Fisheries

COPPER
RIVER
NATIVE
ASSOCIATION, INC.

(Ahtna Tanah Ninnah)
Drawer G
Copper Center, Alaska 99573

Telephone: 822-3333

April, 14, 1976

Mr. Nels A. Anderson
P.O. Box 234
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

Dear Mr. Anderson,

We of the Copper River Area, support House Committee Resource Bill 114, (Relating to the Copper River Subsistence Fishery) and 115(Requesting Department of Fish & Game to change the restrictive procedure for permit issuance for Copper River Subsistence Fishery) wholeheartedly, since more than 85%(documented in the AHTNA Region Planning Guide, 1973) of the people in the Copper River Basin are subsistence off the land, we feel this would be a great asset of flexibility and convience for the people in regard to HCR 114 and 115. Also, we of the Copper River Area would like to see some effort of study directed towards banning the use of airplane equipment. I think that a band on their use would favor rural people, who usually has the time, rather than money to invest in connection with the use of airplane equipment for hunting and fishing, the entire question of access should carefully considered because it can pose serious problems. For instance, people because of their knowldege or time available to them, have access to the resources of their community may not be ben fited if access is improved for outsiders. We realize such recommendations would take much time and cooperation between interested parties, but we are willing to cooperate and help in any way.

Sincerely,

Wilbur T. Joe, Executive Director
Harry Johns, Paralegal (Alaska Legal Services)
Harry A. Johns Sr.

cc: Frank Ferguson
Keith W. Specking
Jalmar Kerttula

PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AQUACULTURE CORPORATION

A regional non-profit organization for the enhancement of fisheries.

Wallace H. Noerenberg
Executive Director

P.O. Box 1110
Cordova, Alaska 99574
(907) 424-3411

March 10, 1976

The Honorable Frank Ferguson
State Senate
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Frank:

The enclosed position paper by the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation is being sent to you in an effort to identify some of the many issues underlying the formulation of an Alaskan fisheries policy. It has been written in response to the recent introduction by Governor Hammond of a 40 million dollar fisheries rehabilitation bond proposal and an accompanying 200 million dollar Fisheries Enhancement Loan Bill (SB689).

We encourage you to consider our proposal as a viable alternative to the existing situation, and we solicit both your criticisms and support. Please do not hesitate to call on us for further comment, testimony or information. We are vitally concerned and eager to contribute.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Hall

A. W. (Bill) Hall,
Secretary

AWH:sk

Encl.

(10)

PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AQUACULTURE CORPORATION

Position Paper on Salmon Aquaculture
Development in Alaska.

INTRODUCTION

Following passage of the private nonprofit salmon hatchery act in 1974 and the subsequent incorporation of nonprofit aquaculture corporations, the subject of salmon aquaculture development in Alaska has acquired a new significance that calls for a careful examination and definition of the numerous issues involved. This significance was given added impetus with the appointment by Governor Hammond, in January of 1976, of an Alaska Fisheries Council whose goal is to stimulate and direct the actions necessary to restore the salmon fisheries to acceptable high levels of production in the shortest time possible.

As an aid to the council and for the information of the general public, the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation, on the basis of experience gained in the forming of a regional organization, planning, financing and partial construction of a salmon hatchery offers the following position paper.

A PARTNERSHIP PROPOSAL FOR SALMON ENHANCEMENT

As a point of departure from which to launch this position paper, it is necessary to establish the value judgements that must necessarily precede a logical proposal. In this case, the relevant value judgements are inherent in the following constitutional and statutory quotations.

> "Wherever occuring in their natural state, fish, wildlife and waters are reserved to the people for common use".
> (Alaska Constitution Article VIII, Sec. 3)

"The Commissioner shall manage, protect, maintain, improve and extend the fish, game and aquatic plant resources of the State in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the State;..." (A.S.16.05.020(2).

"The Division of Fisheries Rehabilitation, Enhancement, and Development shall encourage the investment by private enterprise in the technological development and economic utilization of the fisheries resources;..." (A.S.16.06.092(2).

