Coastal Plain Resource Assessment." At the Fairbanks Scoping Meeting of May 29, 2018, James Warren, a retired English Professor, gave a professional reader's reading of this section. First, Section 1002 calls for a "comprehensive and continuing inventory and assessment of the fish and wildlife resources of the coastal plain." Secondly, Section 1002 calls for "an analysis of the impacts, of oil and gas exploration, development, and production." This begs the question: "impacts" on whom or what? The first part of Section 1002 of ANILCA sets up fish and wildlife as primary values as does the requirement that authorized exploratory activities be done in a way that "avoids significant adverse effects on the fish and wildlife and other resources." The overarching Purposes of the Act, set out in Section 101, also make clear that the *whom* or *what* are fish and wildlife and "nationally significant natural, scenic, historic, archeological, geological, scientific, wilderness, cultural, recreational, and wildlife values," which are for present and future generations' "benefit, use, education and inspiration." It is also the intent of ANILCA "to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence way of life to continue to do so." This applies to the Gwich'in people, who depend upon the Porcupine caribou herd, which uses the coastal plain in summer as their birthing ground, as well as other Alaska Native Peoples.

According to ANILCA, including with reference to the 1002 Section, oil and gas activities may proceed only if they can do so without adverse effects on the ecological health of the coastal plain as habitat. Oil and gas activities may proceed only if they can do so in accordance with the Section 101 Purpose of ANILCA (detailed in Section 810), including protecting subsistence needs of the area's interdependent peoples.

For millennia, the Gwich'in people have depended —nutritionally, culturally, and -- *continued page 5*

Environmentalism and political ideology

I teach psychology at UAA. My expertise is in "cognition"—topics such as memory, language comprehension, decision making, etc. I am particularly interested in the psychology of political belief or ideology. Here, I would like to share my understanding of political ideology and its relation to environmentalism, because this discussion may help in understanding where environmentalism might be heading.

In current US politics Republicans and Democrats are sharply divided, with Democrats generally favoring more environmental regulations and Republicans favoring less regulation. Why so sharp a division? Recent research indicates that conservative and progressive ideologies are associated with different moral foundations. There are three key moral foundation domains to which people are generally sensitive. They are, roughly speaking:

- care of the individual (should not hurt others but care for them);
- group loyalty (conform to recognized societal authority such as government);
- purity/sanctity (something is sacred such as life and soul, and violation of that evokes disgust).

People with a progressive/liberal moral foundation mostly care about individuals; if caring for an individual is in conflict with another moral domain they prioritize individual caring (e.g, religious belief and authority are less important than an individual woman's right to choose). One can characterize liberal ideology as based on "empathy" because liberals tend to seek to maximize the quality of individual well-being as well as maximizing the number of people (possibly including other living creatures, animals) who receive that quality care (e.g., safe net, educational support from government.

On the other hand, conservatives lean toward the other two domains. Although conservatives may care about individual well-being, whether they feel empathy for a given individual depends on whether the individual (or a certain group) is seen as a legitimate member of their own social group. This may explain conservatives' lack of empathy to LGBTQ community members. Conservatives tend to see these communities' actions as violation of their own perceived sanctity of the body and the discipline that they associate with it; thus those engaged in such actions are viewed as outsiders who do not deserve empathy.

Conservative sensitivity to group loyalty and perceived sanctity may be related to concerns about threats. They have a higher fear perception, some of which may be biological. Conservatives tend to view the world as a dangerous jungle where individuals need to constantly fight to survive. Such fears lead to leaning on authority, and thus higher tolerance of inequality, with a consequent lower level of empathy to others who are weaker or unfortunate. Higher sensitivity to fear/threat drives conservatives to prefer

-- continued page 6

Have you seen the latest (June 2018) National Geographic magazine article on the Arctic Refuge, highlighting its REAL wildlife values? Worth taking a look if you can!

What You Hould Know-Arctic Refuge and ANILCA *-- from page 4*

spiritually--on the Porcupine caribou herd [named after northern Canada's Porcupine River, near their winter habitat] who birth on the coastal plain. Caribou make up 80 percent of the Gwich'in subsistence diet. As Bernadette Demientieff, director of The Gwich'in Steering Committee, stresses, "My elders are my scientists. They have been living in this area a lot longer than anybody else. And, when they say this [oil and gas activities] is the wrong thing to do, when they say that our way of life is at risk, I'm gonna take their word before anybody else's. They know our animals."

Scientists report evidence that caribou cows with newborn calves are particularly sensitive to disruptions. They will move as much as one and a half miles away from human disturbance. Within the unique coastal plain, which is a relatively narrow [undulating plain between the Arctic Ocean and the Brooks Range of mountains], there is not much alternative space into which displaced cows could move their young.

