

JOSEPH D. DARNELL, REGIONAL SOLICITOR
Office of the Solicitor - Alaska Region
United States Department of the Interior
4230 University Drive, Suite 300
Anchorage, Alaska 99508-4626
(907) 271-4131 / Fax (907) 271-4143
Email: joe.darnell@sol.doi.gov

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS
INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS
801 N. Quincy St., Suite 300
Arlington, Virginia 22203

IBLA No. 2016-0109)	F-31832 (2611), F-31833, F-31845
)	F-31847, F- 31848, F-31846
STATE OF ALASKA)	
)	Alaska Statehood Act
)	Alaska Conveyance Applications

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ANSWER

Comes now the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), by and through undersigned counsel, and herein provides its answer to the Statement of Reasons (SOR) filed by the State of Alaska (State) in the above captioned matter. The State appeals the contents of a February 2, 2016 letter from the BLM which it attempts to characterize as a decision. The February 2, 2016 letter was written in response to a request from the State that BLM convey lands it had selected under section 6(b) of the Alaska Statehood Act, Pub. L. 85-508; 74 Stat. 340 (1958), that were adjacent to the northwest north-south boundary of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The letter responded that the lands identified by the State for conveyance have been part of the Refuge since it was established as the Arctic National Wildlife Range in 1960 and that the surveys delineating that boundary were done in the mid-1960's and the Plats of Survey accepted October 25, 1968. As explained below, the letter was not a

decision by BLM and therefore not subject to an appeal to this Board. Additionally, the surveys which the State actually seeks review of were done by BLM in the 1960's and the plats of survey accepted in 1968. Those survey plats and the decisions based upon them are almost 50 years old. Under the doctrine of administrative finality those surveys plats and the TA decisions deriving from them in 1965 and 1969, and patents from the 1970s are not subject to review by the Board. The State's appeal should be dismissed.

FACTS

In an October 17, 2014, letter to the BLM the State requested priority conveyance of lands it had selected under the Alaska Statehood in six townships located within the Umiat Meridian, T. 7 N., R. 23 E.; T. 7 N., R. 24 E.; T. 8 N., R. 24 E.; T. 8 N., R. 25 E.; T. 9 N., 24 E.; and T. 9 N., R. 25 E.¹ The BLM responded February 2, 2016, informing the State that there were no remaining lands in those townships available for selection because all of the lands were within the boundary of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.² The lands had been part of the Arctic National Wildlife Range since it was established in 1960 by Public Land Order (PLO) 2214, (Dec. 6, 1960); 25 F.R. 12598 – 99 (Dec. 9, 1960).³ The relevant portion of the boundary description in the PLO as it pertains to the lands in the above referenced townships is:

Beginning at the intersection of the International Boundary line between Alaska and Yukon Territory, Canada, with the line of extreme low water of the Arctic Ocean in the Vicinity of Monument 1 of said International Boundary line;

thence westerly along the said line of extreme low water, including all offshore bars, reefs, and islands to a point of land on the Arctic Seacoast known as Brownlow Point, at approximate longitude 145° 51' W. , and latitude 70°10' N.;

¹ The State's October 17, 2014 letter is Exhibit R to the States's SOR and is also part of the BLM case file before the Board. Rather than attaching duplicate exhibits reference will be made to the BLM case file before the Board and the State's exhibits where possible.

² February 2, 2016 Letter in BLM case files F031832; F031833; F031845; F031847; F031848; F031849 (hereinafter February 2, 2016 Letter); also State SOR Ex. I

³ State SOR Ex. H.

thence in a southwesterly direction approximately three (3) miles to the mean high water mark of the extreme west bank of the Canning River;
thence southerly up the said west bank of the Canning River along the mean high water mark approximately seventy (70) miles to the mouth of Marsh Fork of Canning River at approximately longitude 145°53' W., and latitude 69° 12' N., and 10 ½ miles E. of Mt. Salisbury; ...⁴

Contemporaneous with issuance of PLO 2214 was issuance of PLO 2215 which revoked PLO 82 of January 22, 1943 which had reserved lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to support the war effort during World War II. Among the lands covered by PLO 82 were those reserved by PLO 2214 for the contemporaneous establishment of the Range.⁵

