

SCOMM

7:5

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels Anderson, Jr.
Chairman
Representative Sam Cotten
Representative Steve Cowper
Representative Al Nakak
Representative Leo Shaeffer
Representative Joe Hayes
Representative William Akers

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorothy Larson, Staff Assistant
Adelheid Hermann

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

Anchorage Community Center
Anchorage, Alaska

DATE: November 10, 1977
TIME: 6:00 P.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Nels Anderson..... | 1 |
| Nels Anderson..... | 2 |
| Nels Anderson..... | 3 |
| Mitch Demientieff..... | 3 |
| Mitch Demientieff..... | 3 |
| Isaac Juneby..... | 4 |
| Isaac Juneby..... | 5 |
| Representative Cowper..... | 5 |
| Steve Cowper..... | 6 |
| Isaac Juneby..... | 6 |
| Isaac Juneby..... | 7 |
| Representative Cowper..... | 7 |
| Isaac Juneby..... | 8 |
| Representative Cowper..... | 8 |
| Charles Nelson..... | 8 |
| Charles Nelson..... | 9, 10, 11 |
| Dale Bondurant..... | 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 2223, |
| Representative Al Nakak..... | 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 |
| Representative Nels Anderson..... | 21, 22, |
| REP. Nels Anderson..... | 23 |
| Dale Bondurant..... | 23 |
| Charles Nelson..... | 24 |
| Dale Bondurant..... | 24 |
| Mark Jacobs, Jr..... | 24, 25, 26 |
| Rep. Nels Anderson..... | 26 |
| Judy Rosander..... | 26 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Representative Steve Cowper.....26

Judy Rosander.....27

Woodrow Morrison.....28,29,30,31,32

Representative Sam Cotten.....32

Representative Sam Cotten.....33

Dale Bondurant.....33

Representative Steve Cowper.....33

Irene Catalone.....33,34,35

Representative Nels Anderson.....35

Male Participant in the Audience.....35

Representative Nels Anderson.....36

Peter Demoski.....36,37

Phil Smith.....38

Representative Nels Anderson.....38

Hank Ostrosky.....38,39,40,41,42,43
44,

Andy Jimmy.....44,45

Representative.....45

Phillip Dembroski,.....45,46,48

Representative Nels Anderson.....46,47,48

Phillip Dembroski.....49

Representative Nels Anderson.....49

Joe Clark.....50

Ed Norman.....50,51,52,53

Representative Nels Anderson.....52,53

ANCHORAGE PUBLIC HEARING- COMMUNITY CENTER

NOVEMBER 10, 1977 6:00 P.M.

NELS ANDERSON- I will call the Interim Committee on Subsistence to order at this time. My name is Nels Anderson, I'm Chairman of the Interim Committee on Subsistence. I would like to introduce the panel members that are up front here. To my far left is Representative Al Nakak, from Nome, sitting next to him is Representative Billy Akers from Chuloonawich, Representative Steve Cowper from Fairbanks and Representative Leo Schaeffer from Kotzebue. Our staff is Adelheid Hermann from Naknek, and Dorothy Larson, in the back in the gray, from Dillingham.

The reasons for our hearing has been made pretty well known in the media, thanks to Seanator Rodey, he was able to get a press release out and gave us a little publicity. The question that we've been asking the public throughout our hearings in various parts of the State, is asking the public whether or not subsistence or subsistence activities should be defined? How do you as individual Alaskan people feel about subsistence and what should the State of Alaska do to protect subsistence hunting and fishing. Those are basically the questions that the committee is interested in finding out at least to get comments from the public on those three issues. Anything that the public may have relevant to the question of subsistence is of course going to be important. It becomes increasingly important because one of our members has been asked to go back to Washington, D.C. and attend Mark up hearings on D-2 Land Legislation. Representative Cowper will be going back to Washington the latter part of this week. I don't know how long he's going to be back there

NELS ANDERSON continued

but whatever information we can get from the public on what their feelings are I think will be extremely important because Mr. Cowper then could transmit that information directly to the Congressmen that are going to be writing legislation that is going to directly affect Alaskans.

We are planning a full committee meeting tomorrow at nine a.m. and what we'll be doing will be reviewing some of the activities and some of the proposed legislation that has been drafted by Legislative Affairs Agency. The substance of that proposed legislation will be made known to the public after the subsistence committee meets tomorrow or else would be discussed tomorrow and I'm sure the press will be there and you are certainly welcome to attend. And any other members of the public at that time may attend as well. We plan the meeting at nine o'clock in the morning at the Federal/State Land Use Planning Commission Conference Room. I would ask if any members of the panel have any comments to make at this time.

I do have one request from the public, Mitch Demientieff has asked that he be the first to testify and if there is no objection from the panel we'll go ahead and do that. Before then Representative Nakak, Do you have any comments? Mr. Akers? Representative Cowper - Just this Mr. Chairman, the Congress has made it pretty clear that they are going to create a subsistence preference on the Federal Lands that are included in the D-2 Bill. The problem is they don't really know how to define subsistence. What is a subsistence hunter, what is a subsistence fisherman. We would like to help them draw a bill that is going to work, so I would like to find out how you would do it. If you have to have a limited harvest of animals in a given area who should have preference. Should it be on a class basis, should it be

on a geographical basis, these are all things that we'd be interested in hearing from you, about and also any comments you have on subsistence lifestyle.

MITCH DEMIENTIEFF - Thank you very much for allowing me to go back and retestify to those of you that were in Nenana will recall, I did testify in Nenana and since then we've had a few more meetings in the area and have changed our attitudes, of which I'll make specific reference to. Again, I thank you for the opportunity to talk, I know this is the first occasion to talk to the committee without having to do best man honors for committee members. Very interesting time we had in Nenana. Specifically, the concerns I had were in reference to the selling of salmon roe caught from subsistence fish. In working with the subsistence issue - I think we're beginning to realize that we need to have a clear distinction between commercial and subsistence activities and we begin to see the difference in, and in We I'm speaking of the Tanana Advisory Committee to the Department of Fish and Game, in reviewing the recent regulation changes that are proposed and that the Board will be considering very soon in December, I understand.

The Tanana Advisory Committee of which I'm currently Chairman of that Committee. We adopted the position unanimously that the sale of salmon roe caught from subsistence fish be terminated at the end of the commercial season. We were in favor of that contingent and we put that word in there, contingent on subsistence fishing reopening to 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. We feel that this will do a number of things, one - it will make a clear distinction between subsistence and commercial activity. And the only people on the river at that time will be true subsistence fishermen, true people who need the fish and have a use for the fish. If there is no monetary gain in the fish then we feel that a lot less people are going after the fish therefore we have

Mitch Demientieff's testimony continued

adopted that contingent that subsistence fisherman are allowed to return back to 7 days a week, 24 hours a day fishing. I say that we think it will significantly reduce the number of fisherman on the river after commercial season closes because some people aren't just going to fish if they can't make money at it and I know it's going to be of some burden, I speak for myself personally, I have my fishing operation is seven miles one way from Nenana and that's 14 miles round trip times twice a day minimum, that's 28 miles a day, I'm going to be hauling fish out of my own pocket plus the cost of maintaining my gear. We done some hard thinking about it and we just feel that there has to be that clearer distinction and if we are going to truly protect the subsistence resources this is what we're going to have to do. My testimony prior to this time was contrary and I felt the need to and I was going to write, I didn't realize you guys were going to have a hearing down here, I was going to write and let you know, that I've changed my position and if you read back through the testimony that is no longer standing - this is our position as we've adopted it now and my own personal feeling as well.

PARTICIPANT IN THE AUDIENCE- Question - Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question please? I just want a ballpark figure on how much he gets for the sale of roe?

Mitch - \$2.50 was the price we were getting this year. Last year it was \$3.00. There's more money in the eggs than in the fish that's why we think it's going to reduce the subsistence.

Isaac Juneby - My name is Isaac Juneby, I'm from Eagle, Alaska. I'm the head of the Eagle Village Council. I'm the chief up there. My deal is that this is subsistence - Who is to govern what subsistence means. Webster's dictionary explains that it means the support or

Isaac Juneby's testimony continued

livelihood. Yes, let me fulfill on that there it says in subsistence you are dealing with Natives to Alaska, Native from Alaska, and Caucasians who are registered up there. There is a lot of trouble that's going on - Native to Alaska means that your subsisting off the land and you're making your livelihood in that. I would like to say in Eagle many families have low income both white and Athabascans and we want all of these people to be able to feed their families and (inaudible). I just want to make it explanatory that I know my way of life - I live off the land and I would make it self-explanatory that according to the Alaska Native Land Claims it says, "Native"- Alaska Native yes, but you've got to consider that you were talking about two different people there. I've got Caucasian brother-in-law who is a trapper, who is making his living off the land so they didn't state that - it just says natives of Alaska which complies to me, Eskimos and it didn't say about Representative Cowper - in the bill did it explain to you that you could settle there as long as you're a resident.

Representative Cowper - Mr. Chairman, if I can repond to that. I think what the Congress is going to do and what we're urging them to do is just what you say is they are going to make a subsistence preference, and that is not to be based on race. That it be based on probably on geographical areas so that people who live close to the fishand game get first choice.

Isaac Juneby- What I'm talking about is not discrimination or anything against race or anything like that it says if you can get the ANLC and read over such and such, it says Alaska Natives. Now who is to consider the Alaska Natives as a whole - You are considered, Alaska Native because you're from Fairbanks, you're out of the Fairbanks area

so who in the - how can you consider, you can go to my area, Eagle, which you never have been and you could hunt and subsist off my land and who can consider you because you been well, I can tell you the fact there, I've known you, I've heard of your name in the Legislature, about 4 yrs. You're the head of the Finance and I know this as a fact to my notion, who can tell you that you can not come up there. You're a resident of the State of Alaska, you are a native to the land, who can determin that?

Representative Steve Cowper - Well, I guess the answer to that would be, of course I've never applied for a subsistence permit, and I don't imagine I would get one if I did apply for it. I have a regular job and I work in Fairbanks.

Isaac Juneby-But you do - in the fall time when the hunting season is there do you hunt moose or caribou?

Representative Steve Cowper - No, I don't. I'd have a lot of trouble skinning them.

Isaac Juneby- What is your last name there. I would like to take it. Steve Cowper, my name is Isacc Juneby from Eagle, How can you, like the State Fish and Game and the Federal Fish and Game get together in April last year and this year, the governing body of the Fish and Game, They made the rules, regulations that we cannot hunt moose on the south side of the Yukon River. It is 20 days, from September 1st through September 20th on the North side of the River, Unit 25 C. We live by moose, and by caribou and stuff like that and what it is is self explanatory. How come they let it go on the other side of the river and not on the south side where I live. It's causing quite a problem up there.

Representative Steve Cowper- I don't know the answer to that. But I'd be interested in findin out. A lot of times these rules are made by

Representative Cowper continued

regulation and we don't find out about it until somebody tells us like you're doing.

Isaas Juneby- What can be brought up about it if I tell you. I told you what it is there, you could promise and yet - Are you running this year again? Well, I'm going to tell you what, while you're sitting on the meeting there right now, if you are, if you get me, my name is Isaac Juneby, Chief of Eagle River, You can write me and let me find out the and I probably will have people support you if you run for Governor but I don't know if we're going to get something there.

REPRESENTATIVE COWPER- Assuming if there's not enough moose we'll say to go around up in you area, How do you think the State should decide who takes it. In other words, if you can't shoot but 300 moose, maybe it's 30 or 3,000 I don't know. But lets say if you can't shoot but 300 moose up in that area, who do you think should have the preference. How do you think we ought to decide who gets to go in and shoot the moose.

Isaace Juneby - Well, you've got to take it to the constitution that all men are equally. If I'm not in Eagle, and I come in here and I buy a \$2400 licence, I'm entitled to get it, so we got no discriminatory remarks on that. What it is, is that you as an individual, if you fly, and this is one of the things I brought up to the Tanana Chiefs, last March, who is to govern who flies an aircraft according to the State Statutes of the Fish and Game there, you can go into this and you're supposed to wait 24 hours or what have you on the same day airborne and all that. Up in Eagle I can get a plane and I could fly into this place there is no given area and I could shoot a moose there on the same day airborne. People are against it. Who is to determine all these there? Somebody has got to be there as a law enforcement.

Issac Juneby Testimony continued

Representative Steve Cowper - One of the things the committee's found out by having hearings around the state is that there's probably not enough money in the enforcement agency to keep enforcement agents around in the places where they should be because the they've chosen up until recently to go on the license fees, the hunting and the fishing license fees, that they get and then they get federal money that matches that. But they haven't asked the State for any more money for fish and game enforcement or management. That may be on of the problems - we just got too big a State and too few people. So what we may do is cut some general fund money.

Isaac Juneby - Would you give me all the revenues that the State got with the Fish and Game. How much they got during 1977 and I would like a complete report - that's throughout the whole State of Alaska. That't probably self explanatory right there if I see the figures in.

Steve Cowper- You'll have to give me your address.

Isaac Juneby - It's Isaac Juneby, Box 122, Eagle, Alaska. I take this opportunity. Nice talking with you there.