"It is the intent of this Act to authorize the private ownership of salmon hatcheries by qualified nonprofit corporations for the purpose of contributing, by artificial means, to the rehabilitation of the State's depleted and depressed salmon fishery." (Section I, Ch. III, SLA 1974).

It is an obvious and logical deduction from the foregoing, that because of the common property constraints on the management and use of the salmon resource, that the goals of the State and of qualified nonprofit corporations in a salmon rehabilitation program must be identical.

It is very significant that this same concept was alluded to by Commissioner James Brooks of the Alaska Department of Fish & Game at a salmon aquaculture conference in Cordova in January of this year. To quote from Commisssioner Brook's speech which was entitled "A Partnership Proposal for Salmon Management":

"... With common goals, purposes and constituencies, state and private salmon enhancement efforts must develop in harmony

even to the point of joint enterprises where there is mutual benefit and agreement. These statements reflect the administration's policy, certainly another fundamental change from the traditional role of government in our fisheries, and I hope they contribute to a new era of progress and cooperation."

The Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation congratulates Commissioner Brooks, and in acknowledgement of the commonality of goals, purposes and constituencies between public and private salmon enhancement programs, accepts the Hammond Administration's partnership proposal for salmon management. Now, in the spirit of that proposal, we suggest that the important question to ask is how to do the job most economically and expeditiously. This question in turn raises the following questions:

1. Who should finance the planning, construction and operation of the hatcheries?
2. Who should be responsible for the planning and construction of the hatcheries?
3. Who should operate the hatcheries?

The remainder of this paper will deal with these questions, and in so doing will attempt to define a plan of action through which to achieve a true partnership in the rehabilitation of Alaska's salmon resource.

FINANCE

Because qualified nonprofit hatchery corporations are assisting the state by contributing toward the rehabilitation of a common

property resource, they are in effect, public service corporations. In this regard, they provide access to private sources of funding otherwise unavailable to the state, and thereby offer the state the opportunity for expediting the rehabilitation effort. It is only logical therefor that the state and the public service hatchery corporations should join together in a program to finance the planning and construction of salmon hatcheries.

We propose that a state loan program be enacted including a provision for performance grants. The performance grants would constitute a credit against the interest and principal of the loan based on a specified dollar amount per quantity of salmon fry actually produced with the total credit limit being the full amount of the debt. As a means of funding the performance grants, the proposed 40 million dollar bond issue should be modified to allocate a specified dollar amount for this prupose, and provisions should also be made to make monies from "The Renewable Resources Fund" available for this and other related purposes.

PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

Beacuse of the staff and expertise presently existing with the A.D.F.&G., it is only logical that the state should play a primary role in the planning of salmon hatcheries. However, the planning process must include user group input in specific regard to site selections and species to be produced. As the public service hatchery corporations gain more experience and expertise they will, of course play a larger role in the planning process.

In regard to the question of who should construct the hatcheries,

we offer the following observations. Because of state law specifying bidding procedures for construction of publicly owned facilities, it may very well be more economical for private enterprise to construct the hatcheries. Particularly in the case of regional user group corporations, savings may be possible through the availability of donated services. This did in fact, occur in the construction of the Port San Juan hatchery by the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation. However, until the public service hatchery corporations acquire the necessary experience and expertise, it is probable that the state, by contracting with private enterprise, can build more economically.

OPERATIONS

It is the position of the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation that the operation and management of state owned salmon hatcheries should be contracted to qualified nonprofit hatchery corporations for the following reasons.

1. Private enterpirse can do the job for less cost. The A.D.F.&G. estimates that the annual operating cost for a 50 million egg capacity pink and chum salmon incubation facility to be approximately $300,000. The Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation estimates that it can accomplish the same job for about $150,000.
2. Under management by private enterprise, the receipts from sales of surplus fish can be more easily applied to operating costs thereby avoiding a costly expense to the state.
3. Under management by regional, nonprofit user group corporations the marketing of surplus fish will be done by experienced persons in such a manner as to avoid adverse effects

on the existing economic structure. This has not been the case in Oregon and Washington where the marketing of fish from state owned hatcheries has caused the value of fish caught by commercial fishermen to drop precipitously.