In early 1964 the State filed selections under the Statehood Act for the six townships referenced above.⁶ The BLM tentatively approved (TA) conveyance of T. 9 N., R. 24 E., U.M.; and T. 9 N. 25, R. 25 E., U.M. on October 9, 1964.⁷ In a January 15, 1965 decision it tentatively approved conveyance of T. 7 N., R. 23 E., U.M.; T. 7 N., R. 24 E., U.M.; T. 8 N., R 24 E., U.M.; and T.8 N., R 25 E, U.M.⁸ On January 21, 1965 the State requested protractions of PLO 2214 because it stated it was “unable to determine the boundaries of this withdrawal.”⁹ BLM provided copies February 4, 1965.¹⁰ On that same date BLM issued decisions modifying the October 9, 1964, and January 15, 1965 decisions to exclude lands within the Range.¹¹

BLM conducted surveys of the six townships in 1965 with the Plats of Survey being accepted on October 25, 1968.¹² With the filing of the Plats of Survey two decisions were issued, both on February 7, 1969. One partially vacated the October 9, 1964 decision, as

⁴ State SOR Exhibit H.

⁵ *Id.* (PLO 2215, 25 Fed Reg 12599 (December 9, 1960)).

⁶ T. 9 N., R. 24 E., U.M. - F031832; T. 9 N., R. 25 E., U.M. - F031833; T. 7 N., R. 23 E., U.M. - F031845; T. 8 N., R. 24 E., U.M. - F031847; T. 7 N., R. 24 E., U.M. - F031848; T. 8 N., R. 25 E., U.M. - F031849.

⁷ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 1.

⁸ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 2.

⁹ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 3.

¹⁰ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 4.

¹¹ February 2, 2016, Letter Exs. 5 and 6.

¹² February 2, 2016, Letter Exs. 7 – 12.

modified, to reject State selections in four townships in the Umat Meridian, including T. 9 N., R. 25 E., and T. 8 N. R. 25 E. because the townships were entirely within the Range.¹³ The second February 7, 1969 decision (as modified on February 19, 1969) modified the previous TAs to conform to the plats of survey accepted on October 25, 1968.¹⁴ The case files for the townships contain no objections from the State to the surveys nor do they contain any appeals by the State to any of the decisions.

DISCUSSION

A. There is No Decision to Appeal

The Board's jurisdiction is limited to review of final decisions by the BLM. 43 CFR § 4.410(a). The BLM's February 2, 2016, letter contains no decision. It is instead a chronicle of the history during the 1960's and early 1970's of the State's selection of the lands adjacent to the northwest boundary of the then Range, now Refuge, under the Statehood Act with an explanation at the end that there have been no remaining State selected lands in the identified townships since 1969. The February 2, 2016 letter from BLM to the State was not a "decision" so this Board has no jurisdiction given that there is no decision to review. The State's appeal should therefore be dismissed.

B. Doctrine of Administrative Finality Bars Appeal

While BLM does not concede there is a decision to appeal, were the Board to consider the February 2, 2016 letter a decision able to be appealed, the doctrine of administrative finality requires that the Board dismiss the appeal as being untimely.

Under the doctrine of administrative finality the Board will not normally overturn a decision where a party has failed to appeal a decision "and [has] in essence acquiesced to the

¹³ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 13.

¹⁴ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 14.

decision for a prolonged period of time.” *Ida May Rose, Leo G. Comer*, 73 IBLA 97, 99 (1983). Absent compelling legal or equitable reasons for reconsideration, the doctrine of administrative finality, which is the administrative counterpart of *res judicata*, will bar consideration of an agency decision in later proceedings after a party has been given an opportunity for departmental review and did not seek review, or appealed the decision and the decision was affirmed. *Melvin Helit v. Gold Fields Mining Corp.*, 113 IBLA 299, 97 I.D. 109 (1990); *United States v. Vernon E. Jones*, 106 IBLA 230, 246, 95 I.D. 314, 323 (1988). Neither compelling legal or equitable reasons are present here for the Board to act contrary to this well established doctrine.

As set forth in the February 2, 2016 letter BLM letter to the State, and as amply explained in the history chronicled above, the decisions now complained about by the State date back to the mid 1960’s with the first being a Tentative Approval (TA) for two townships being issued October 9, 1964 and a TA for the other four townships being issued just over three months later on January 15, 1965. The State did not appeal either of those TAs. Significantly, it did request on January 21, 1965 protractions of PLO 2214 which established the Range (now Refuge) because it was “unable to determine the boundaries of this withdrawal.”¹⁵ BLM responded February 4, 1965 with the requested protractions.¹⁶ There is no evidence in the case files for any of these selections and TAs that the State appealed, nor is there any explanation now as to why the State waited all this time to question this long established boundary.