Charles Nelson- My name is Charles Nelson, I'm from Ketchikan, I'm with the Tlingit and Haida but I'm here representing myself and some of the older people that live out in the outlying villages of Hydaburg, Craig, Klawok, I have never given testimony on subsistence before and I don't really know what you require but I would like to try for the record to give you some of the things that we have lost over the period of the years by State regulations and some of the things that have been taken from us were never regulated until they became of some value. I can recite back to the years, '52, '53, '54, I used to bring tons of

Charles Nelson testimony continued

Herring roe to Ketchikan and sell it for less than 5¢ a lb., Nobody cared about it, nobody cared whether I took 10 tons, 20 tons, 50 tons, or how much I took. Indians used to use it for their garden. They supplemented their living in the spring with the herring eggs. And I think it done sort of a ecological factor in the environment by keeping the herring at a rate that you know that could be controlled. Same with our seagull eggs. We used to go gather our seagull eggs in the spring and pretty soon we get laws prohibiting us from taking them. These things, that don 't seem much to people today but this is the livelihood and the lifestyle of the people. It is the inherent right of the people that were born and raised in Alaska. I think there is some provisions , I'm not no lawyer, but I think there's some provisions and our constitution that gives Ethnic group of Indians some privilages that no other group enjoy and even in our State constitution it says no rights previously enjoyed by the Indians that the territorial of Alaska becoming a State shall be taken from them. But then the State says that you can't qualify these things because the State superceded these rights and they no longer are effective but Congress never repealed some of these things.

I used to have an Indian Fishing and Trapping license that was given to me by the Federal Government, the fact that I was a quarter Indian, I had this license. I was going to test it in the State myself, but I didn't have the funds to go along with it. Congress never repealed that license, so therefore, I think that license should have been still in effect but rather than argue over \$10.00 I went and bought a State license but when you stop and look at some of these things. If you're taken away, if you want to look at in the sense, (inaudible) But terms that they use now - the impact on the economy

CHARLES NELSON- testimony continued

and lifestyle of the people. Some of those people don't have anything else but that there is no wages. The pipeline was up here, but that has come and gone, and maybe there will be some more but they live under an environment that very few people could subsist without the subsistence. When you come down measure this to who has the right to subsistence. Now everybody says that as an individual we all have this. as a citizen we have these rights. But those rights are not guaranteed to everybody, I think that Congress in their wisdom saw that the people would have to retain some of these rights and it's hard for anybody maybe justify these things but I don't think that they've ever hurt the environment in the taking of some of these things.

I've heard the people in the south eastern accusing the Indians of taking deer out of season. The Indians themselves in their own protection of deer, never took them in winter months, well after about November. December, January, February, March they're hardly fit to eat so they never used to take them, yet they accuse people of this. We found out there are clam beds we have supplemented our diet with, now they say they are poisonous, you're not supposed to go there and pick them, But for centuries people lived, I don't say some of them didn't die but through trial and error, they were able to eliminate some of the that biologist are finding out now - that the snout contains most of the toxin, the skin. And in the summer months, when the weather is warm, some of the plankton and stuff die cause the red tide. Well, they learned this through trial and error see, but all of a sudden, I don't think it's so confusing to the younger people but to the older people whose lifestyle has been this, and I've seen it in my time and I've lived it, I'm a half Indian, my mother was a full-blooded Indian, my dad was a Swede but he adopted he came up here with

CHARLES NELSON-testimony continued

Lieutenant Perry to Alaska and he was up in the North so he adapted to the lifestyle and unless you lived it is pretty hard to put into legislation something that would be really fair to the people and this is all I'm asking. If you get reasonable people, I don't care who they are, if they're reasonable in their decisions the people by appealing never get left out. But the fact that the people that are in the decision making position, if they don't know this there's no way they can put into effect good legislation. So if this is only my reason of appearing here is to try to add a little something that might help in your decision in making up some laws. Thank you very kindly.

Dale Bondurant - My name is Dale Bondurant and I'm here representing the Izaak Walton League and the Sportsmans Game Preservation Association. I'm not against subsistence hunting and fishing or the subsistence way of life. But we are against an exclusive or priority consideration for this way of life. Our main reasons are it's not an equitable consideration. The State constitution is pretty explicit, it says that the fish and the wildlife and the waters are reserved to the people for their common use. Taking the Native view that this is a lifestyle or a traditional way of living I would like to point out that there has been something that just came into effect that does no longer a valid claim. That's the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in which it says that aboriginal rights are hereby forever extinguished and if we had a settlement what did we settle? If this part doesn't apply. I think another thing we have to look at is the validity of this claim and what the Native people have done to themselves. NOW there is 44 million acres awarded under the claims Settlement Act whether this is a valid settlement or not it has been accepted

DALE BONDURANT - testimony continued

and those 44 million acres are in the process of being selected. I think there's some things we must look at in this selection to see the validity of the claim. Very little of the selections as far as the regional corporations were made for subsistence reasons, they were mainly made for economic reasons that were controlled of course by the areas in which they were allowed to select. Again, in the transfer of these lands the Native Corporation leaders have been violently opposed to any type of easements on these lands. Not one subsistence easement was requested by any Native Corporation in the transfer of these lands. This is going to make a hardship on the Native people because if some village owns traditional hunting and fishing area, another village can be denied it because of no public easement. You can say well we can have agreements between ourselves but this doesn't assure the person of having it and it surely doesn't assure him of having the right of subsistence hunting and fishing if the land is sold which it can be as soon as they get a hold of it.

Another thing we hear about the D-2 Lands and the right of priority or exclusive subsistence hunting and fishing on these lands. How are people going to get to these lands. They have no easements into the land and they have no easements out of the land. If the village owns a traditional trail or access, they could (inaudible) tie this up.

Another one and I think a real important one, and I've considered a very selfish method was some of the game regulations that were proposed last year. There were five different proposals in which they asked for large areas of Alaska to be set aside for exclusive hunting and fishing, subsistence but they asked that any land within those areas that were going to be transferred to Native Corporations be excluded and I say this for the economic value that they'd have to sell rights

DALE BONDURANT - Testimony continued

to guides or sell rights to other people, access to the game on this land and this game belongs to everybody so I say the validity of their claims haven't been supported by some of the things they've done. Now we say traditional uses, well, let's actually look at traditional use- What is traditional use? I said in the D-2 land hearing here in Anchorage and here time after time that they use the traditional method of hunting on these lands of snowmachines, many Native groups have asked this that they can continue to use snow machines on the D-2 lands as tradition. Well, my tradition goes back that far I've lived in Alaska for 30 years, I hunt and I consume the game so my tradition goes back that far. How far does the traditional use of radios in hunting of whales and walrus - is that a traditional use? Let's go airplanes, or high powered rifles. I would admire and support anybody that could live off the land like they did 300 years ago but those days are past and we got to look at it as a fact of life so we got this question that MR. Cowper has asked and that Mr. Anderson has brought up that how do we determine subsistence. Well, I hope we are not going to determine it on race because we have a Constitution and A Native Claims Settlement Act that should have done away with that and I don't think we need this kind of problems in Alaska. I think most of the people in the State of Alaska supported the Native Claims Act because they believed in the validity of these claims so let's don't get into that.

Are we going to do it by method - I don't think we can because how far do you go back on method - do you go back past the snow machine. Do you go back past the airplane or radio or what do you do as far as method? I don't think you can do that. So then I think you have to get down to the economics of it. I think that is the only way you can make any determination. Okay, we're going to talk about economics

DALE BONDURANT- Testimony continued

and the way we got to talk about economics and any kind of management of the fish and game. We got to see how we're going to manage it and I hope that we manage it so that it perpetuates itself and when we do that we've got to look at the supply we've got and the demand and when look at the supply and the demand this economics has to be applied to that. Now you ask the example of say 300 moose lets get it down to say 10 moose, you've got 10 moose and we've got 10 people, we got no problem then next year we got nine moose and 10 people or 10 moose and 11 people whatever you got. Okay, we've got to make some economics determination then, We have got to say all the people under a \$2,000 income can hunt moose. Okay, what happens in the next year, we only got 8 moose and we still got 10 people - are we going to say all the people under \$1,900. can hunt moose and the next year are we going to say the same thing because we no longer have a leveling factor that I think the gentleman before me brought out a little bit that nature had before. I think this is why we had people and game in any type aboriginal type country - was we had nature's leveling factor. When man kill off the game - nature kill off the man. There was no management of the game by the people. The people exists and they had to live and they took the game as it come by and the only thing that managed the game was this way of nature.

So we get down to this economix thing and the only thing that we can say then is that it's welfare - it has to be welfare. It has to be welfare then, cause we all live off the land. There is nobody on this earth that doesn't live off the earth and it's the extent of the direct living off the earth so I say it becomes a method of welfare, if you're going to base it on who has the right to it under economics and if this resource belongs to all of us and I say it does, I say that

DALE BONDURANT - Testimony continued

the constitution guarantees it in the State of Alaska and I say the constitution of the United States guarantees it, that it belongs to every body. I don't want my share of welfare or my share of the resources used as a welfare. I think it's a pitiful thing if this country isn't rich enough to support the people in it. But I don't want it done in that way. Therefore, I am against an exclusive or preferential right of subsistence. I think in the management of the game subsistence is such a motherhood factor that it throws such a weight on the management of the game that it makes it impossible. I would like to give you some examples of this. Last year when the caribou were suddenly realized they were in desperate shape. They came by and tried to make some way to let some of the people have the caribou. We had, I think it was a magistrate in the North, said that they wouldn't even try somebody that went out and killed a caribou even though the Fish and Game said it was against the Law. We got people in the North now saying that they are going to hunt whale even though this is an international agreement. And we have had people that are hunting waterfowl and eggs for years even though we've had an agreement with Mexico a agreement with Mexico and Canada. Now, I say we're all equal, and we all have to be treated equal and we all have to obey the laws equally and if we don't do this what have we settled in Alaska. I say we haven't settled anything and if we haven't settled anything I think it's time for the State of Alaska to quit playing their part in the settlement and not use your and my money, royalty money for the other part of the settlement act, the billion dollars. If people aren't going to obey the laws that I have to obey then we have no obligation to our part of the settlement.

Representative Al Nakak- I've got a few thoughts from your comments. Theoretically, the Claims Act passed title to 40 million acres of land, more or less in realtors terms to Native Corporations, now if I was to sit here and Representative Schaeffer how many acres the Arctic Slope Regional Corp. has received or NANA Regional Corporation has received or if I was to ask Mr. Anderson how many acres the Bristol Bay Native Corporation has received or if I was to tell you how many acres Bering Straits Native Corporation has received and I were able to tell you presently that we don't have title to one acre and six years have passed you tell me that it's been settled, we've accepted the Act, but parity? hasn't been received, we don't have title to the land. Face it, the land area such as Bering Straits area, the title which a village Corporation receives which is surface estate in my area certainly with the condition of game, the traditional hunting patterns, you don't hunt withing a 36 square mile area, granted traditionally people went up to the coast 40 miles inland for moose, caribou, etc..But when you say, the land was in exchange for the Claims Act was given for economic reasons that is right - 36 square miles of land doesn't support 400 people (INAUDIABLE).

Dale Bondurant- I would like to answer you, I realize tha title to land hasn't been given.

Al Nakak- As far as requisition of easements etc. with all the easements everybody asked for you might as well recognize that the Natives get a piece of land and the public gets a third of it.

DALE BONDURANT - I would like to respond to some of the statements you're making.

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK- Well, I'm responding to the statements you made.

Dale Bondurant- Okay, lets go to the easement question. The only easements that are being asked and the only valid easements that should be allowed is the same easements that will be allowed on any private land

Dale Bondurant - Testimony continued

that was given to anybody whether it was State land transferred to private or so forth and that land belongs to everybody, it belongs to the Native as well as does everybody else and that's what I'm trying to impress here is I think we're all Alaskans, we're not non-Natives and Native, there is no such thing anymore we're in the 20th Century, and there's no such a thing and I realize title hasn't been given, there's blame can be laid in a lot of places, I think the overselection is part of it, I think the fight for easements is part of it. There's a lot of things but there is an intent to make a settlement and it will be made and what I'm saying is that settlement also, or part of that settlement is also that the aboriginal rights of the Natives are hereby forever extinguished or is it not? Can we come back and say, like Mr. Hopson is saying, that we're going to hunt whales no matter what or are they going to say that we are going to hunt caribou no matter what? I have to abide by the laws of this State and I think everybody in them out to abide by them. Let's change them if they're not right but let's don't just say that the Native people don't have to abide by them and I have to. Some of my people crossed the Land Bridge ahead of yours because I'm part Indian from the lower 48 but I am an Alaskan right now and I think we're all Alaskans. We have had darn good rapport and I don't think we need these kinds of special privileges for one group or the other no matter who they are. I think this has to be cut out and I think like Mr. Hopson making statements that we're going to hunt whale even though the United States is in an International Agreement isn't the way to go if it's wrong we should get the agreement changed. The United States has an obligation to see that the people in dire

DALE BONDURANT - Testimony continued

need of living surely should be doing something about it but is shouldn't be okaying a right to violate an agreement that's been in good faith by the United States and I can't buy this under any conditions.