4. Because the operations of a system of salmon hatcheries will not constitute a financial burden on the state, more state money will be available for research and management. Again, this is not the case in Washington where the cost of hatchery operations consumes so much money that little or nothing is left over for research and management.

The foregoing outlines the basic elements of a partnership for salmon enhancement as conceived by the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation. The present bond issue and loan program proposals are inconsistent with this partnership concept because they define two separate sets of criteria and regulations, (one for the state and one for the nonprofit public service corporations) that serve to emphasize and increase the separation between the two efforts. This is obviously not the most economical and expeditious way to rehabilitate the salmon resource. Rather, we should pool our resources in a cooperative effort to apply the appropriate talent to the appropriate problem.

In addition to the foregoing reason, we feel that the loan program is unacceptable because it will impose too high a debt service on the financing. Why should a public service nonprofit hatchery corporation be charged a fee for helping the state? If the purpose of a state sponsored financial aid program for aquaculture development is to accomplish a significant infusion of capital in-

to hatchery construction, then the loan program as defined by the latest bill drafted by the Governor's Fisheries Council will defeat its' own purpose. We say this because our experience has taught us that the costs of administration, research and development, operations, and construction are such that they alone will tax the ability of a fledgling corporation to survive. In fact, without a brood stock that can produce an immediate return of significant size, the only means by which a hatchery corporation can pay its' debts during its' first years of operation is by a subsidy borne by supporters of the program.

CONCLUSION

We have refrained in this paper from dealing with specific details both in regard to our proposals and to our criticisms. We have done this in an intentional effort to emphasize the underlying assumptions and value judgements that must precede the formulation of a comprehensive salmon enhancement program. We feel very strongly that agreement must be reached on these value judgements prior to creation of specific programs, because the assumptions upon which a program is based will dictate the direction in which it proceeds. We definitely DO NOT want a program created that pulls in two different directions and that will eventually arrive at two different destinations. We definitely DO want a program created that will develop into a cooperative effort consistent with a pre-determined set of goals that will accomplish an objective beneficial to the general well-being of the state.

JAY S. HAMMOND
GOVERNOR

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

April, 1976

MAILER MEMORANDUM NO. 76-3

FROM: Charles H. Meacham, Director
International Fisheries and External Affairs

Here it is--the long-awaited Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, the United States extended fisheries jurisdiction legislation! The enclosed copy is provided with the compliments of Senator Ted Stevens.

Governor Jay Hammond has lauded the efforts of Alaska's Senator Ted Stevens and Congressman Don Young in attaining congressional passage of the extended fisheries jurisdiction bill, which became law on April 13, 1976, with an effective date of March 1, 1977. Under terms of this bill begins a new era of U. S. fisheries jurisdiction extending seaward 200 nautical miles and based on a regional management concept.

Foreign fishing will be allowed within the 200-mile zone only when fish stocks cannot or will not be harvested by U. S. vessels. Total fishing in the zone is not to exceed the optimum yield for each stock. All continental shelf fishery resources within and extending beyond the fishery conservation zone are also protected. Exclusive U. S. fishery management authority is extended to anadromous fish spawned in U. S. waters throughout the migratory range of such species.

One of the most important items to Alaskans covered in the bill is the establishment of a North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Alaska alone among the 50 states has a region consisting entirely of one state and a clear majority of the voting membership on its regional council.

The North Pacific Fisheries Management Council will consist of eleven members, five of whom are nominated by the Governor of Alaska and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. The sixth Alaskan member of the Council will be the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (or his designee).