BLM then conducted surveys of the six townships in 1965 with Plats of Survey being accepted on October 25, 1968.¹⁷ As explained above, decisions based upon the plats were then issued. The State could have appealed the finalizing of the plats which is the acceptance, or the

¹⁵ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 3.

¹⁶ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 4.

¹⁷ February 2, 2016, Letter Exs. 7 – 12.

issuance of decisions flowing from those surveys taking issue with the surveys, but it did not – which the State admits in its Statement of Reasons.¹⁸

In a February 7, 1969 decision BLM partially vacated the October 8, 1964, TA decision on State selections in four townships in the Umiat Meridian, including T. 9 N., R. 25 E., and T. 8 N., R. 25 E., because the townships were entirely within the Range.¹⁹ A second decision on that same date modified the previous TAs to conform to the plats of survey accepted on October 25, 1968.²⁰ There is nothing in the case files, nor is there evidence offered by the State, that the State ever objected to the decisions or the surveys upon which they were based – the last being issued in 1969, 47 years ago. The surveyed lands tentatively approved to the State were then patented in 1974 (Patents 50-74-0092 and 50-74-0094).²¹ Again, there were no objections from the State when the patents were issued.²²

The State argues that field examinations it has recently conducted “reveal” that the Staines River was “likely” not a distributary of the Canning when the legal boundary for establishment of the Range was written in 1957 at the time application was made for establishment of the Range.²³ It also cites the BLM’s 2012 “Field Notes of the Dependent Resurvey ... to Township 6 North, Range 23 West of the Umiat Meridian”²⁴ for the proposition BLM recognizes that much of the Staines River identified as the ANWR boundary is not a river but instead as “a slight rolling uplift in the arctic tundra.” *Id.* at 9. The State’s quote

¹⁸ SOR at 12.

¹⁹ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 13.

²⁰ February 2, 2016, Letter Ex. 14.

²¹ February 2, 2016, Letter Exs. 15 and 16.

²² This situation is distinguishable from *State of Alaska*, 167 IBLA 250 (2005), where the State appeal was of a decision which flowed from a survey and was thus deemed timely. Here the decisions complained of were not appealed.

²³ SOR 23.

²⁴ State SOR Ex. BB.

is incomplete. The 2012 Field Notes instead state:

This boundary follows the physical features of the most westerly channel of the Canning River, now called the Staines River, identified on the ground by field survey. Said most westerly channel of the Staines River is now only identifiable by a slight rolling uplift in the arctic tundra, which was the physical feature surveyed to create this boundary.

Contrary to the State's assertion, the Field Notes confirm the widely understood determination that the Staines is not a separate river but rather considered to be part of the Canning River.

A distributary is a branch of a river flowing away from the main stream of the river which does not rejoin it, as in the delta of a river.²⁵ The BLM surveyors understood this in 1965 when they conducted the surveys needed to eventually patent to the State the land it had selected. In 1967 when the U.S. Geological Survey published the Dictionary of Alaska Place Names, Geological, Survey Professional Paper 567 it identified the Staines as a distributary of the Canning River and as such part of the Canning River.²⁶ Nothing in the Dependent Resurvey conducted in 2012 changed any of this. That a distributary of the Canning is identified on maps by the name Staines River does not change the underlying fact that it is a distributary of the Canning River and therefore part of the geographic feature named the Canning River identified in the withdrawal for establishment of ANWR as its northwestern boundary in 1960.

The State argues that it has valid selections for unpatented lands in the townships that its filing of reassertions of Statehood Act selections for the subject lands (between December 1978 and November 1980 (SOR 8) and then again in 1981 and 1993 under section 906(e) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA); 43 U.S.C. 1635(e). That the State repeatedly makes selections for lands which have been unavailable for selection since 1960 does not now make them available or reopen the selection process necessitating a new decision. If

²⁵ Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd Ed., 535 (1983).

²⁶ Orth, Dictionary of Alaska Place Names, Geological Survey Professional Paper 567, p. 912 (1967) (copy attached, Exhibit A hereto).

that were the situation there would be no end to the Alaska Statehood land conveyance process so long as the State's full land entitlement under the Statehood Act had not yet been completed and the State continued filing selections or requests for conveyance of lands previously listed in selections which have not been available and the selections for the subject lands rejected.