Representative Al Nakak - I've read some of these documents that have been prepared for the Committee and one which you may be interested in by the Interior Wildlife Association of Alaska and I imagine you may know some of the people involved there but its entirely evident to me that all the wrongs ave been committed historically, presently and in the future have been by the Natives of the Villages.

Dale Bondurant - What do you mean?

Representative Al Nakak - I'm saying that the Natives have wasted the resources.

Dale Bondurant - I don't even think that's even a consideration of what we're talking today. We're talking today about protecting a resource we have today.

Representative Al Nakak - We're talking about such a broad subject that I should have prefaced my statement by saying that it's my position that it's not an ethnic institution and it's my position that subsistence is not an ethnice institution. I come from and area in which covers maybe 80 thousand square miles from Siberia to above the Artic Circle to the mouth of the Yukon, 20 communities, St. Lawarance Islan, walrus, whale, the very same thing that you mentioned and its evident to me that the wrong-the fact that the concern is that subsistence is in this time and place, this Era, within Alaska's total society is totally and exclusively an ethnic institution. The right of subsistence use, hunting, gathering,

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK - Testimony continued

fishing, I feel should be maintained and along the same lines as you state - without regard to race.

DALE BONDURANT - Well, I ask you how are you going to determine this?

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK - This is why we're here.

DALE BONDURANT - I say the only way you're going to determine it - if you're not going to on the way of the race and you can't do it on method because everybody's using different methods now. There's not ly going to deny that you don't hunt walrus with a radio and in there's nobody denies you're not going to hunt whale with a radio.

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK - There's nobody from Shaktoolik, to Koyuk, to St. Michaels, to Stebbins, who is going to deny that they haven't seen sportsmens come out with Supercubs etc. to the gravel bars behind the mountains. Had we the opportunity to earn \$25,000 or \$40,000 and buy ourselves an airplane maybe we could hunt in Anchorage but there's nothing - it's all hunted out.

DALE BONDURANT - I agree, and this is a problem and I don't support the guy that abuses the resource whether he's white or Native or what he is. I'm not for that. I'm for the resource and let's don't make any mistakes unless we make them for the resource. I don't think any of us have a right whether we're white, Native, or politicians, or John Doe public, have a right to destroy any one species of our resource. We don't have this right. Just because we live on this earth, we don't have the right.

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK - I've never felt that from Kotlik, to Stebbins, to St. Micheals to Unalakleet, to Shaktoolik, to Koyuk, to Elim, to White Mountain, to Golivin. to Council, to Nome, to Brevig Mission, to Teller, to Mary's Igloo, to Wales, to Diomede,

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK - Testimony continued

to Gambell, to Savoonga, to Shismaref, up in Deering or Selawik, I've never ever maintained that subsistence is a right only because we happen to be Natives out there or that we have the right aboriginal or otherwise to extinguish any species. I just think that subsistence is a way of life that can be maintained.. Now if you happen to live at Shaktoolik and that's what you want to do, fine.

DALE BONDURANT - I agree that my opening statement was that I'm not against subsistence, I'm against that subsistence has a priority or any exclusive right to a resource that belongs just as much to me as anybody in this room and that's what I'm saying. I only hunt what I use, I don't go out and kill a bear or something like that. I've live in Alaska for 30 years and I generally take a moose every year. I go fishing and I get my salmon and everything, I'm called a sportsman, but I subsist on that game that I take. I subsist just as much on that moose as you do. I have a job, I agree with that. But there's also some of these people that are hunting some of the marine mammals that are supposedly exclusive subsistence that have jobs too. And even beyond that, they're making profits to buy a way of life that isn't so much traditional and I have no objection to that. And I have no objection to that, that isn't my objection is if you give it a priority or an exclusive right. That's my objection. I say that when one community say that when one community takes 600 walrus, in which they can't use over 120 or 130 and the rest of them their heads cut off and the rest of the carcass goes to waste and they call that subsistence and they say that they should have a priority or a right to that, I say baloney. There isn't - what's traditional about a bunch of cribbage boards or so forth

DALE BONDURANT - Testimony continued

made out of walrus rusks, there's nothing traditional about this and we shouldn't be supporting this. But this is what it's getting down to, and that's what I say and if those people can compete with me to do that I got no objections but if you give it exclusive rights to do that - that's a choice of a way of life that they're taking. That's what I'm objecting to and that's why I'm here explaining my position and the position of the people that I represent.

REPRESENTATIVE AL NAKAK- First part inaudible). And then go back in the hills for moose or caribou or go up and help with the reindeer herd. You know that's a choice but I'd like to see that choice remain.

DALE BONDURANT - But I think it can remain but don't make it an exclusive choice. But I'd like to ask Mr. Cowper a question - I think he said something about there was, or maybe it was Mr. Nelson (Anderson) that there was a meeting tomorrow and they were going to present a proposal for legislation and the gentlemen here just tells me we're here tonight to get the people's view on this before we present legislation and evidently there is some legislation that is already.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - I made the statement that we have asked Legislative Affairs to prepare proposed legislation for us.

DALE BONDURANT - So there must be preparation already made without the input here.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Now, wait a minute. You have to let me clarify that. The legislation that I referred to was one-creating a Division of Subsistence in the Department of Fish and Game okay - it has nothing to do with defining subsistence or

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON- Testimony continued

describing the activities or anything else like that because we've still got until December 12 before we complete our hearings and the gentleman that spoke from Eagle brought out some points that have already been made and you're not telling us anything new either. All I'm saying that your comments are well taken, I agree basically with the premises that you have brought to the Committee's attention and I certainly appreciate those.

We've already been told, in the past, that if we are going to determine who may subsist that it should not be defined on the basis of race on the basis of the basis of method, that we ought to take a good close look at the economics. I think that idea has merit, we are certainly looking at those suggestions, and I certainly have no preconceived notions on how or what we're going to ultimately end up with and that's precisely why we're here. The other legislation is legislation that looks to me as Chairman of this Committee to be appropriate legislation for the Committee's consideration for proposal to the Legislative Council, which in turn can or cannot introduce it to the next legislative session. That's basically it.

DALE BONDURANT- Well, Mr. Nelson - (Nels corrects him) Mr. Anderson pardon me. I think the one thing that we have to do and I've not heard anybody able to do it - I've heard everybody ask about it- is define subsistence because we're all here talking about it some people for it- how do they know they're for it when there's no definition of it. This is one thing - I've heard people stand right up here and argue I'm for subsistence and ask them how to define subsistence and they son't know how. So how can you be for something when it hasn't ever been given an acceptabele definition

DALE BONDURANT - Testimony continued

We better define subsistence and then decide whether we're for it - the gentleman over here may be against it just as much as I am.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON- I think what we've also accomplished to is that to try to define subsistence as it may relate to every part of the State of Alaska may not be the right thing to do because subsistence activities differ. We've been told to describe subsistence activities rather than try to define the term itself. When you came in, I remember the first thing you said was that you are for subsistence.

DALE BONDURANT - I'm for using the resource and living off it. I think every one of us is for subsistence.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - But you're not against subsistence, but even though we haven't defined it you still have a position on it.

DALE BONDURANT - I'm against any priority or exclusive use of subsistence we all subsist, we all live off of mother earth, every one of us we don't get anything from anywhere else. And we're all subsistence. I don't think the farmer has anymore right to be a farmer from now on, and his ancestors to be farmers from now on than me as a machinist to be a machinist from now on and so forth. We're all living off mother earth and it's a competitive thing and let's not give people exclusive or priority rights.

CHARLES NELSON - I would like to ask one question - That's what I brought up in my statement - we used to be able to take these herring roe - hundreds of pounds of it. The law now says that you can have only 10 lbs. per family and yet last summer or the last two or three years seine boats have come in and taken hundred of tons, cut

CHARLES NELSON - Testimony continued

the roe out of the herring, shipped them to Japan, made big money off of them. Ho so you base that equal rights of the economy of the natural resource for the people? I don't care whether somebody sells it or I just eat it - it doesn't make any difference - it's there for the people - if I decide to put it up and use it throught the winter for part of my living, I have a right to do that but the saw has changed now and says I no longer have that right but somebody else has a right to come in and take hundreds of tons because he has a permit. Now can you show the equality of that thing when you're talking about economy?

DALE BONDURANT - Mr. I sure can and I'm for you just as much- if some of these gentlemen have seen me in the fish and game meetings fighting the commercialization of the resource just as much as I'm against a priority consideration for the subsistence use of the resource. I think that that resource belongs to everybodey and there should be an equitabe use of it and I'm not for the guy that goes out here and just says that's my livelihood. I should have the right to it I'm a commercial fisherman or I'm a guide - him having any more right than you or me - I'm for an equitabe right and I'll fight right along with you against that and I have in these hearings so I totally agree with what he says. I don't think somebody because they got a commercial license and a boat has any more right to that roe than the gentleman here does.

MARK JACOBS, JR. - My name is Mark Jacobs, Jr. from Sitka, Alaska I want to thank you for affording me this opportunity to express my views on subsistence hunting and fishing. Alathough I've been adapted to a cash economy I cannot turn my back on a Native Culture under which I was raised. Subsistence hunting and fishing. Although

MARK JACOBS, Jr. - Testimony continued

is something that I cherish. There's no monetary value that can be placed on it. Any laws or regulations that would either ban or severely restrict the Native would be destroying the Culture. I heard a statement here that was said - that no special groups of people have a right to destroy any species of people or any species of animal. I'd like to say that the State Legislature or the Federal Legislature has no right to destroy a culture either. We've been brought up under that system for many years - I cannot turn my back on it. I am concerned about my status and my right to continue to use of subsistence resources. It seems to me that I would be precluded because of my income.

My continued use of Native foods has not eroded. It will be a part of my life as long as I live. No amount of laws or regulations can be created to imply that I can no longer crave my traditional food. When one is acculturated to a certain food the best white man's steak cannot satisfy that craving. Traditional food taking away a traditional food is like taking the rice diet out of the oriental. That's how serious it is. Maybe it can be best expressed by taking the politician or the business man and especially those that enjoy their cocktail hours I realize it is something that is cherished just like we cherish our traditional use of Native foods. If you enact a prohibition, there will be a lot of screaming and hollering from the politician the business man because they cherish their cocktail hours. I believe that the Traditional uses is a lot deeper than this. I believe conservation and subsistence can be compatible. The State of Alaska, through its Governor, the legislature and mainly the State Fish and Game can be more responsible to those that use traditional subsistence

MARK JACOBS, JR. - Testimony continued

resources and not be sportsman oriented only.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - I agree, they cannot take the cocktail hour away. They better not do that.

Judy Rosander - My name is Judy Rosander, I reside in Fairbank, Alaska but I grew up in rural Alaska. A lot of questions that have been asked this evening is concerning the definition of subsistence. I think if anybody tries to define it they should leave it as broad as possible. Cause if you start narrowing it down - it's going to become law and have to many restrictions on the people who have to use that law. It's kind of a touchy thing. I would leave it as broad as possible and then discuss regulations concerning it after. and then I'm also hearing tonight, traditional way of life, traditional lifestyle which connotes that they have a choice. The people who use those terms should go out to the villages where they have to live off the land there is no choice and if you take away subsistence living from them you don't take their lifestyle or their way of life, you take their life period cause that's what they live off. I would like the committee in mind also. And everything else I wanted to say has been said.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE COWPER - Mr. Chairman, this is something that I think is correct. There is no cash economy to speak of in a lot of rural Alaska - it is in some of the larger towns and of course it is here in the urban areas. I think it's something that we just have to consider - a lot of the villages in Alaska, the subsistence economy is (inaudible) that's all it is. Somehow I think that fact has to be recognized - I don't know how long it will remain that way but it is something we have to recognize in order to make

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE COWPER - Testimony continued.

these decisions. The cash economy only extends so far into rural Alaska .

JUDY ROSANDER - It's nice to know you recognize that, lots of people don't realize that knowing that fact that people do live wholly off the land.

WOODROW MORRISON , JR. -My name is Woodrow Morrison Jr. I'm from Hydaburg but I've been living out in Shageluk, on the lower Yukon for the last three years. I like these other two gentlemen down here. I grew up subsisting. Here we get into that word again. Anyway, living off certain types of a diet. I think that as people born into generation after generation of eating food like this their body adapts to certain types of diets so there is no longer a matter of choice it's necessity but getting back to the word subsistence. The word subsistence has general usage in sociology and anthropology which generally refers to meeting and fulfilling basic needs. In other words enough to keep alive is how it's generally used. But we have two different styles since we are now getting into the cultural definition of it. Out in the village. when we're talking about subsistence we're talking about survival. But to the Natives that moved from the Villages to the city or large Urban centers subsistence has become traditional.