BLM would need to be able to give highly certain evidence that oil and gas activities will not breach the purposes of [the Refuge as given in] ANILCA, which are primarily to protect fish and wildlife—caribou as well as musk oxen, polar bears, over 135 kinds of birds, plants, soils and the permafrost upholding them--and other natural values as well as cultural values, including traditional subsistence for present and future generations. There is already plenty of evidence that oil and gas activities and ANILCA's primary purposes are not compatible. BLM must respect this evidence, particularly taking into account the knowledge of Gwich'in and other Alaska Natives who know this land better than anyone else and have been responsible to it for longer than anyone else. ❖

(Julianne Warren has a Ph.D. in Wildlife Ecology. She has authored Aldo Leopold's Odyssey and other writings on human-ecosphere interrelations. She is a resident of Fairbanks, Alaska. More here: www.coyotetrail.net.)

Sources: https://www.wilderness.net/NWPS/documents/publiclaws/PDF/96-487.pdf
For Bernadette's quote: http://kalw.org/post/gwichin-nation-resisting-drilling-arctic-refuge-matter-survival#stream/0 and, for the line on the 1.5 mi mvmt of caribou: http://arcticcircle.uconn.edu/ANWR/anwr_fws.htm.

Environmentalism & political idedology *-- from page 5*

the status quo for the stability of an existing social order or group. Connection between conservative ideology and fear perception is well established. For example, manipulation to increase perceived fears and threats can move people's political ideology to be even more rigidly conservative.

Knowing the psychological basis of political ideologies helps us understand why and how conservatives and liberals are also divided in environmental policies. Chronic fears regarding threats tend to make conservatives favor economic expansion and growth—to counter threats to the US from other countries (e.g., China, Russia, or other rogue states). Some may even argue that "Nature" or the broader environment is itself a potential threat to the society, due to the uncertainty of controlling it. Therefore, it should be maximally controlled, or managed, to increase security and stability of life. Such views would make it difficult for people to see and recognize the environment as our very home --that requires our care. So conservatives' lack of attention to scientific facts regarding climate change and environmental risk is more likely a symptom not a cause of unwillingness to act on climate change and other environmental issues.

How do liberals act for the environment?

At least part of a liberal's love of environment is driven by empathy or care extended to other animals and living things as fellow community members. Liberals may even anthropolomize Nature as if it were some sort of being that requires care. Although some may argue that a liberal's care of environment and nature is rational, and based on scientific knowledge, I think that knowledge and reason are likely to follow the basic belief. Knowledge helps to justify a belief, but it is less likely to cause it.

Here are two ideas that emerge from this discussion, in my mind. First, engaging conservatives into the empathy-based environmentalism practiced by liberals is not going to work--it just does not resonate with their view of the world; they do not see Nature and the environment in that way. Instead, it may be more feasible to encourage conservatives to act for the environment by linking it to conservation and discipline based on their spiritual value on sanctity, maybe religious sanctity.

Here in Alaska we can see such disciplined traditional environmentalism by Alaska Natives living in remote villages. They practice a different form of environmentalism than the lifestyle of many liberal environmentalists in big cities. They hunt, trap, and kill animals, but they often do so in a disciplined way that preserves the health of the ecosystem. Their traditional subsistence life is not easy, but they manage to continue to live with strict observance of the culture of their community. I believe we have a lot to learn from that conservative form of environmentalism which has worked in many parts of the world before the introduction of modern mechanized lifestyle.

The second point is about ourselves in the Sierra Club, so-called liberal environmentalists. How far can we can hold to our form of environmentalism? Can we stick to this version of environmentalism as we strive to save this planet from environmental catastrophe even if that involves some inconvenience, changing our habits, such as eating meat less often—if at all, having only one car per household, living in a much smaller house, giving up pets, etc.? We may not be able to avoid environmental catastrophe without significant reduction in use of economic resources. The size of economic output is tied to energy consumption and exploitation of the environment.

An irony is that environmentalism as held among liberal/progressives may in large part depend on the very economic expansion that caused the environmental problem itself. While the empathy to other animal friends and Mother Nature is desirable, how much of that is the byproduct of wealth and security of a modern society that lives in separation from "true nature?" We just enjoy "Nature" on the internet, in movies, and books as a leisure time convenience. In reality, Nature, by definition, is often inconvenient and dangerous. (For example, the mosquito is an important part of the environment that ultimately supports other wildlife, but it is nuisance for our human life.) Also--a majority of life on the earth is micro organisms that we cannot even see.