The State asserts the 1983 ANWR boundary described in accordance to section 103(b) of ANILCA, 16 U.S.C. § 3103(b), attempted to annex additional area into the Refuge along the northwest border.²⁷ The description of the boundary in the 1983 Federal Register notice goes in the reverse direction from that used in PLO 2214. The 1983 description starts at a southern point along the western boundary and then proceeding north until it reaches a specified point on the coast and then east to the Canadian border, whereas the boundary description from the PLO 2214 starts in the East on the Canadian border and then proceeds west before turning south. They both clearly describe the same boundary utilizing the left bank of the Canning River. The boundary description from *U.S. v. Alaska*, 530 U.S. 1021, 1025 (2000), is also substantively in accord with the PLO 2214 description and that used in the 1983 Federal Register notice.

The State offers a critique of how it would have done the surveys versus how they were done by BLM in the 1960s "supported" with numerous exhibits. Suffice it to say there are differences between the State's approach and that used by BLM in the 1965, over 50 years ago. Among the exhibits offered by the State are the survey plats accepted October 25, 1968. Even to the non-surveyor it is abundantly clear when looking at the survey plats – *see* SOR Exhibits T, U, V, and X - that the northwestern boundary for ANWR had been placed by the surveyors along the geographic feature called the Staines River. The western boundary of the Range was no secret. Its location was known by the State of Alaska with the acceptance of the plats by

²⁷ State SOR 6; 48 Fed. Reg. 7890, 7929-30 (Feb. 24, 1983).

BLM in 1968 and subsequent issuance of the Statehood Act TA decisions in 1969 when it partially revoked earlier TAs so as to more accurately identify the lands being approved to which the State did not object. The State's own exhibits to its Statement of Reason prove this overwhelmingly. The State could have objected or appealed those decisions at the time, but it did not. It has offered no explanation for why it did not appeal when it had the opportunity.

CONCLUSION

There is no justification at this late date to revisit surveys and decisions. The Board should not overturn decisions made by BLM decades ago where the State was fully informed at the time of the decision yet failed to object to or appeal. The State has acquiesced to the decision for decades and has offered no justification for its delay. The State has not offered, nor is there any, compelling legal or equitable reasons for reconsideration of decisions made half a century ago. The doctrine of administrative finality should be affirmed here and the State's appeal dismissed as untimely.

Dated this 9th day of August, 2016.



Joseph D. Darnell
Counsel for the Bureau
of Land Management

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE/MAILING

I certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Solicitor, Alaska Region, U.S. Department of the Interior, and I am a person of such age and discretion as to be competent to serve papers. I further certify that on August 9, 2016, I caused the foregoing original BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ANSWER to be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, on the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Arlington, Virginia, with a copy of the same to the following:

CERTIFIED MAIL (RRR):

Michael S. Schechter
Assistant Attorney General
Department of Law
State of Alaska
1031 West 4th Avenue, Suite 200
Anchorage, AK 99501

Courtesy Copy:

Division of Alaska Lands
Alaska State Office
Bureau of Land Management

Lorraine Carter Date 8/19/2016
Lorraine Carter
Administrative Assistant

DICTIONARY OF ALASKA PLACE NAMES

By Donald J. Orth

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY PROFESSIONAL PAPER 567

The principal names listed conform with nomenclature established through decisions of the U.S. Board on Geographic Names or are recognized by the Board as standard names for use on Federal maps and other publications



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON : 1967

EXHIBIT

A

Squirrel Cove: *cove*, 0.5 mi. across, on NE coast of Kenai Penin., at SE end of Passage Canal, 7 mi. NE of Whittier, Chugach Mts.; 60°48'20" N, 148°28'00" W; *BGN 1915*; (map 63).
Name reported in 1914 by USC&GS.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows S 1.5 mi. to Platinum Creek, 25 mi. NE of Cape Newenham, Kilbuck-Kuskokwim Mts.; 58°55'25" N, 161°43'30" W; *BGN 1938*; (map 39).
Local name published in a 1933 U.S. Dept. of Interior mining report.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows E 1.5 mi. to lake on S edge of Red Glacier, 7.5 mi. N of Chinitna Bay and 55 mi. NW of Homer, Aleutian Ra.; 59°59'30" N, 152°56'30" W; (map 50).
Local name reported and published by USGS in the 1950's.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows NE 16 mi. to Tonsina River, 1 mi. N of Tonsina and 53 mi. NE of Valdez, Chugach Mts.; 61°40'05" N, 145°10'00" W; *BGN 1932*; (map 68).
Local name reported in 1930 by USGS.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows NE 0.5 mi., joins Wagner Gulch to form Mills Creek, 46 mi. W of Talkeetna, Alaska Ra.; 62°21'25" N, 151°32'00" W; (map 81).
Prospectors' name reported in 1911 by Capps (1913, fig. 7), USGS.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows SW 20 mi. to Patsy Slough, 6 mi. NE of Nulato, Koyukuk Low.; 64°46' N, 157°56' W; (map 97).
Local name reported in 1954 by USGS.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows NW 1 mi. to Casadepaga River, 14 mi. N of Solomon, Seward Penin. High.; 64°46' N, 164°28' W; (map 95). *Var.* Dewey Creek.
Prospectors' name reported on a 1902 prospectors' manuscript map. Reported as "Dewey" on a 1901 map of Cape Nome gold fields by David Fox, Jr.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, flows NW 18 mi. to Sucker River, 5 mi. E of Fort Yukon, Yukon Flats; 66°34'30" N, 145°05'00" W; (map 119). *Var.* Black River.
Local name reported in 1909 by A. G. Madren (in Brooks and others, 1910, pl. 7), USGS.