I operate a small grocery store out in the village. And people out there their primary diet comes from the land. The white fish, the pike, the shee, ravnits, and the stuff they buy in the store supplements that diet. Whereas, I believe that the people who have moved to the city their primary diet comes from the store and is supplemented by the moose that they get when they go out in the villages, fish so you have two different ones here. But

WOODROW MORRISON - Testimony continued

as you have noticed I have not made too much of a distinction on income but income does play a large part in it. I've heard somebody else say it should be put on income. Well. I believe along the same lines that if it does get down to the point where the State has to decide who may take the fish and game then I think it's going to have to be done along the lines of poverty level income. But then that would be only one of the criteria and I think for establishing it because if you go strictly on the income level the people who would be hurt most on it would be the ones that are not quite -their income would be slightly over that poverty level which would disqualify them for subsistence permits like you have in southeastern. Down there they just apply for them and you get it. But if it does go on the income level the guy that's making just a little bit over what's it going to do to him -is he going to quit his job so that his income will go below the level or is he going to work harder so he can afford to buy more food. And as far as protecting the game we did - I was an alternate delegate to a meeting down Pilot Station, down on the Yukon last February, we were concerned with the number of moose that were being killed on the upper (inaudible) and left. Some of the moose were left with only the hind quarters missing. Others, the entire carcass with only the head removed. Down in unit 18, an area down around Piamute, Kalskag, and Marshall they were having worse problems. down there with the airplane hunters coming in and using CB radios but there was nothing anybody could do about it. We used existing State laws and we proposed to the State Department of Fish and Game to set up two subsistence zones and we did it with the understanding that subsistence zones

WOODROW MORRISON'S -Testimony continued

would not keep out any State resident regardless if he was Native or white, it would keep out the foreign and non-resident hunters, primarily, it would limit the type of vehicle that could be used to travel into the hunting area. And Fish and Game backed off on it and gave us the control zone - called the Paradise Control Zone one the lower Yukon well, bounded on the west by the Yukon River and the Inoko River on the east running down below Holy Cross and then North above Grayling to Eagle Island and then on across to the mouth of the Ididarod River. So what happened was- what we did was it prohibited aircraft from landing within the zone, in other words if a hunter came out he could not land on the river with a float plane in front of the town of Shageluk, he could land on the lake behind the town, because it was beyond the boundary. But what it force him to do was to hunt under our terms. He had to go up river by boat the same way we do, then bringing the meat our, he could not remove any part of the meat with a chartered aircraft. It had to be taken our on a scheduled mail run or however you call it.

We wanted to go a step further but we were turned down. We were told the Fish and Game didn't have the money to do it. We wanted to put a control type of officer, more of a customs inspector type person, in each of the four landing zones, Well I think there were five anyway there was Graylin, Anvik, Holy Cross and Shageluk and what we were attempting to do was force that hunter to bring the entire carcass back to that designated landing area where that subsistence officer, or whatever you wanted to call him, would inspect the carcass and determine how much of it is no longer usable You know bloodshot and all the rest of it the parts he couldn't use. And also to check, and get an accuarte account of how many

WOODROW MORRISON - Testimony continued

moose were killed so we didn't go far enough into it to first tell Fish and Game we wanted an accurate population of the moose within that zone. If we had an accurate count, then one could determine an optimum size - a number of moose that would be necessary for sustained yield in other words when you got a herd of cattle out there and you just go in and kill them and you don't know how many there are and you just keep killing them eventually you're not going to have too many. So anyway this was part of it so we can get an accurate count of how many were killed, but there was no money for that and the person would have been hired just during the hunting season. Now this doesn't stop anybody from hunting in the zone all it does, is like I said, it controls the type of vehicle that can be used within the area.

And down in Piamute control area, it really made more of an impact down there because the only way you can get into those lakes is with a float plane, set a zodiac boat on the lake, with a walkie talkie, another guy go up with a float plane and spot, without the float plane being able to land on those lakes I think if I remember correctly, I think they have to portage in, pack their canoes in like everybody else. I was hoping that more of this type of thing would be done because this was done by the Native people themselves, it was not done by anything suggested by any white sportsman groups in fact the ones that fought it the hardest was the game guides and the sports hunters, they didn't even bother to find out what it's all about.

We were not trying to set up an exclusive hunting park for Natives. We were trying to control or set up some protective device for the game.

The other thing that's coming in now is that every time some

WOODROW MORRISON - Testimony

protective device for the game.

The other thing that's coming in now is that every time something has a commercial value then it's taken away from us. Like with the Herring Roe in Southeastern. We got a lot of whitefish. We get them in the winter after freeze up and we get them in the spring during break up by dipping for them, and setting nets for them and I'm afraid that some smart guy is going to come along and make a commercial season for them. I hope that the legislature will never permit this to happen now there are some areas where whitefish is traded back and forth. It's more of a barter type economy in the different villages. But you come in there in the winter time when they're no jobs, even right now, there's no jobs, it's damn tempting to sell your food if somebody offers you money for it. And I'm afraid that this is going to happen again. It happens everytime the whiteman finds a market for something - it's gone. Then we get blamed so those are the things that I would recommend.

First, establish the population of the effected animals and the fish and of necessity assign quotas as to how many of these game animals or birds can be taken, Set up an effective checking systems We can't get all of them. Under the present method people send in their moose tags if they feel like it so you never really know how many are killed. Set your regulations so that certain types of fish that are necessary to people's diets who live out there - don't come on a commercial market. And if you do define subsistence and do get it down to a point where you're going to have to decide who may take these animals and who may take these fish and birds then set it up on a - well, for example, if the guy is

WOODROW MORRISON - Testimony

eligible for food stamps - it'll have to be done primarily on income level. I think I said everything I meant to say. Oh, there was one other thing on the migratory waterfowl, during the spring months, I do realize that there have been excuses in it. But it's my understanding that the International Treaty does not prohibit the emergency taking of waterfowl during the spring months the migratory waterfowl. The only restriction on it is by the Alaska State Regulations. and I don't believe it's a statutory condition-it's an administrative code of the Fish and Game and it's my understanding that other states where they are affected by this, Duck Unlimited, now these organizations are not opposed to the emergency taking of migratory waterfowl in the spring months but yet in a meeting in Bethel last year the fish and game people said we will enforce that even if you shoot at us. If you're hungry out there. I mean if you're really down and hungry and you do kill waterfowl in the spring-time you can be prosecuted for it and that's only because of the Alaska Administrative Code and so that doesn't jive with the International Treaty and they won't change it. We've requested it to Fish and Game.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM COTTEN - That differs than from, I think I read someplace where there's an emergency provision for other types of game.

WOODROW MORRISON - For everything but migratory waterfowl.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM COTTEN - And the State of Alaska makes exclusion on that?

WOODROW MORRISON - That's right in the Fish and Game regulations.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM COTTEN - Good Statement Mr. Morrison -Mr.Chairman

REPRESENTATIVE SAM COTTEN - Testimony continued

If I could take the liberty I'd like to ask Mr. Bondurant what he thinks of that proposals - I would just sort of like to get your reaction.

DALE BONDURANT - Well, I think proposals such as the way you control the take of the game are good proposals if they're designed for the management of the game. I think they're poor proposals if they're designed to give by nature a certain area exclusive use of that game.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE COWPER - That wasn't what he was talking about.

DALE BONDURANT - No - I say if they are designed for that reason, I would be against them. But if they designed to control the taking of game and the management we're for them. Our organization has fought for these walk in areas and we're the ones that got the - no hunting the same day airborne into the regulations - we fought the Fish and Game for years to get that one in. We definitely believe in the protection of the resource and I agree with the man - how can you manage game unless you what's there? We fought the Fish and Game for years on this because they manage more on the take, and we got more people taking game every year so they got a bigger take and they say well, we've got plenty of game which we all know we have't it's been here a few years. But anything that that's designed to protect the game and I'll pack my game as far as anybody else. I don't think I have a right to be guaranteed part of this resource - I just have a right to be guaranteed equal access to it - that's all I want.

IRENE CATALONE - My name is Irene Catalone and I'm from Fairbanks, Now, I think that what you 're doing here is kind of confusing mess mainly because subsistence hasn't been defined and there has been

IRENE CATALONE-Testimony continued

a whole lot of different things thrown out trying to define subsistence, that don't really relate to subsistence at all such as lifestyle, different economics and everything else. To me subsistence has to be defined before we can really do anything else about subsistence. Hold any further hearings or anything else. To me subsistence is just the ability to make a living whether it's in a regular job from 8 to 5 such as most of us I assume, here, or whether you're out in the village where no other economy exists where it is your job to go out and make a living, which you'll do off the land, fishing, gathering wood, getting your water and if anyone has been out in the village, this is what it is - it's full time job, making a living out there. So I don't have any problems with whoever it happens to be, of any ethnic persuasion, if they choose to make this their lifestyle, going out to a village or living in a cabin in the woods, making their living like that. That's subsistence, they're keeping themselves alive. I don't see how anyone could have a problem with that. And we're bringing in another subject which is the Claims Act. Eventually, hopefully the Claims Act will put private property in the hands of village corporations, when that becomes private property that's not everyone's problem. That's not everyone's to deal with. You don't go to, for instance, if I had a house with a lot, you wouldn't come and tell me how to regulate that lot. Whether I can have somebody hunt on it or anything else. It's really not that much of your business and that's what's going to happen if the land ever gets, what's it called conveyed. That's such a vague term anymore - it's been so long. But you know, none of these things really seems to present a problem. When you think about them

IRENE CATALONE - Testimony continued

they're really pretty much simplistic. That's all I have to say.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - I have to agree with you that in our efforts I went in full blast to try to get the term defined and then I got my wings singed pretty quickly and was told quite clearly to try to define it was going to take an awful lot of time because it is confusing, there are a lot of factors that enter into trying to define it. The only thing that I've gotten any real direction from was a statement made by some pers. I can't remember who it was or where not, but the point is that we have to as you just did describe subsistence activities describe subsistence activities. I think we'll describe the activities in general terms. Out of that I think regulations will probably develop and if those regulations don't fit then I think the courts? will take over further define what we're talking about. Now as far as defining the term, I've discovered, as you've said, it is a confusing mess and a lot of different factors come in to the picture. And we're having a very difficult time as a committee to try to come to terms with that term. Any comments from the committee?

Male Participant in the Audience - I would just like to throw one little thing out for thought.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Would you like to come forward or are you going to ask the lady a question?

Male Participant in the Audience - Neither really. It's just a question of thought. What happens if an individual makes \$50,000 this year and decides to go out and live in his cabin next year and not make any money.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - You just have to go up there and kill a moose whenever you need some meat. That would be my answer, I don't know what the rest of the panel thinks.

PETER DEMOSKI - My name is Peter Demoski, I'm from Nulato, along the Yukon River. Sitting here tonight, a lot of the testimony covered a lot of the areas that I've been concerned with in the last few years. But I would like to bring up a couple of concerns that a Mr. Bondurant brought up. Okay, we seem to be confusing trying to define subsistence in a traditional sense. Now, one has nothing to do with the other. When he made a statement saying that the Ivory cribbage boards, and similiar items - what have that has to do with tradition? Well, ther're just advance improvements on something that was started a long time ago. So that is tradition. That's the way cultured advanced throughout history. Your just improve on what was done before. Now, I don't agree with his other statement that his asking who has the right to restrict certain persons and allow certain persons more leeway in obeying regulations and laws. This just falls back on the United States Government. Their law was based on moral principle that freedom and some human rights are privileged but they're not rights. Federal law or State law can restrict those rights if they want to. I also disagree with his statements that portions of Alaska should be granted varying degrees of subsistence usage of those areas by certain people. It's a well known fact that in any culture you go to in the world there are different statuses of people. Some are more affluent some less, and some even lesser. Now the gentleman who brought up the question - What does a guy who makes \$50,000 do a year and then move into a bush and live in a cabin. That's

PETER DEMOSKI - Testimony continued

a privilege he can use, now you take a rural resident. He can't make that privilege, he's stuck in the village. He's got to live off the land.

Okay, now we get to the easement section. This is going to have an impact on subsistence because I've already sent a statement of opposition to BLM and the Land Use Planning Commission on a lot of their easement propositions for our village selection. I believe it's the opinion of some federal and state judges that allowing certain portions of the Native selected lands as Public Usage Lands is against the law. I back that up 100%. You can't allow a certain footage of land along both sides of navigable waters as public usage land. You do that you're going to be in conflict with Native allotments along that land, fishing camps along that water and whatever usage is those Native people in that area have utilized the land for. As far as using easements going through Native selection land especially through well, I'll just use subsistence in a broad term since I don't think it can be defined and I don't think it ever will be accepted by any one group of people. But it's going to have an affect on the people who use that land. There are alternatives that they can consider, the alternative might take a little more time, or it might make it more difficult for the people who want to use that public land but it can be accomplished. It's unfortunate that subsistence has to come up to legislation but we're stuck with it and I sympathize with this committee's job in trying to define it and make it work for all the people in Alaska. I fear the outcome of it because no one will ever be satisfied but we're just going to have to accept it. That's all.

PHIL SMITH - I'm executive Director of the Rural Alaska Community Action Program but I made the mistake of staying up late and dictating a great big long statement that got typed up and somebody handed it to me today as I walked out of the office today, so I won't read it I'll present it to you. Essentially, Mr. Chairman, the question was asked in the announcement of this hearing whether or now subsistence should be defined and of course there has been tremendous lot of discussion around that it is the opinion developed over some time of Rural Cap at least that it is probably best left undefined. That rather what should be defined are management systems and other forms of habitat protection devices and so forth which will allow local people to define subsistence as they do it or to describe it. (see attached statement).