Progressives may well adopt a more conservative attitude when faced with the prospect of giving up this comfortable life. While I believe our empathy to natural environment and wildlife is important, I wonder how much of that is an isolated set of hobby-like activity fostered by the highly unnatural life we live most of the time—and how much can be sustained even in a sharply changing time? I believe we all should think about this carefully and seriously because just sending more Democrats to congress and the presidency is not enough. We all need to think how much we are willing to change at the individual level to save the earth's environment; it is impossible to maximize all the good things simultaneously, one researcher said, and I tend to agree with that. ❖

-- Yasuhiro Ozuru

Update

Federal Subsistence Board targets bears

At its April meeting this year the Federal Subsistence Board voted 7-1 to adopt a regulation that allows human food and bear scent, not just natural bait, at bear baiting stations on the public lands. Human food includes grease, popcorn, bacon, donuts, dog food etc. Natural bait includes the inedible remains of legally bagged animals and fish. The Board's action "aligns" the new rule with the State's regulation that allows both types of bait and bear scent at bait stations under state permits, (see **sierra borealis** March 2018, December 2017, June 2016)

The new rule applies to national wildlife refuges, national forests, wild and scenic rivers, designated wilderness areas, and BLM lands, but not to national park system units open to subsistence where only natural bait is allowed to bait black bears. (Brown bears can be baited in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, the only national park in Alaska in which brown bear baiting is permitted.)

Voting for the regulation were the Board's three subsistence representatives, and the BIA, BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service regional directors. Nine of the Board's ten regional advisory councils (the tenth took no position) and the State supported the proposed regulation. The NPS rrepresentative, Regional Director Bert Frost, voted against the regulation even though it doesn't apply to NPS areas.

Over the objections of the NPS, FWS, and the BLM members, the Board also voted 5-3 to amend a regulation for only one brown/grizzly a year, June and July closed, to two a year, with no closed season in Game Management Unit 23 that encloses two national wildlife refuges and five national park system units in northwest Arctic Alaska. ❖

-- Jack Hession

Sierra Club Local Outings

The Alaska Chapter is cooperating with Alaska Trail Stewards, who offer opportunities to volunteer for some summer projects at the BEST time of year to GET OUTDOORS! (Even the White House thinks so--see below.)

Here are two July stewardship outings: Helping to get useful work done is a great way to enjoy the outdoors!

July 7, 2018

Middle Fork Trail - Volunteer Saturday July 7th

Glen Alps Trailhead Rest Area

To REGISTER-- go to https://www.eventbrite.com/e/middle-fork-trail-volunteer-saturday-july-7th-tickets-46338955062

July 24, 2018

Turnagain Arm Trail Volunteer TUESDAY

Rainbow Trailhead

To REGISTER--go to https://www.eventbrite.com/e/turnagain-arm-trail-volunteer-tuesday-tickets-46366371064

Check our Facebook page, **https://www.facebook.com/SierraClubAlaska/** for more outings as they get listed. And remember to let us know YOUR favorite trails and outdoor campsites! ❖

White House proclaims June Great Outdoors Month

During Great Outdoors Month, we celebrate the unmatched magnificence of our Nation's mountains, waters, canyons, and coastlines. Spending time in the great outdoors, especially during summer, is an American tradition. Every American should take the opportunity to enjoy the beauty of our natural wonders, which stretch from coast to coast and beyond.

As Americans, we are blessed with many stunning lands and waters that surround each of our communities. Our numerous forests, wildlife refuges, and local parks offer endless opportunities for recreation, adventure, and renewal. Early morning fishing trips, the splendid beauty of a sunset and the thrill of summiting mountain peaks with friends create lasting memories.

My Administration has made access to public land a top priority. We have modified national monuments to enhance public use and enjoyment of nearly two million acres of public land in Utah, *[sic!]* and opened or expanded hunting and fishing access at 10 national wildlife refuges across the country. The splendor of our country's treasured lands is a source of national pride, ...and I encourage all Americans to step outside and appreciate America's natural beauty and to practice good stewardship of our environment. By enjoying our great outdoors, we enhance our collective efforts to preserve our natural lands and waters, protecting them for future generations....

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me...do hereby proclaim June 2018 as Great Outdoors Month. ❖

Book Review

Prince William Sound – A Wild Promise *-- new "knock your socks off" book by Debbie S. Miller*

-- reviewed by Vicky Hoover

If you have been to a beautiful area and have spent some highly memorable times of your life there and have been angered for many years about the area's lack of formal wilderness protection– wouldn't you naturally be inclined to enthuse about a book whose abundant breathtaking photographs made you ooh and aah and whose descriptive prose says so much more eloquently that you could – what you feel about this special place?