Squirrel Creek: *stream*, see Black River.

Squirrel Island: *island*, 1 mi. long, in Prince William Sound, off W coast of Knight I., in Knight Island Passage, 7 mi. NE of Chenega, Chugach Mts.; 60°20'00" N, 147°53'45" W; (map 63).
Local name published in 1910 by USC&GS.

Squirrel Point: *point of land*, near E end and on S shore of Iliamna Lake at the mouth of Pile Bay, 24 mi. SE of Iliamna, Aleutian Ra.; 59°40'30" N, 154°15'00" W; (map 51).
Name published by USGS in 1954.

Squirrel Point: *point of land*, on NE coast of Kenai Penin., 6.5 mi. NE of Whittier, Chugach Mts.; 60°48'20" N, 148°28'30" W; *BGN 1915*; (map 63).
Name reported in 1914 by USC&GS.

Squirrel River: *stream*, flows SE 72 mi. to Kobuk River, 28 mi. NW of Selawik, Hogatza High.;

66°59' N, 160°24' W; (map 114). *Var.* Shee-gar-rik-puk, Shee-leelictok, Shee-lee-li-tok, Shu-shuk-to-ark.

This is a translation of the Eskimo name "sikrikpak," for the hoary marmot, *Marmota caligata broweri*, or "sikrik," for the Parry ground squirrel, *Citellus parryi barrowensis* (Rausch, 1951, p. 178, 179). In 1884 Lt. Cantwell (in Healy, 1889, p. 55), USRCS, called it "Shee-leelictok or squirrel," and a year later he spelled the Eskimo name "Shee-gar-rik-puk" and "Shee-lee-lie-tok" (Healy, 1887, p. 47 and map). Lt. Stoney (1900, map), USN, called it "Squirrel or Shu-shuk-to-ark."

Squirrel River: *stream*, see Black River.

Srednaia: *bay*, see Middle Bay.

Srednaia Bay: *bay*, see Alimuda Bay.

Srednaya Bay: *bay*, see Alimuda Bay.

Sredney, Kamen: *rock*, see Middle Rock.

Sredney, Ostrov: *island*, see Middle Island.

Sredni Bight: *bight*, 1.9 mi. across, 7 mi. NE of Kiska Harbor, on NE coast of Kiska I., Aleutian Is.; 52°03'40" N, 177°38'40" E; (map 14). *Var.* Raven Bay, Soldier Bay.

Russian name "Sredniy," meaning "middle," given in 1935 by the U.S. Navy Hydrog. Office relative to nearby Sredni Point. "Soldier" and "Raven" are names applied by U.S. forces during World War II for tactical purposes.

Srednie Island: *island*, see Middle Island.

Srednie Point: *point of land*, see Middle Point.

Srednie Rock: *rock*, see Middle Rock.

Sredni Island: *island*, see Apple Islands.

Sredni Point: *point of land*, S of Sredni Bight, on NE coast of Kiska I., Aleutian Is.; 52°02'48" N, 177°38'35" E; *BGN 1937*; (map 14).

Russian name "Sredniy," meaning "middle," given in 1935 by the U.S. Navy Hydrog. Office.

Sredniy, Farvater: *water passage*, see Middle Channel.

Sredniy, Kamen: *rock*, see Midway Rock.

Sredniy, Mys: *point of land*, see Middle Point.