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANERSON - Mr. Smith, your suggestion on creating- (inaudible) legislation that could do what you suggested in your final comment. There is already in our statutes as you well know a limited entry program for fishing and that's been tested in the courts and found that it stood the constitutional test and perhaps that may be the direction that the committee will have to go.. I'm sure in this point in time - the idea seems to have a great deal of merit.

HANK OSTROSKY - Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Hank Ostrosky and I'm here strictly as a citizen representing no specialized group. A background of information that I think would be helpful to this committee. A little history - in 1972 we were looking for alternate marketing and banking systems and also management systems for fisheries in rural Alaska and in our studies we found out

HANK OSTROSKY- Testimony continued

that any impact that this would have into rural Alaska, could cause a lot of interference and that there are a lot of lives of people involved by not taking a look at what existed in depth within the areas of the villages. This led us into subsistence, looking at subsistence uses of various resources. We would look into it and put a little study to see exactly what would happen you know if things were disrupted. It became very obvious that we were looking not at subsistence as such but a subsistence system. We compiled a lot of information concerning it and we ran across other people who had been doing some studies to show for instance that subsistence was a taboo to quantify or put a value to subsistence and everybody was more or less shying away from it. We sort of bit the bullet and looked at it to quantify it and we found an alarming situation like in the Wade Hampton area, which Emmonak is a part of. When we started to quantify it and we didn't go through all of (inaudible) and we came to a figure and this is based on subsistence to replace subsistence within that actually small area would cost \$40 million dollars a year. This was not looking at the disruption within the cultural system and result in social services that would have to put in there to rectify that. We had to sort of extrapolate that figure in looking into the past that you know you hit basically into the economics of a culture and sometimes the damage can never be rectified no matter how much money you put into it. Taking just a - off the top you know to replace that you can safely say about another \$50 million dollars or \$90 million dollars that would just have to place that one particular economy if you are going to disrupt it. Well, then we saw what we were really looking at. Now before I use another term I would like to make a definition and look at economics. We sort of looking at a definition

HANK OSTROSKY - Testimony continued

of economics - the transfer of goods and services. Well, for who? And you look at what you're talking about - it's the transfer of goods and services for people alright that says that the index of what you're talking about is economics if for people. Then what we found out at - we were looking at a subsistence economic system. All of a sudden the whole problem seemed to fall into focus. Then we started looking say what was considered another mechanism of a cash economic system. The more we looked at it - the more we found out that actually using cash as an economic system is a big fallacy-that people do not eat or use money - I mean as that - they take money and they transfer it for goods and services. And then we found that what we're looking at is a cash inflatable demand - all of a sudden - that certain groups were trying to substitute cash for what people use - and people use cash to get goods and service, and all of a sudden you see, almost like the moneychangers, actually corrupting the discipline of economics as indexed back to the human being.

With this we decided to look into certain systems that existed in Anchorage, Subsistence systems, so er look at moose - people to out in the bush and stuff like that - but all of a sudden that doesn't supply the economics basis for how people exist in Anchorage. So we start kicking stuff around - alright how does a person survive in Anchorage - by a job he gets cash, he turns that into goods and services and there is very little left over in the end so that his cash inflates because he's using his cash for in most cases just to stay above board. If he has a surplus he's going into another type of system which he is now controlling more demand. I hope I'm not making this too complex, but we go into it. We looked into it and we know that there's a whole group of people in Anchorage that

HANK OSTROSKY -Testimony continued

didn't have jobs so how were they living and they had no excess cash so we said what is the subsistence that actually exists in Anchorage.

Well, define that we're out in the bush where a person in the village will pick up a gun, go shoot a ptarmigan or a duck, throw it in the pot or go shoot a moose. This was not available to the citizen of Anchorage. So what he did - his tool of getting subsistence was a fountain pen, in which he hunted the bureaucracies for unemployment checks, and this type of thing and there was no disposable income after it so you're looking at a subsistence economic system in which you're transferring cash into full goods and services. Like Phil Smith, there I mean, I know if you get a narrow definition of subsistence -once that narrow definition of subsistence was satisfied that those who were trying to destroy a culture then you've had it in the legislation, You'd be lined up against the wall. When you start looking at a subsistence economic system and allowing each local area to define what that meant in lifestyle and this they would be able to quantify -now that meant in lifestyle and this they would be able to quantify -now I'm talking about the local areas themselves, doing the studies, and I would suggest here that the local commion be formed and before the State moved in to try to regulate priority usage that all this be taken into consideration.

Four years ago I attended a subsistence hearing in Juneau and the same thing came - to define subsistence - at that time I was looking at another group that was studying a problem and they were trying to legislate - first of all before they could come up with a suggestion to legislate they said we would have to come to a definition of what we were talking about because they found out if

HANK OSTROSKY - Testimony continued

they didn't come up with a proper definition that every time they tried to change it later on a new bureau would form - a bureaucracy around the new definition. I'm thinking about bureaucracy - once they are formed you can't destroy them and as a result the cost of this went insurmountable so what they did, they sat down and by consensus of this whole group they came up with a definition - now it didn't take too much longer. This conference in Juneau, I suggested, if it took up five years to come up with a definition, and a definition that would be a consensus, everybody in this room here, I notice a similiarity between the gentleman's remarks and what Woody, and they were very similiar but the only arguement there was priority of use and this is what they were looking at. But there were hitting on the saying really what they wanted to protect.

I would suggest on this that before any legislation we come up with a definition but not a definition that's going to serve any special interest group. The priority of distribution, this can be handled at a later date ? and it can be handled very constitutionally I think at the level of the village, or at the level of the local community because the power of local government when you look at it constitutionally is very, very powerful especially when the citizens start acting very responsibly, as did the North Slope people when they formed their Whaling Commission and they were using more accurate information, more accurate than the federal government could produce or any of the conservationists could produce and I think with the strength of these commissions working through local government that the problem of subsistence and the priority use of the commodities that subsistence - you're going to regulate could actually be satisfied. Another thing, it's funny at this time - you've got

HANK OSTROSKY-Testimony continued

a lot of young people you know that are going into how to-
your're dealing with scientific facts, your also dealing with
human beings, political decisions, and the whole demension,
because if you do something here, something reacts overhere.

Recently, I testified in front of the 200 mile commission
and the problems that they are facing is similiar to what
the committee here is facing. I ran across a mechanism by which,
you probably can hire people - we're trying to get a person up here
from the States, he's a former? - to do these what they call
econometric models, I mean -that's a big term - but econometric
models don't take into consideration people and how people react.
But there is a new mechanism of computing this and I got an article
out o Newsweek and it's the only article I've got and thecommittee
is welcome to this if they would copy this - so that with enough
data in all your departments, you've got your social services, Health
and Welfare, you've got a lot of data existing in your bureauacries
right now that is fairly accurate and would hve to be extrapulated
out right now to see how accurat it is to see what your present problem
is. But if you use that data correctly, in a four dimensional model
what they call, and they are very sucessful now, so that you can
actually, instead of by guess and or by gosh, you can start
picking up the accuracy of you decisions as a legislators which I
think if this is what you attemp to do and come up wiht these
models based on accurate information so that you force your de-
partments to intercommunicate this information and come to you with
results, not with more problems. Because consistently your bureau-
acries because they do not intercommunicate and they have all the
information to do so and to say okay here is what we figure as a

HANK OSTROSKY - Testimony continued

group, that we can solve this problem, they come to you with more problems, and the legislature is wasting it's time, not representing people, but trying to straighten out the problems within the bureaucracies that if they would intercommunicate their observable facts of what they have experienced that in this respect they could come up to you and say here is the solutions we would like your political judgement on it as representative of the people, who we represent, your political judgements, you put the icing on the cake and call it a piece of legislation that now represents people. This is my testimony and I did this (inaudible) I just listened to the problems that were voiced here and concentrating on some of this problem, indirectly say from 1952 until 1972 and directly we're forced to look into this thing, Believe me I'm not an economist or anything of this nature but I had to look at all these disciplines and try to interrelate these different deals and try to come up with a conclusion that was satisfying to me.

ANDY JIMMY - My name is Andy Jimmy from Minto - Mr. Chairman, Living off the land, The State says we'll treat everybody equal. (inaudible) You're making \$50,000 a year and I'm making \$2,000 but we're treated equal right? Okay the Federal could give priority or give some people subsistence when they need it but the State can't. You know what I'd like to suggest -like living off the country, living off the land, like fish and game, we can't do things like you're making \$50,000 a year, I can't get an airplane, charter the airplane, go out there and get my food for the winter. It's pretty hard to change people like that. I got elected chief of Minto in January, I told the people I'll do my best to help them along but I can't the way

ANDY JIMMY - Testimony continued

the way they been living, I can't change their ideas, I can't change nothing, I'm there ot help them and I think you people are the same way right? We're all there to help the people. But I can't move my grandma to Fairbanks or Anchorage to live because she wants to live off the coutry and that's about the extent of my testimony. To mix it around it the people that really need it I (inaudible) To not favor people but to steady them and to give them what ever it takes to keep them over the winter. What I'm trying to say is what we get off the country or out of the river we get to use and we get just what we need let's keep it that way and if someone needs mear for the winter, charter the airplane and go out ther and get it, I can't charter an airplane, (inaudible sentences)

REPRESENTATIVE JOE HAYES - The way I'm interpreting what you're saying is that economics is a factor in economic living, in other words, if there is a need based on lack of miney, lack of cash, then that consideration should be given to that.

ANDY JIMMY - If you go to the villages and see how they live and how many people really need it you'd give it to them. Well, if you say we have subistence for 6 people put your name in and draw it out of the hat.

PHILLIP DEMBROSKI - My name is Phil Dembroski and I'm not representing any specific club tonight however I am a member of four sportsmen's organizations within the Anchorage area and I think what I say they would back me up, the majority of them, All I want

PHILLIP DEMBROSKI - Testimony continued

to state tonight, is that I so and most of the members of the organizations that I belong to agree with Mr. Bondurant's philosophy as far as the game belonging to everyone and it should be dealt out equitably. I have one more question, that I have not been able to find an answer to. Why do we need subsistence when we have a fisherman hunting license when we each can go out and get a moose or caribou or two caribou or three caribou, along with all the fish we can possibly eat or our family can eat. Now people are - do not have the income where they can purchase this license, then I would be in favor of the State issuing to them free of charge, versus a subsistence permit per se.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Okay, the question is why do we have subsistence. All the traveling I've done so far, on the issue, there are several, more than several places in the State that have very limited resources. Okay, you take up in the Fairbanks area for instance or in the Kodiak area where we held a hearing, where people are allowed 25 fish per person. All the people in Kodiak that came up and testified said that 25 fish wasn't enough. If your main diet is fish, 25 fish just isn't going to cut it. You have 3 in the family, that's 75 fish and five that's five times twenty-five. We've gone to other parts of the State of Alaska where the caribou herds were supposedly down to such a point where the herd couldn't take unlimited catch from everybody - there had to be some mechanism developed to permit certain people to get the caribou. Even up in the Glennallen area people are on a permit system up there as well, okay when we go into this, I didn't realize that there was that severe of a problem in some of our areas but

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON -Testimony continued

what we have to take a look and I begin to see that as one of the responsibilities of this committee is to find out what the actual need is of alot of these people who are on subsistence resources. Some of the areas of our State, there are no rules or regulations guiding the subsistence take or the commercial take of herring, the Bristol Bay Area for instance, the Department of Fish and Game has absolutely no idea of what the size of the herring run is at the present time. So they are going to recomment that 6,000 metric will hve some harmful effect on the long term reproduction of that species or whether it's not going to have any effect at all . These ara the kinds of things that prople have been bringing to the attention of the committee.

What are you going to do about this - it that the right thing to do. I have on my own personally made recommendations to the Fish and Game prior to the time that they go out and make these commmercial recommendations that they have a better idea of what they're talking about prior to the time that they try to sell the public on it because we have run into some very problems obviously with thw Northwest herd - the caribor herd. The Bowhead Whale is another thing that's a Federal and International realm. I know but still what do Alaskaans really know about the Bowhead population. What kind of information is abailable that is really truthful and accurate. Why we need subsistence - I've got notes and tapes and a lot of that has been transcribed and the need for the State of Alaska to look at subsistence is very clear and very real. That's the reason, I brought up earlier that we have to define, we have a Civision of Commercial Fisheries, we have a

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Testimony continued

Divison of Sports Fisheries ,we have a Division of Sport Hunting and so forth. People are telling us, in many parts of the State that we've gone to that why don't we create a Division of Subsistence so that we know what we're talking about because apparently the Teh Department of Fish and Game really doesn't have any real idea what the Beaver population is in the lower part of the Nushagak River. Okay, how so we get aroun that, I really don't know but people have been saying if the existing mechanism isn't going to work and the Department is going to continue to sell the game that they better know what they're talking about because they're infringing on subsistence activities when they blindly go out and say okay you guys can kill so many moose or you can take so many beaver, yet they don't really know what they're doing. I think the people have a right to expect the State of Alaska to demand that Administration properly evaluate the resources of ou State of Alaska adn that's one of the purposes of the committee to try to find out what the problems are, make recommendations to the legislature, and try to find out what we're talking about. I really didn't think that we were going to have this much of an impact on the minds throughout the State of Alaska. And people are talking subsistence now. it used to be something we just mentioned vaguely but now you have to sit down and talk about it in official gathering here and really trying to grasp what we're trying to get at.