JAY S. HAMMOND
GOVERNOR

15.1

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

April 17, 1975

MAILER MEMORANDUM No. 75-4

FROM: Charles H. Meacham, Director
International Fisheries and External Affairs

From the many articles and subjects related to international fisheries and external affairs recently in the news, the following have been selected as being of special interest to you:

Law of the Sea, Geneva, Report of the first week
U F A W U Convention Calls for Pressure on Americans to Reduce Their Catch, Western Fisheries, Vancouver, B.C., Feb. 1975
Incidental Halibut Catch Coming Under Control, ibid
Proposal to Change Bering Sea from Two Fishing Periods to One, ibid
Halibut Association Meeting Held . . ., ibid
North Korea, Deepsea Catches up 20 per cent, Fishing News International, Jan. 1975
Taiwan, Catch Target of 820,000 Tons, ibid
USSR and Norway Agree on Quota, ibid
British Fishermen Angered as Soviet Fleet Moves in, ibid, Dec. 1974
Russia and Norway Discuss Fish Limit, ibid
Web of Danger, Japanese High Seas Salmon Fishery, The Fishermen's News, Seattle, Feb. 1975
New Vaccine for Salmon, The Fisherman, Vancouver, B. C., Feb. 24, 1975
Japanese Tags on Oregon Tuna, ibid
"Equator" Visits Vancouver, Soviets, U.S. Tag Halibut, ibid
Britain Rejects Idea of Exclusive Fishing, International Herald Tribune, Paris, March 17, 1975
Soviet Fishing Fleet May Be on Way Home, Shipping and Trade News, March 25, 1975
Soviet Crab Ban Bid Rejected, Japan Times, March 26, 1975
Tohoku Fishermen Worried, ibid, March 31, 1975
Russia Seeks Curbs on Salmon Fishing, ibid, March 30, 1975
Mediterranean Tuna Fishing Banned by Japan, ibid
Focus on Fisheries, ibid, March 7, 1975
Continental Shelf Pact, ibid, March 15, 1975
Japanese, Chinese Delegates Discuss Marine Resources, ibid
Soviet Fisheries Minister to Visit Japan in May, ibid
Japan to Accept 200-Mile Zone Proposal at U.N. Sea Law Meet, ibid March 16, 1975
U.N. Sea Law Meet, ibid
Miyazawa Not Sure of Sea Law Confab Outcome, ibid
N. Pacific Fishing Ban Not Due Soon: Official, ibid, March 17, 1975
Japan, China Talk Voluntary Fishing Curbs, ibid

China Unwilling to Withdraw Military Protection Line Closing Off Gulf of Liaotung in Fishery Negotiations, translation from Asahi Shimbun, March 4, 1975

Japan Soviet Fishery Negotiations Begin for Salmon and Trout, ibid

United States Observer Placed on USSR Fishing Vessel, Statistics and Market News, March 24, 1975

Consolidation of Japanese Whaling Industry from Four Fleets to Two, ibid

Soviet-American Fisheries Claims Board, ibid, March 17, 1975

Digest of Congressional Record, Protection/Fishery Industry, Vessels/Fishermen's Protective Act, Jurisdiction/Extended Fisheries Zone, ibid

December 1974 Japanese Frozen Shrimp Imports Record 9,404 Metric Tons, ibid

Counting Fish Populations by Computer . . ., ibid, March 6, 1975

Four U. S. Halibut Vessels in Early Bering Sea Fishery, ibid

Japanese Fishery Reports Recovery of Tagged Sablefish, ibid

Spain to Buy Alaska Pollock from Japan, Foreign Fisheries Information, Feb. 25, 1975

JAY S. HAMMOND
GOVERNOR

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

Geneva, Switzerland
March 21, 1975

Following is a report covering the first week of the third session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea which convened in Geneva, Switzerland, March 17, 1975.

Chairman Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka) in his opening address urged committees to begin immediate negotiations for the first two weeks, after which he stated his intention to meet with committee chairmen and other conference officers to consider a future course of action. He listed as essential the achievement of articles which include the issues of territorial sea, straits, and an economic zone. These were presented in a sober atmosphere with wide recognition that failure to achieve substantial progress at this session will substantially minimize chances of any widely acceptable LOS agreement.

The Conference is divided into three main committees: (1) Seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction--exploitation system, conditions of exploitation, economic implications, and evaluation; (2) Territorial sea, contiguous zone, straits, high seas, access to the sea, archipelagos, economic zone and continental shelf; and (3) Marine pollution, scientific research and transfer of technology. These committees are, for the first two weeks, to meet to discuss a program of work which will include committee meetings in the morning and informal working and negotiating groups in the afternoon.