Does such a bias disqualify a would-be book reviewer ?

If so, that is just tough, because that is my situation regarding Prince William Sound and it isn't stopping me from telling you about the remarkable book that writer Debbie Miller and nature photographer Hugh Rose have produced. Prince William Sound is an undervalued Alaska treasure--so near Anchorage. The remote Arctic Refuge (also a treasure) gets more hype—even the larger Tongass Forest is viewed as glitzier.

But Prince William Sound, jewel of the Chugach National Forest, has America's largest legislated wilderness study area (WSA)—and this book describes travels within the Nellie Juan-College Fjord WSA – and its amazing land and seascape: a coastal zone and wildlife "that have no boundary between land and sea."

Debbie S. Miller has been a heralded conservation writer since the late 1980s when Sierra Club published her first--now classic-- book, *Midnight Wilderness*, about the then-virtually unknown Arctic Refuge. She's also writen some delightful children's books. The Forest Service's inadequate recommendations for wilderness for Prince William Sound, combined with opportunities to strengthen those recommendations during the present long-drawn out forest plan revision, brought Debbie south from Fairbanks to explore and study the Sound. Her partnership with photographer Hugh Rose and with Braided River Books has given us a book that will make you want to go there—if you're not already familiar—and it certainly will make you want to help protect the wildness of this extraordinary fusion of land and sea.

The photographs may catch your eye first and keep you turning pages – but then text will enchant you to keep reading on. The pictures and text match perfectly. Debbie can clarify complex biological systems in direct simple terms. She highlights human values too--the role of Native communities as well as more recent settlers who are all intimately connected to this place—which is still recovering from both the 1964 tsunami after Alaska's big earthquake, and the Exxon-Valdez oil spill disaster exactly 25 years later.

The book details several forays into the Sound, on board local conservationist Dean Rand's boat Discovery to view some of the many glaciers in the northern WSA—their receding puts focus on the local impacts of climate change—illustrated sharply by a pair of photos of the Columbia Glacier 30 years ago and recently. This boat trip contrasts with a quiet kayaking interlude among glaciers and service ventures with Forest Service.

Outlook after these forays of exploration? "This is a place too precious to exploit." Debbie ends on a note of political action – we all CAN raise our voices to help to protect this wild Alaska treasure.

In early May, the Alaska Chapter helped host an Anch-orage book-reading event for *A Wild Promise*, highlighting our support for Chugach wilderness.

My only minor grumble was the inadequacy of the one map of the Sound included in the book – definitely not detailed enough. Some of the many places named in the text are not findable on the map. But, no matter, without any doubt--the book gets a "Thumbs Up!"

Hard cover, 176 pp., $29.95.
https://www.braidedriver.org/wild-promise. ❖

Sierra Borealis */ alaska report*

is the newsletter of the Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club

Sierra Club Alaska: 907-276-4088
601 W 5th Ave, Anchorage, AK 99501
This is also the Chapter mail address.

Chapter Directory

Executive Committee:
CHAIR: Christin Anderson <mushroomchristin@gmail.com>
VICE CHAIR: Suzanne Schafer: <suzeqzin@gmail.com>,
SECRETARY: Su Chon: <schon.336@gmail.com>,
COUNCIL DELEGATE: Susan Hansen: <skhansen@ak.net>,
Jared James: <jamesjs@muni.org>,
Yasuhiro Ozuru <yasozuru@gmail.com>
Toshihide Hamazaki <toshihide_hamazaki@yahoo.com>
Roxanna Reynolds <roxyjreynolds@icloud.com>,

Other Officers:
Treasurer: Patrick Fort, Anchorage: c.patrick.fort@gmail.com
Outing Chair: Julie K. Wahl: AKfrogprincess@gmail.com
Webmaster: William Taygan: will.taygan@alaska.sierraclub.org
(Newsletter editor: Vicky Hoover: vicky.hoover@sierraclub.org)

Alaska Field Office:
Dan Ritzman, Alaska Program Director, 206-378-0114,
dan.ritzman@sierraclub.org
Alli Harvey, Our Wild America Campaign Rep, 907-276-4088,
alli.harvey@sierraclub.org

https://www.facebook.com/SierraClubAlaska

SIERRA CLUB

Featured in this issue:

Zinke rule against wildlife	*pp. 1-2*
Political training coming	*p. 2*
Fighting Arctic drilling	*pp. 3-4*
ANILCA and Arctic Refuge	*pp. 4-5*
Political ideology and enviros	*pp. 5-6*
Bear baiting update	*p. 7*
Outings	*p. 7*
Book Review	*p. 8*