PHILLIP DEMBROSKI - Well, hypothetically when you make your recommend- ations and assuming that you did recommend subsistence would you also make recommendations as to quotals, based on a famil's economy based on their size. If that game in that area did become depleted

PHILLIP DEMBROSKI - Testmony continued

such as the Arctic Caribor Hear or a certain fishery in a certain area.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Well, what we're going to have to do is take a look at all the recommendations that have been made by people like yourself, and Mr. Bondurand and come up with what we think is the best mechanism is in the committtee and make that recommendation to the council and hopefully they'll adopt whatever recommendations we'lll come up with as you probably can tell what I'm saying is that I ahven't made up my mind yet what I'm going to do or what I'm going to recoment to the committee or what the recommendations of the Committee is going to be but apparently we are going to have to take every theing that you've said into consideration - that we are going to have to take the geographical location of a person into consideration, we're going to have to take a liik at the size of the resource aroundy which the person is living, the economic status of that person, the size of that family - it's all goint to be part of the total picture. That's about the best I can do - we're going to have to consider all those factors.

JOE CLARK - Mr. Chairman, my name is Joe Clark and I'm Eskimo, I'm very proud of it and I think we are a privileged people. Forthe most part- I can say this formyself with out this thing that we are talking - subsistence- I don't know whether I would be here right now. I rely very heavily on subistence, I've raised a big family, 11 children and I'm very thankful that they are all alive adn in good

JOE CLARK - Testimony continued

health and it's mainly because of subsistence that they are there. I know because I am a privileged person, that I could look to our government, which is the United States Government, for help, for food and clothing, if this is the way I wanted to go but like I said I am a very proud person and I've not asked for help from the government to feed or cloth my children or myself. And the only thing that I'm asking as far as subsistence goes if you have to make a judgement - I'd like to say - if there is one animal left - I would like for whoever to make this judgement to go for subsistence rather than a sport fisherman or hunter. That's all I have to say.

ED NORMAN - My name is Ed Norman and I'm going to represent myself but I'm also the vice president of the Sportsman's Game Preservation Association. And one of the things I can understand that this is a very, very complex situation and it's not one that any one person or any small group is going to be able to get to the ground work right away I know only through these kinds of different types of hearing are you going to touch on different bases. One of the things that I was, and I'm not trying to make a guess. We were going to get experts from the outside to study things, we've had quite a few experts up here in Alaska from the outside to study things and sometimes we ought to do a little bit to look on our past and take some of the advice from people who have lived here to although one of the things that was brought up about the 25 fish in Kodiak and I hope I live long enough to see it sounds like limited entry - I don't think it's a fair and equitable situation where you've got a man that can make \$60,000 and still on limited entry are we still going to have

ED NORMAN- Testimony continued

a person, and I'm not knocking anybody who is making \$40,000, \$50,00, or 60,000 but on subsistence I think this is brought up. Like my dentist you couldn't go to him because he had to go out and commercial fish. We're going to have the same thing in some of these villages. This is something that touches on the resident and the people that live here in Alaska. I think that there is quite a few avenues that have to be really looked into. Like the man said he's proud he's a Eskimo.

My grandparents were from Lapland and I'm proud of that. I'm not here because of that I'm just here. I know they can see many, many things that's going to be leaving the game has left. We went on record 8 years ago with the Nelshina caribou herd, it was the people that were depleting them. Many of them were being slaughtered, and I think we have to be very careful and this is the advent of the snowmobile. I would have hunted them by dog sled or other ways I'm sure it wouldn't hurt them. To get a field count is very important and I don't feel the Fish and Game had ever done a good job on this. The one man that said about checking areas were people bring out the meat - I think that's a real good idea rather than the antlers. I think it gives - I don't know the name, I like the name sportsman, but the fact is the people don't think sportsman eat fish, I do and I enjoy them, and I eat moose and by golly if I didn't get a moose I'd be pretty much in a year to get through because I can't afford the beef prices. There has never been beef in my house. I eat fish instead but the point is I got one salmon this year. No, the point is if the person can get it for ones need is fine but to have exclusive areas set up and and I can see right now there will be capitalization on it- lets

ED NORMAN - Testimony continued

say I have an area over here and possible for a monetary gain, and money speaks might loud these days, so I think that there's going to have to be a lot of policing to make a law that's fair and equitable and plus it can be enforced - it's really going to have to have some looking into, I can see this. So that's teh only thind I look at - I found out when they set up some kind of certain zones, I understand some certain privileged individuals already had a handle on it. What I'm talking about now is the hunting area where they pat to get in. These are thing that I really look at with a jaundiced eye. I think these things will crop up so I'm sure that you guys got you hands full.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - I just want to make a comment here. There has been some resistance to the idea of creating subsistence zones to protect the resource. When we were up in Kotzebue, there was testimony gived to us stating that there are exclusive sport hunting zones set aside up in that particular area. There's a dentist down in Anchorage, and a school teacher down in Anchorage that have the exclusive right and no other game guide can go in there and take any of the game from that particular area. It seems to me if that's correct and if that's right then I can't see any reason why people think that rural areas and urban areas as well, that there-should be subsistence use of our resources when they have exclusive use game guides. Exclusive areas all for them selves alone. If anybody comes in the can be prosecuted, the game licensing board can (inaudible) Exclusive area?

ED NORMAN - Maybe I didn't read that the same as you did, I understood

ED NORMAN - Testimony continued

and I'm not for that exclusive area, I'll just righ now, I don't think they should be set aside for these different people but the part I read and correct me if I'm wrong, that anybody could go in there, and in fact you can even use the airstrips, which I son't have an airplant so it wouldn't do me any good but this is the way I understood it although I think they're cutting their own throats by doing this because just what you said is what I could see a long time ago. What would be happening, I think, I haven't talked to them, adn certainly they could see this what would be forthcoming because certainly what's fail for on would be fair to the other and I'll agree 100% with what you said although I was under the understanding that I could, or you or anyone else could to up there adn use this area.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON-NO--OTHER GUIDES

ED NORMAN-Of course I can understan that point, because we have had, and we still have many bandit guides that fly around and of course they're going to cut their own throats that's just all there is to it. But the point is apparantly that's why this law was enacted, But I'm not in favor of that either.

END OF TRANSCRIPT

BY MARK JACOBS, JR.
P.O. BOX 625
Sitka, Alaska 99835

TO THE COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE HEARING

My name is Mark Jacobs, Jr. I want to thank you for affording me this opportunity to express my views on subsistence hunting & fishing.

Although I have been adapted to a cash economy I cannot turn my back on the Native culture under which I was brought up. Subsistence hunting and fishing is some thing we cherish, there is no monetary value that can be placed on it. Any laws or regulations that would either ban or severely restrict the Native would be destroying a culture.

I am concerned about my native status and my right to continue to use our subsistence resources. It seems to me that I would be precluded because of my income. My continued use of Native foods has not eroded. It will be a part of my life as long as I live. No amount of laws or regulation can be created or enacted to imply that I can no longer crave my traditional food.

When one is addultured to certain foods you cannot destroy that appetite, you can only suppress it. I cherish my native foods, when I crave certain Native or traditional ways of preparation of foods; the best white man's steak or white man's specialties cannot satisfy. To take away traditional food is like taking the rice diet from the orient or maybe a better way to express how I feel about it is for example the politician or business man. Especially those that enjoy their cocktail hour. I realize it is something they cherish, Enact a prohibition and there will be a lot of screaming and hollering.

Our traditional uses is far deeper than that. I believe conservation and subsistence can be compatible. The State of Alaska through it's Governor, Legislature and namely the State Fish & Game Department can be more responsive to those that use traditional subsistence resources and not be sportsman oriented as they presently seem to be. Thank you.

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

Legislative Reference Library
Legislative Affairs Agency
Pouch Y State Capital
Juneau, Alaska 99811

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON
REPRESENTATIVE SAM COTTEN
REPRESENTATIVE JOE HAYS
REPRESENTATIVE LEO SCHAEFFER
REPRESENTATIVE AL OSTERBACK

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

DOROTHY LARSON, STAFF ASSISTANT
ADELHEID HERMANN

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC. CONVENTION
WESTWARD HILTON HOTEL
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

DATE: November 12, 1977
TIME: 5:00 P.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BYRON MALLOT.....1,
Representative Nels Anderson.....1,2
Betty Miller.....3,
Rosita Worl.....4,5
Doug Motig.....5,6,7
Carl Jack.....7,8,9,10,11
Evelyn.Pete.....11,12,13,14
Byron Mallot.....14,15,
Larry Edwards.....15,
Luke Titus.....15,16,17
Nelson Frank,.....17
Bill Wood17,18,
Nick Lunde.....19,20,
Dorothy Pegan.....20,21
Peggy Woodly.....21,22
Charlie Johnson.....22,23
Ed Thomas.....23,24
Byron Mallot.....24,25,
Representative Nels Anderson.....25,26,27,28

PUBLIC HEARING - ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC. CONVENTION

BYRON MALLOT - Those workshop moderators that are going to give reports I will be calling on you. When I do call on you please come forward to one of the mikes to make your report. As we announced earlier all of the workshop reports will be made part of the subsistence hearing that Representative Nels Anderson and his members are holding throughout the State.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Thank you, Byron. I would like to ask the members of the subsistence Committee to come forward and join me up at the front here if they would. There's Representative Joe Hayes, who has been very patient along with myself and Representative Leo Schaeffer from Kotzebue, Why don't you guys get your tails up here so we can get this thing going. I don't know who else is back there. While the members of the Committee are coming forward I'd like to say that I appreciate the opportunity to be here - this thing has turned out to be something all together different than what I had anticipated in my little bush mind, but you'll have to forgive me for that. The Interim Committee on Subsistence, is a committee that was established by the Legislature this year. It was put together by my insistence because the State of Alaska, in my opinion does not really recognize the deep need for subsistence hunting, fishing and gathering activities in the State of Alaska. Members of the Interim Committee are Senator Pat Rodey, he is the only Senator that is serving on the Committee, Representative Steve Cowper, Representative William Akers, Representative Al Nakak, Representative Leo Schaeffer, Representative Joe Hayes, Representative Sam Cotten, who I think was in the area earlier and myself. I think possibly many of you already know the pur-

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON-Testimony continued

Representative Nels Anderson - pose of the Committee. The Committee is to hear comments from the public in as many places as we can get to with a very limited budget to get the people's feelings throughout the State of Alaska on what they feel about subsistence. Questions that we ask are three basically - 1) Should the term Subsistence be defined? 2) What do you feel about subsistence- what are your feelings about subsistence? 3) What should the State of Alaska do about protecting subsistence? At this time I'll officially call the Interim Committee Hearing to order and we'll begin to hear the presentations that the Alaska Federation of Natives has prepared.

BYRON MALLOT - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members. We have during, and we do apologize for the length of time it took us this afternoon. We hope that you understand, I'm sure you did. The AFN, during its annual meeting has had a series of workshops in three broad areas but they relate to the overall question of Subsistence. They have to do with Native Culture and Lifestyle. The role of regional village and regional non-profit corporations and the whole role of State and local and federal governments, policy as they affect our lives. The entire convention comprising some 800 people actively participated in those workshops. The reports of each workshop will be done in writing and will be made available to you as well as the results of questionnaires on those issues that were filled out by members of the annual meeting also. At this time Mr. Chairman I'd like to call on the recorders and moderators to give their reports.

BETTY MILLER - I'm a stock holder in Cook Inlet Region Corp. - I'm scared to death. We were told to give a synopsis of some of the things that we covered in our group and I think the feeling that I got from the groups I attended was first of all the Alaska Natives need to unite and to work as one unit toward one goal. If we don't do that everything that we've worked for - there will be no problem of subsistence because there will be no villages. That slowly the villages are going to go away because there is poor management and no communication between the villages and the regional corporation.

There are language barriers that are not being met. There is no communication between regional corporations and village corporations. This came out very strong in all of the meetings that I attended. I think that most of the people felt that villages can survive on subsistence but a cash flow into the villages enhances the life of the village - in other words some villages could just live on subsistence but money into the villages helps them in buying sugar or if the airplane doesn't make it to the village they don't have fuel to cook their food or whatever. I think that the thing we got out of most of the meetings was that we need to communicate more not only among ourselves but among people. It seems that what we are talking about, our problems are falling on deaf ears and I noticed that the president of Cook Inlet Region did leave as we were about to make our presentation. I feel like on a meeting like this there should be stockholders, villagers, and regional corporations sitting down and talking together instead of being separated. Thank you.