Committee 1: Vice Chairman Thomas Flores of Brazil, in the absence of Chairman Engo (Cameroon) who has not yet arrived, announced that Committee 1 working group would continue with Articles 1-21 on a regime for seabeds with emphasis on Article 9 (who shall exploit) and on conditions of exploitation.

Committee 2: At a formal meeting of Committee 2 the chairman's (Galindo-Pohl of El Salvador) work program was approved which will entail informal morning meetings to consider articles in the main trends paper beginning with provisional territorial sea with a view to reducing differences. The chairman indicated his intentions to undertake an active role in informal working groups and consultations in the afternoon.

Committee 3: Committee 3 will take up questions of marine environment, scientific research, and the transfer of technology from the point left at the last meeting in Caracas, Venezuela, June 20-August 29, 1974.

Additional meetings: "The Group of 77": (Less-developed countries). "The Group of 77" met, privately, during the week prior to the opening session as well as this week. "Landlocked Group": This group has been holding meetings as have many other informal consultative groups.

Charles H. Meacham, Director
International Fisheries and
External Affairs

PACIFIC-RIM DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

SENIOR ASSOCIATE: YUTAKA JAKE OKAMOTO
TEL: ANCHORAGE 333-8530
MAILING ADDRESS: P. O. BOX 3417
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

PENTHOUSE
101 BUNNELL STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
U. S. A.

February 20, 1975.

Dear Frank:

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter I received from the Fish & Game Department here in Anchorage.

Since the Kotzebue Coop indicated that they did not desire to have the Prince William Sound fishermen's organization, CAMA, have access to this research results, I am now determined to finance this trip to Japan myself, and go to Hokkaido to get all the data documents I need to complete the final paper for you.

I expect to receive the 2nd payment of $2,000 sometime in the early part of the next week, and am planning to leave for Japan on March 1, 1975.

..... I just got through and talked to you.

Well. As I said, I am taking some $1500 out myself to finance this trip and try to deliver the full product to you tward the end of March.

I know, from the raction of ADF&G and some others, our paper will be some king of time bomb once it gets into proper circulation. It will arouse considerable interest across the State.....Say, you say you didn't receive my last long letter about all this and other things?

May be it got lost at the hotel, or something. To brief you in on it, right at this moment (learning from the Prince William Sound Experience) there are two schools of thought in Juneau on this subject. They are as follows:

(1) One group lead by Dr. William Y. McNeil, auke Bay Lab. Auke Bay, Alaska (National Marine FISHERIES Service), who favor our kind of artificial rehabilitation effort, and see no problems pitching in for help.
(2) The other group headed by Jack Helle, a genetics biologist of the State Fish & Game (of all organizations!), who has gotten his Phd. on the genetic stidy of Chum salmon, and adamantly maintains a position that 'tampering with the nature' of genetics such as artificially fertilizing salmon eggs with random male melt tends to cause unforseen adverse consequences to the future Chum run in Alaska!!!!!!

OK. In a substantive way, the obvious conclusions of my study will challange such negative position. And in order to combat that sort of 'scholarly' negativism, I feel I should best prepare myself to provide you with sufficient amunition on firm academic and statistical ground once you open up your barrels.

I know I can provide such support which will make you famous in Juneau.

Since I was unable to get any expenses reinbursed on this study project, and since I am further getting into expending more of my fund in order to get it done, I wish you would try your best to get some more fund for my study.

I will complete it for your purpose anyway with what I got from CEDC. But, please do the best you can to fund another study project so that I can, between the two projects, get an equitable return for the effort I am putting into it.

I will contact you as soon as I come back from Japan, so that you can let me know what you will have been able to do about additional funding.

Perhaps, the first project will be what you and I have discussed before, and the second project will strictly be an economic feasibility study and investment-return analysis of the Kotzeube Chum salmon rehaibilitation program itself!