Sredniy, Mys: *point of land*, see Nome Cape.

Sredniy, Mys: *point of land*, see Sredni Point.

Srednyaya, Guba: *bay*, see Middle Bay.

Sshitnak: *locality*, see Chitnak.

Ssitkajë: *glacier*, see Davidson Glacier.

Ssköän: *locality*, see Sukkwan.

Stab Creek: *stream*, in Bendeleben Mts., flows NE 3 mi. to Pargon River, 32 mi. SW of Imuruk Lake, Seward Penin. High.; 65°11' N, 163°41' W; (map 110).

Prospectors' name published on the 1908 "Map of Seward Peninsula" by Arthur Gibson.

Stachine River: *stream*, see Stikine River.

Stachin River: *stream*, see Stikine River.

Stachinski Strait: *Water passage*, see Stikine Strait.

Stachtan Nitada: *area*, "discovered by the Russians in 1730" applied to the region east of Bering Strait, that is Alaska; it means "great continent." See Wagner (1937, p. 517) and Thomas Jefferys 1775 chart of "North and

South America including the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, etc."

Stack Island: *island*, 0.3 mi. long, between Behm Canal and Moser Bay, off W coast of Revilagigedo I., 16 mi. N of Ketchikan, Alex. Arch.; 55°33'40" N, 131°41'55" W; (map 3).

Local navigators' name obtained in 1904 by H. C. Fassett, USBF; probably named for Capt. R. Stack [cenna], a local seaman.

Stack Pup: *stream*, flows N 2 mi. to Crooked Creek, 10 mi. W of Central and 36 mi. SW of Circle, Yukon-Tanana High.; 65°33'20" N, 145°09'10" W; (map 104).

Prospectors' name reported in 1954 or 1955 by USGS topographers.

Stadia Rock: *rock*, in Rocky Pass of Keku Strait, 16 mi. SE of Kake, on NE coast of Kuiu I., Alex. Arch.; 56°46'40" N, 133°43'35" W; *BGN 1929*; (map 6).

Named in 1927 by USC&GS.

Staganuk: *locality*, see Sfaganuk.

Stagarok: *village*, see Clarks Point.

Stag Bay: *estuary*, on Chichagof I., extends NW 4 mi. to Lisianski Strait, 22 mi. N of Chichagof, Alex. Arch.; 57°35'45" N, 136°21'30" W; *BGN 1908*; (map 9). *Var.* Deer Bay.

Named in 1908 by USC&GS; published in 1908 Coast Pilot (p. 169). It was locally known as "Deer Bay."

Stag Island: *island*, 750 ft. long, in Behm Canal off S Coast of Smeaton I., Coast Mts.; 55°19'10" N, 130°56'50" W; (map 3).

Local name published in 1911 by USC&GS.

Stag Point: *point of land*, on N coast of Deer I., at SW end of Aleutian Ra.; 54°59' N, 162°18' W; (map 25). *Var.* North Cape.

Named by H. Dall, USC&GS, and published on USC&GS Chart 806 in 1882. The USBF called this point North Cape in 1888.

Stag River: *stream*, on Chichagof I., flows NW 4 mi. to Stag Bay, 5 mi. SW of Pelican and 18 mi. N of Chichagof, Alex. Arch.; 57°53'50" N, 136°16'30" W; *BGN 1960*; (map 9).

Named in 1955 by D. L. Rossman, USGS, "for Stag Bay."

Stah-Keena River: *stream*, see Stikine River.

Stahkin River: *stream*, see Stikine River.

Staines River: *stream*, tributary of Canning River, heads at 69°52'45" N, 146°23'45" W, and flows NE 20 mi. to Lion Bay, Arctic Plain; 70°08'20" N, 145°59'45" W; (map 151). *Var.* Sir T. Staines River.

Named by Franklin (1828, map) in 1826; the name appeared on his map as "Sir T. Staines R." and was applied to either this stream or the West Canning River.

Staines River: *stream*, see Canning River.

Stair Mountain: *mountain*, 1,732 ft., 4.3 mi. N of Cape Cleare, on Montague I., 59 mi. SE of Seward, Chugach Mts.; 59°50' N, 147°53' W; *BGN 1931*; (map 49).

Named by the 1927 USC&GS field party; suggested by the name of the triangulation station "Stair" on its summit.

Stairway, The: *glacier*, see Surprise Glacier.

Stairway Glacier: *glacier*, trends S 4 mi. to Surprise Glacier, 49 mi. SE of Anchorage,