ROSITA WORL - I did prepare a statement on Subsistence based on my two years of experience in the Arctic Slope and my own personal experiences as being raised in a subsistence based economy. I will submit to you that statement, however, I would just like to give you a very brief account of what I view to be the important elements in Subsistence. The three elements are economics, social and cultural. The primary focus of subsistence has been on the economic aspect in the harvest of resources and also on defining the boundaries within which those economic or subsistence activities occur. That's been the primary focus of all subsistence works and generally the subsistence legislation. It is my feeling that if legislation is to protect or insure the maintenance of subsistence then the other aspects of the social and cultural elements must be taken into consideration. And, in that respect, social aspects I'm talking about the organization of social relations in which the harvest is secured and in contemporary society that social relations encompasses a relationship between the actual activities, the person who is going out and also financial support. Now that might sound like economics but the relationship of social in that group of people go together to secure a subsistence harvest. There are two aspects to it- 1) Subsistence requires economic income or monetary income and that monetary income is secured in various ways either by the person actively going out to work himself part time or else he may receive financial support from other members of his family or other members in his community and in return those resources are shared within the community and so to legislate on an individual basis, my feeling, would be detrimental to the survival of subsistence.

The other aspect of subsistence that must be considered in

ROSITA WORL - Testimony continued

legislation is cultural. The Athabascans case which was discussed today is a very good example of the Cultural values of Subsistence. Cultural is a very complex issue and it deals with a psychological feelings of going out and being on the land, the continued relationship to the land, the manifestations of subsistence in your arts and in your oral tradition in your literature and those must all be considered. I guess the final statement that I would like to say is that the fate of subsistence today lies not so much in the hunter pursuing his game in the field but it lies on legislation that will either inhibit, or restrict his or her activities.

DOUG MOTIG - I've been accused of always being ready but that's not the truth. We discussed and agreed and recommended that the following:

Subsistence is a village way of life both for bodily well-being and spiritual, emotional well-being. Since being deprived of a subsistence way of life would cause death of a valuable culture and economically would be impossible to replace and if deprived and has caused alcoholism and other kind of disabling activities. Education of the subsistence way of life should be keyed to the environment.

Utilizing Native people on the local level, There needs to be a more clearly defined set of duties for each corporation. And more important the corporations work cooperatively. We recommend communication between the corporations and people should be provided for. An ombudsman serves a role as a mediator, to

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

communicate the business of the corporation and to communicate to the corporation of the people's wishes. The non-profit could probably serve this role better and we also recommend a directory, informational booklet be developed as to what and who is the Native serving corporation and that book be distributed to the village people. In the past the regional corporation have had self serving roles in terms of advocacy, they have as can be seen served the best interests of the whole. However, for better services to the local community the regional profit corporation should advocate more for human services since they have more available dollars and political clout. Alaska Federation of Natives, has in the past served as a forum for general issues to be discussed at the Convention. This has provided for a better response to the people's needs on a village level. They have also served as advocates for the solutions to problems of village people. This activity should be continued with more provisions for effective communications to village people recognizing that villages are distinctly different and that we are living in a grace period of no taxes of heavy competitors in terms of economic viability we suggest a set of alternatives be drawn up to meet the future needs of the villages economically and action be taken to insure a stable economic base.

Two of the current bills facing the population of Alaska Natives directly are the D-2 Bill and Senate Bill 2046 concerning D-2 lands Bill it is the responsibility of the Secretary of Interior to respond to the subsistence issue by writing in to amend the Bill to address itself to the subsistence concerns in response to the Native way of life in Alaska utilizing face to

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

Doug Motig - input and participation. Senate Bill 2046 does not allow for implementing the right to self - determination for local communities to become autonomous. There must be language in the Bill to insure the viability of local government control. Granted there are some communcations needed, there are some communities needed extra technical assistance. It is our position, that only way to insure self determination of Native peoples is to clearly assist with the intention of establishing local autonomy. Thankyou very much.

CARL JACK - Thank you Mr. Cahirman. The delegated from the Association of Village Council Presidents during the last two days have met as a group to establish the regions position. Since the convention here deals with an emphasis on subsistence we have reviewed the resolutions that hve been passed at the convention. I have submitted those resolutions to the resolutions to the Resolutions Commettee. We also have reviewed the results of the last conference that was sponsored by AVCP in August 4,5,6, in Bethel and I have been directed by the delegates to submit the results of the Conference. I will touch on the main importtant parts and will submit the results of the Conference. I will touch on the main important parts and will submit the written text to the Committee here. Fires on dealt with the Wildlife Management. The adoption of the Soviet U.S. Treaty on Migratory Birds that allowed for the Harvest of Migratory birds during the current closed season based on need. AVCP also supports an earlier opening of the September 1, full hunting period for rural Alaska to allow AVCP villagers to leagally harvest migratory birds

DOUG MOTIG -Testimony continued

DOUG MOTIG - for food in August before they leave the region in abundance prior to September. The retention of management of marine mammals by the Federal Government and the retention of the Native exemption as enacted by Congress. AVCP does not support the State of Alaska obtaining management control for the State refuses to regulate game based on need of the rural Alaskan Subsistence hunters. AVCP would only support State management only if Sports hunting is clearly restricted when and where it interferes with subsistence hunting of marine mammals for food. The establishment of subsistence hunting zones for moose in the entire AVCP region, the elimination of all sports hunters. These hunters increase competition for the surplus moose and force rural villages to resort to illegal hunting during the closed periods to obtain meat for their families. Subsistence hunters must hunt legally and the State of Alaska contributes to the crisis in moose management by continually declaring that urban hunters have the same right to the limited moose resource as rural subsistence hunters. The elimination of a \$500. permit fee for the hunting of musk ox and the closure of musk ox population to sports hunting when subsistence needs require all surplus musk oxen for local food.

On fisheries, that the subsistence way of life be linked to management of regional fisheries both within its rivers and the sea. AVCP desires that fishing of salmon stocks in the ocean by foreign countries must stop immediately. And that the Congress of the United States must take steps to recognize importance of management of fisheries as an important part of the management of AVCP land mass as an ecosystem That the AVCP be made an integral part of the fisheries management program

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

Doug Motig - of the Federal Government in the formal management arrangement as part of the regional Federal Land Management Program, The formal cooperative arrangement between the federal land management and AVCP must exist. That both the Federal and State governments. That the Federal Government must refrain from disturbing the land where the fish spawn and the animals live to protect the regions fisheries and wildlife. On OCS- that all studies be completed before the decision to lift the suspension on ocs (inaudible) and that these results be shared at Government expense be shared with the villages. That the village be informed how the information was obtained. That AVCP and it's villages have the power of local review prior to the initiation of studies while the studies are going on and in reviewing the studies. That AVCP be part of the management system of Federal decisions to lease OCS where and when leases occur and be involved in all decision making in the operation and maintenance of the project to insure continuation of Yupik lifestyle.

On CZM -that before initiating CZM in the AVCP region that AVCP be notified and be given the opportunity for recommendations for it is the people of AVCP who will suffer the hardships. That the Federal government give money to AVCP to do the studies in education of the villages and that these funds not be given to outside groups. That AVCP wants preference in contracting for local people because we know the information is best.

When the Government classifies its land and AVCP have full participation in the classification procedures. On interim conveyance, reconveyance and navigability. Reaffirm the decision of Energy Transportation Workshop that we have had to wait for the land rather than be forced into accepting easements and immediate

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

DOUG MOTIG - conveyance. People are concerned with integrity of the land, and the subsistence problems that can accompany many easements. AVCP recognizes that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is not as good as promised and that D-2 Bill might be able to correct some of the bad parts of the Settlement act particularly sections dealing with easements and navigability. AVCP supports a definition of navigability that gives as much of the river beds to the State of Alaska so that villages can receive high grounds. There was a special concern at the conference on the issue of hereing. In the eastern Bering Sea the herring is an important subsistence fish to the coastal villages and will be an important commercial industry on the coast line in the future with or without the village participation. In 1977 unexpected fishing success was achieved in Togiak area by American Fisheries. The total of 3,200 metric tons was harvested in just 3 weeks and a full season in 1978 could net someplace between 6 or 7 thousand metric tons in the Togiak alone. The state of Alaska supports the commercialization of herring as a renewable resource industry. AVCP does not support commercial fishing of herring but does encourage on the coast line to join with Bristol Bay villages to establish the rules for the state and the Federal Government on this fisheries. The rules that could protect subsistence by establishing registration for gear, tonnage quotas and mechanisms to insure village control and profit from any commercial herring fisheries. AVCP moved that the state and federal government must do a complete study of the eastern Bering Sea Herring Population for not less than 10 years and all important information must be made

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

DOUG MOTIG - available to the coastal communities. This study would determine the spawning sequence, the areas of distributio, seasonal fluctuation, age, sex ratios, fisheries management conflicts as well as conflicts with set net tradional sites for subsistence harvests in Hooper Bay and Nelson Island Region. If the results of the studies so that commercial fishing of Herring would be detrimental to the subsistence harvests and commercial fishery closure should be extended to the agreed upon date. These are the most important parts that came from the Land Donference and as directed by the delegates, I submit them to you.

EVELYN PETE - Subsistence for hunting, the Copper River people have always depended on Subsistence fishing and hunting. All of the fish that we take is used to survive. When we kill an animal like a moose or a caribou we eat everything. We do not use the head for a trophy we eat most of it. We eat the stomach and all of the meat. We use the bones to tan the hide and we use the hide to make mocassins and coats. Our position on Subsistence fishing - now the sports fihermens cash economy to the state seems to be more important to the state than the subsistence fisherman. The Copper River people cannot survive without fish or game. The regulations won't work with us. We use all the present limit of 30 fish a year that the Fish and Game Department forces those who make over \$5,000.00 a year to live on. We have to take a stand on this issue because without Fish and Game our people will die. We do not have a heavy

EVELYN PETE - Testimony continued

Evelyn Pete- cash economy and it is so cold in the winter that even big contractors and big pipeline companies have to close down so how can our people live then? They have to go back to our old way and get enough meat and fish to live during the winter months. D-2 will greatly effect the Copper River by the Wrangell proposed withdrawal, the Denali Withdrawal and the McKinley park extension. The Copper River region needs to have control over the results of the rules and the regulations regarding D-2/

The AGTNA position of the roles of profit and non-profit corporations. There is a lack of communication between village corporations and the regional corporations which could be eased through use of correspondence, meeting of minutes of corporation minutes to shareholders of village corporations, telephone communications, questionnaires and village visits where applicable. There is a need of equalization of representation on the Board of Directors in some regions such as in the AHTNA region. Revitalization of the interests of the stockholders is essential. There exists the responsibility of the stockholders to demand and secure information from the region. Regional boards could increase communications by sending a list of board members addresses to stockholders. Non-profit corporations need to inform stockholders of status of grants and contracts monthly. Training for board members is needed. Nominated individuals need to be evaluated for qualifications and capabilities. Regional corporations should have representation of federal and/or state level and governors offices for a stronger political base.

Social issues need to be presented by a unified front of both

EVELYN PETE - Testimony continued

Evelyn Pete - Profit and Non-Profit corporations. There is a need for two branches of AFN, one to continue to implement Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and the other to meet individual needs and to provide technical assistance and support. In answer to how the village corporation could maintain the economic stability there is the need to keep ongoing costs to a minimum. In part this can be done by using the resources of the regional corporation.

There is a need to increase interest in bi'lingualism in the home. Program should be developed to provide bilingual education for young adults and/or parents who are not bilingual. Cultural activities should be continued to be stressed in school programs and to the school board.

AHTNA's position on government problems facing rural Alaska. There is a need for any elected representative to the legislature or a lobbyist to represent the interests of the region. We hope the AFN could provide support and communication between the villages and the State government. There is a need to get Native people in key positions in industry, business, and education. There is a need to get younger people involved politically as well as socially and culturally.

The group wants no more transportation corridors across our lands unless we have control over commercial enterprises that are on the corridors of the land. There should be education by rural Alaskans to help urban Alaskans understand the special problems of rural villages. These rural people would be chosen by rural people. State monies from the surplus oil revenues should be used first

EVELYN PETE - Testimony continued

EVELYN PETE - of all to help rural areas in teh field of education, Health and industry. As this is accomplished excess monies could go to the permanent fund. There is a need for the state to provide more assistance in provideing plannning for all state programs and information on current and future state programs.

I'm going to take advantage of the floor and speak about another issue that we felt that should be brought before you. We have been discussing all of the issues and making position known that are very important to all of us. But we haven't addressed the real issue that is before us and that is alcoholism. Some of us can come to this convention and go to all the parties adn drink and know when it starts to hurt our lives then it's time to quit. Some of our people are here and observe us but they cannot draw that fine line and quit when it is hurting them because alcohol has taken control over their lives. We believe that we have in just getting together anmeeting Natives from all over our state, sharing ideas, problems, goals, objectives adn just being together. Alchol is a relatively new problem to Alaska Natives since the whit man has only been here around here 100 year with his booze. We should at least be aware of the dangers of alchol in our own lives and also be aware that people we represent are watching us and know alchol used without caution and self awareness is dangerous to all human beings.

BYRON MALLOT - I would like to ask in the interest of time and to the germaine to the Subsistence Hearing that those moderators

BYRON MALLOT - Testimony continued

BYRON MALLOT - that still have to report - report only the Subsistence sections verbally, the reports on the other sections will be placed in the written records.