I know I will get enough data from Japan to base such study on a sound analytical evidence. With the input of Fish & Game, I am certain I will come up with a sound and comprehensive feasibility study for you as it applies to your area in Kotzebue Sound.

A lot of good luck.

Respectfully your,

Yutaka Jake Okamoto

P.S. Yoshiko wahted to to convey her best regards to you.

PACIFIC-RIM DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

SENIOR ASSOCIATE: YUTAKA JAKE OKAMOTO
TEL: ANCHORAGE 333-8530
MAILING ADDRESS: P. O. BOX 3417
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

PENTHOUSE
101 BUNNELL STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
U. S. A.

February 20, 1975.

Mr. Edwin Cross
Manager
KOTZEBUE SOUND AREA FISHERIES COOP, INC.
Kotaebue, Alaska

Dear Edwin:

Thank you very much for your attention to my study contract for which I understand you are now mailing your second payment check tomorrow.

As I promised, I am now enclosing a copy of an official letter I received from Mr. Kenneth Middleton of Alaska Department of Fish & Game dated February 18.

I will also send a copy to Frank in Juneau so that he can be kept informed.

Now that I can plan on the trip to Japan next week, instead of the 22nd, it sort of interfears with my schedule.....I have to get a few things done which I now cannot do here during the second week of March.....and am presently trying to get off here on March 1, 1975.

This way, I can spend enough time in Hokkaido talking to the experts at the Federal hatchery system, getting everything I need to write the final report. I will check with Frank before leaving so that we can make sure he will get the final report in time for his legislative use in Jueanu.

Hope your coop will have a good contract this year so that you will enjoy a productive and profitable summer this year. Say hello to all Board members.

Sincerely yours,

Yutaka Jake Okamoto

cc - Senator Frank Ferguson.

STATE OF ALASKA

WILLIAM A. EGAN, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME

Division of Commercial Fisheries

333 RASPBERRY ROAD — ANCHORAGE 99502

February 18, 1975

Mr. Yutaka Jake Okamoto
Pacific-Rim Development Research Associates
P. O. Box 3417
Anchorage, AK 99501

Dear Jake:

It was with great interest that I read your recent report concerning the development and status of the chum salmon rehabilitation efforts in Hokkaido, Japan.

There currently is a great deal of interest in Alaska in fisheries rehabilitation techniques, both from the standpoint of public (Department of Fish and Game) expenditures and programs, and private endeavors as a result of recent legislation enabling private entities to engage in fisheries production programs.

Naturally, there is much to gain by utilizing the experience of others, especially if that experience is successful. Therefore, there is a great deal of interest in the Japanese experience.

The question of segregating (identifying) natural vs. hatchery produced fish is a basic and difficult question. Accurate and realistic assessment of hatchery produced fish, both from a survival and cost-benefit standpoint, is heavily dependent upon this factor.

In any event, it certainly appears that there is much to learn from a detailed study and evaluation of the Japanese work in this field. I am looking forward to your continued examination of these efforts to assist the public as well as private interests for similar programs in Alaska.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Middleton
Regional Supervisor

PACIFIC-RIM DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

SENIOR ASSOCIATE: YUTAKA JAKE OKAMOTO
TEL: ANCHORAGE 333-8530
MAILING ADDRESS: P. O. BOX 3417
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

PENTHOUSE
101 BUNNELL STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504
U. S. A.

February 20, 1975.

Mr. Tomonari Matsushita
Deputy Director
Fishery Agency
The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisehry.
Government of Japan

Dear Mr. Matsushita:

I trust you have received my previous letter by now. I just received a comment letter from our mutual friend Kenneth R. Middleton of Alaska State Department of Fish & Game, who has been the supervisor of the Bristol Bay commercial fisheries for a long time.

He is fully in accord with my view, that I didcussed with you at dinner in Tokyo, that the Japanese government and the government of Alaska should develop areas of technical cooperation in the field of salmon stock rehabilitation as a purely 'technical' exchange program and as such completely divorced from the political issue of international fisheries.

I will also hand-carry another letter from Mr. Robert C. Lebida who is in charge of the Division of Fisheries Rehabilitation, Enhancement, and Development under the State Separtment of Fish and Game.

I am also working on this study particularly in assistance to a Alaska State Senator Frank Ferguson from the Kotzebue area, who is introducing a new legislation in April calling for a special State appropriation to finance a salmon hatchery system in the Kotzebue Sound.

I am now leaving definitely for Tokyo on March 1, 1975. And I will contact you sometime Monday, the 3rd for an appointment at another day. Please kindly make advance arrangement so that I will be able to obtain the publications I wish to have as mentioned in my previous letter to you.

May I congratulate you on your appointment recently to the position of Japan's chief negotiator with the government of the People's Republic of China. I hope I will not hit you at the busiest moment in Japan. Please give my best regards to Mr. Yonezawa who I understand is heading for Europe soon.

Sincerely yours,

Yutaka

Yutaka Jake Okamoto

cc - Senator F. Ferguson.

E-Z-OUT

Uarco Business Forms - Ro

Form 02-006

REPLY MEMO

State of Alaska

Cil fisheries

MESSAGE	REPLY
TO _____ DATE 11/	TO Mike Whitehead DATE 5/1/75
	During our conversation after I received this memo with the attached letter from Kotzebue you indicated that you thought you had solved the problems. I would like to know if you were successful. Jerry Wolfe

SIGNED

1. KEEP YELLOW COPY. 2. SEND WHITE AND PINK COPIES WITH CARBON INTACT.

SIGNED

1. WRITE REPLY. 2. DETACH STUB. KEEP PINK COPY. RETURN WHITE COPY TO SENDER.

MEMORANDUM State of Alaska

TO: Mike Whitehead
Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

DATE: April 16, 1975

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-4124

FROM: Vern Roberts, Director
Division of Administration
Department of Fish and Game

SUBJECT: Lake Nunavaugaluk (Snake Lake) Land Problem

Mike, this will confirm our telephone conversation of April 14, 1975 regarding the above referenced subject.

Chapter 2 SLA1974 appropriated $1,500,000 to the Department of Fish and Game for rehabilitation of fisheries in the Bristol Bay area. One million dollars of this was allocated to the "Snake" Lake incubation project. This money lapses on June 30, 1975 if not obligated or reappropriated.

We have negotiated with Choggiung Limited, the native corporation for Dillingham, which filed on the land at "Snake" Lake under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, for the lease of lands required. Although the state has included all terms and conditions demanded by Choggiung Limited in a proposed lease, it has remained unsigned for six months; despite attempts of their attorney to expedite its completion. Unless the required land is either owned by the state or comitted to the state by a valid lease, I cannot and will not commit the state to a capital expenditure of over a million dollars.

Representative Ted Smith contacted the Department of Fish and Game approximately thirty days ago to determine if a land swap was objectionable. This swap would be land at Snake Lake for land in the proposed Tikchik State Park on a fair market basis. Alaska Department of Fish and Game concurred with this idea and so notified Representative Smith and Representative Nels Anderson. Further, we notified Mike Smith, Director, Division of Lands, that we would pay survey and appraisal costs.

I have notified both Representatives Smith and Anderson that time was of the essence in this matter. Bids must be solicited and contracts awarded in order to obligate this money before it lapses on June 30. There is a technical loophole which may be exploited, that of encumbering the money by a reimbursable services agreement to the Department of Public Works who has contracting authority, to buy an additional year on this project. If all else fails, this may be preferable to letting the money lapse.

I have been informed by Representative Smith that the Division of Lands has the authority to enter into an agreement with Choggiung Limited which would provide for the swap upon Choggiung Limited being granted interim conveyance of the land at Snake Lake.

Mike, we need one of two things by April 30, 1975 to guarantee the state's long range use of the required land at Snake Lake so that this project can proceed on schedule: a) Signature by Choggiung Limited on the lease they are holding or b) Signature by the state and Choggiung Limited on an agreement covering the land swap.

Any assistance which you may be able to render in obtaining either of the above alternatives will be appreciated.