LARRY EDWARDS - Mr. Presiden, I don't have any notes or anything on this subsistence living thing but I would like to point out the "In order for one way of life to live and one to die- In order to keep both ways of life for our people that it is essential that we better our fish and wild life laws. And I would like to see more Native input in there- they are the people that know more about our wildlife adn animals in this country. Also on the subject I'd like to see that the fish adn game board take action on that and not have so many board members from guides or know big game hunters and stuff like that. Also on the roads - I would like to see that they don't have so many roads in Alaska expecially if they are Native lands. I urge all the corporations to ban the roads.

LUKE TITUS -In our group defintion of subsistence. We came up with this definition-the utilization of ny renewable or non renewable resource by inhabitants of a region as directed by their native culture. Subsistence and culture go hand and hand the subsistence lifestyle is the way of excercising the traditional rights of the people. Take away those rights, you will practically kill the identity of the people. There are nine effective ways of dealing with this issue 1) Changes in the management scale and regulation of fish and ame to fit the native way of life as an example the setting of seasons for hunting to

LUKE TITUS - Testimony continued

LUKE TITUS - follow the rural area. 2) Set up fish and game management boards in each region to get more input and more control over the game and fish in order to address local issues. 3) Small game limit should be compativle with subsitence needs of the villages. Game management quota levels have historically been set for the sportsman hunter and not for the on going needs of a rural or regional area - examples - inequity and the ptarmigan quotas mentioned such as one that you have two ptarmigan tht can be caught - how will two ptarmigan feed a family of 10? When a sportsman hunter will be really happy to shoot two shotgun shells for two ptarmigan. That's a thing that we're talking about 4) Set up regional fish hatcheries to rehibilitate depleted fisheries resources 5) Where an area an area of subsistence may neighbor a wildlife reserve the native can be given first preference for utilizing that natural resource if it is a renewable resource 6) Rotate areas for hunting to control turnover of game each year an example 100 sq. miles used for hunting one year and the adjacent 100 sq. miles not used then the following year rotate to the area of use. 7) The native themselves should be made aware that a renewable resource will be depleteed without proper management. 8) Educate the general public recognition. I'll speak to this a person who is on subsistence hunting will take all the game - If I go out hunting I will eat the intestines of a moose before I do anything else where as someone from the city went out and caught the same moose they'll probable leave the intestines and some other

LUKE TITUS - Testimony

Luke Titus - part there of the meat. -Also 9) To educate the public about the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act with due regard subsistence level of our native people. That is our report on Subsistence.

NELSON FRANK - Thank you Mr. Chairman. My group is terms of Native lifestyle and culture came up with the following conclusions. That subsistence defined is a total way of life that includes cultural preservation as well as being economically feasible. The values that were discussed were as follows: The villages were started and exists because of th around subsistence lifestyles. Subsistence is seen as more valuable than a cash based economy and is still far more desirable and there is more honor in providing for your own family and taking responsibility for those in the village and far less degrading than accepting welfare. There was a discussion on the issue between subsistence and sport hunting and fishing with the conclusion that subsistence utilizes far more of the game and less abuse of the regulation and that the state provide more technical assistance in balanceing out and protecting the subsistence aspect of the game versus the sports fisherman and were given at the state stocks for sports fishing and very little is done for subsistence. Some of the other solutions were that the village lifestyle should be the sole responsibility of the villagers and that subsistence be incividually defined by each area reflecting its own unique needs and therefore formulatin its own regulations and that the state just provide technical assistance for that purpose.

BILL WOOD - Thank you, Mr. President, I would also like to thank

BILL WOOD - Testimony continued

Bill Wood-you for eliminating all of the testimony except subsistence. I was one of I think two people that was involved in moderating four or five different tables so my eight pages are now down to one. I would like to just summarize some of the statements on subsistence that have come from the four tables that I was moderating. Due to the lack of game resources villages are concerned about selling their land and thereby eliminating the billages. Eklutna was especifically concerned about this area. As far as the definition of subsistence is concerned most of the group felt that it should be defined in the context of rural and urban not in the context of Native adn non-Native the feeling was that politically this may allow for more non-Native during the coming years of reapportionment.

The profits should invest in the non renewabele resource as one of their priorities. For example, fish hatcheries, moose, caribou and deer ranching ets.. That all people should be allowed to subsistence hunt, trap and fish as long as thay don't abuse that privilege. The group agrees with some of the other groups testimony that has already been given on that area. They also stated that on a regional basis and in regional lands that maybe a portion of the hunting and fishing permits cost should be returned to that corporation in that area. A caution is that they should be careful when defining subsistence so as to take into account the culture, current lifestyle, and heritage of the areas that are involved. That the Native Corporations should have some say into the control of the subsistence activities in their area and on their land and finally that we would like to ask consideration that in the definition of subsistence that it be taken into account not only cash based economy but also those subsistence activities themselves.

NICK LUNDE - I have had the honor of being a moderator for two different groups. One from the remote villages and another from a group of students. I thought the contrast on what they chose to discuss was quite relevant. The first group being from the remote villages discussed the lifestyle as it was known over the years prior to the culture of the non-native peoples were brought into the State of Alaska and impacted the manner in which they had to survive. For years they were able to get what they needed from whatever was available, essentially not having to concern themselves with the preservation of any kind of species as they were sufficient numbers available to them in their geographic location to survive without any kind of difficulty. What created the difficulty for them to survive was the influx of the commercialization of all the products. And the overuse by mechanized means such as being able to get to hunting and fishing with outboard motors, snowmobiles, the use of firearms and these kinds of things. So law had to be created which in turn limited their ability to secure life giving commodities such as birds, animals and fish. By having those kinds of things. So laws had to be created which in turn limited their ability to secure life giving commodities such as birds, animals and fish. By having those kinds of elements reduced created the need for the modernized process of going out and earning a dollar and being able to buy something that in order to be able to supplant what was taken away by law.

The discussion went on to that being for a good long time and one of the end results for that discussion was that there is insufficient numbers of Natives that are required by the manner in which they survive being left out of the decision making process. Those individuals that are dependent on the commercialization for their livelihood. I believe the focus in was legislators that were

NICK LUNDE- brought in from locations from locations other than in the small communities. The store owners, the big game hunting guides, these kinds of individuals are the ones being used because of what they call "expert knowledge: on the various subject matter. What are not relied on is the localized expert knowledge and as such the local community individuals that rely on these things for survival are being eliminated from the controlling bodies that develop the laws and regulations.

From the students standpoint - the students happened to be a group from Barrow and very strongly in their minds was the Bowhead Whale situation and they talked about this for a considerable period of time and recognized that in the generating of laws or the limiting of any individual being able to take question came up was "What do we know about the elements that we are attempting to control?" The laws themselves directly impact the species such as the Bowhead Whale those aren't what the law is aimed at but the end result is that those laws also take away from the nutritional needs of the people that rely on them for basic life and also along with that are traditional cultural kinds of activities that occur after all of these things have accomplished. So in the process of enacting laws we need to consider everything that goes into these kinds of things not just what is being regulated for the mere sake of survival of one specific species that is such as whale, or seal, or moose, or caribou or anything of that type. They also went into the area of the discussion of enforcement but since this group is not interested in that I will just submit this in written form.

DOROTHY PEGAN - Thank you Mr. Chairman, most of my remarks will address what the groups I moderated felt were important for

DOROTHY PEGAN - village survival and not necessarily directly concerned with subsistence per se. So my remarks will be very brief. Most of the subsistence problems have been covered and I would just like to reiterate and solidify some remarks made a littler earlier. It was very strongly felt by the groups that I moderated that the villages must forget their differences and pull together in a cooperative to present a stronger and more unified voice in both State and Federal Legislators. And that whereas it is recognized that villages even close to each may wish to maintain different lifestyles, traditional and new and that both of these lifestyles should be allowed to exist and it is further recognized that regardless of lifestyle chosen there will be some degree in each of reliance on both the traditional and the new and that both will face the same subsistence needs so should unify to protect their resource. It was recognized by the group that there are different subsistence needs for rural and urban areas and that although the needs of both should be met, these differences should be recognized. It was strongly felt that the regional fish and game boards should be empowered with regulatory powers for their region and not just be advisory boards and that special hunting regulations should be set up to restrict both the sports hunters who are going into the rural areas and taking the game and also the Urban Native population who apparently have enough money to charter planes to go out into the rural areas and again deplete the game of the rural native Alaskans.

PEGGY WOODLY - I was asked to submit the summary presented by the group at table 20 that Frank Peterson moderated. The Alaska Native should be given preference. Welfare is no acceptable

PEGGY WOODLY- substitute for subsistence. In my life I would never have made it without subsistence fishing. There are too many registered guides in Alaska 1,722 today. Last year one guide brought 45 Swedes in and Air taxi and they got 40 moose. The people living there on subsistence can't stand that kind of competition. The new people coming up to Alaska are causing the wildlife habitat to shrink. It would be better that they didn't come. There are things that money can't buy. I don't get the satisfaction eating the white man's food that I do from eating subsistence food. We don't want welfare. Welfare. My family never would have made it when I was a kid without subsistence food. The rest of my report deals with other subjects.

CHARLIE JOHNSON - The Bering Straits Association met and took a position of a couple of items that we're discussing.

We view the road system as proposed by the State highway department as probably would be the biggest detriment to subsistence activity and would do more damage than any rules or regulations that the state legislature or any game board could come up with. You only have to go around Anchorage or Fairbanks to find that out and I think those residents here would agree with me fully. We are completely opposed to the road that the State highway system is proposing to Nome from Fairbanks to Anchorage.

Secondly, we would also like to point out we would oppose the proposed regulations that the State fish and Game Board is suggesting that would put income requirement, the permit system, and all of those, We feel if this goes on pretty soon we'll have to report every Tom Cod that we take and we'll have to start counting those things so we don't break the law.

CHARLIE JOHNSON - Thirdly, we would like to see that the local board be franted some regularatory powers rather than just advisory. We know that the State is back there on this D-2 issue, proclaiming that it has all these local boards and it listens to these local boards and that it alone can really properly manage the resources of the State. We feel that if this is in fact true, then the local boards must have the regulatory powers that is now held by the one State Board. We feel that the one State Board has to compromise to satisfy for example Anchorage Sports Hunters requirements and compromise as the interest of the people in the bush, the Native people. We have to go (inaudible) miles in one direction, 30 in another, adn 50 in another to take a moose, It was suggested by some local residents that perhaps the reason for that the tourist would have something besides Eskimos to look at. I think that has some basis. Another good example of that is that Brevig has a lot of moose but can't take that but they have to go someplace else quite a few miles and it's very difficult for the people of Brevig to hunt moosewithout breaking the law.

The last point we would like to bring up is that our board would like to suggest that the State Legislator strongly back the position of the Alaska Whalers and they also support the position taken by Governor Hammond that we be allowed to continue taking the whale.

ED THOMAS - Mr. President, on behalf of the table in which I was moderator, I would like to express a point of view and a consideration at future AFN, Conventions, that the time allotment for

ED THOMAS - for hearing the points of view of the individual tables be at a better time rather than at the end of the convention. Our table was very grateful for the opportunity to actively participate in the conference and make recommendations but some of them I thought were very good but they won't be able to be heard and benefiting the rest of the Convention so our recommendation would be to have the hearing of the individual tables at a better time. The points of view from the people at the table were pretty much already covered here pertaining to subsistence use however there were a few other additional considerations. The people at the table felt that the regional profit, and non-profit corporations controlled by the Natives should take the initiative in developing or influencing legislation with access to D-2 lands. They feel that the people in these regions are more expert on what is happening in their area than somebody who would be on a statewide basis.

There is a feeling that sports hunting or sports usage of subsistence items should be based on need whether it be for physical things such as food and clothing, and cultural needs. There is a feeling that the hearing should be nearer to the people, out in the villages where people who utilize the subsistence lifestyle would have an opportunity to present their points of view and be able to do it without getting into large investment to travel to the larger communities. There was a feeling that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Management and policies should change. I will submit the rest of the points in writing on other issues.

BYRON MALLOT - That, Mr. Chairman concludes AFN'S formal testimony before I turn the chair over to you I'd like you to

BYRON MALLOT - indulge me for one minute that I do apologize to the moderators and the workshop recorders who worked so hard to get the written reports as you are all aware that AFN meeting happens once a year over a period of three days period we try to get as much meaningful kind of involvement. And as much meaningful kinds of information out to people and the people control the convention and every once in a while the best laid agenda of men and mice sometimes go a wry. I would like to thank the moderators and the workshop recorders for the fine work that they did I think the the process is and excellent one. I'm certain from what I've seen that the written reports AFN will prepare on the workshop process, the response to the questionnaires will be very helpful both to legislators who are concerned with these issues, as evident here, as well as to the Native people themselves and to other government policy makers. I would like to extend particular thanks to Cliff Black and his staff for the work they've put into in and helping to make this part of the AFN Annual meeting a success. With that Mr. Chairman, that concludes AFN's testimony.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Thank you Mr. President. The comments that have been made have pretty much summarized those comments that have already been made to the committee in our travels however there's one unique difference is that there have been large groups of people discussing an issue and you've come to a consensus and have made this known to the Interim Committee on Subsistence. I'd like to also invite those people

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - to write their comments and send those comments to the Interim Committee on Subsistence, Box 234, Dillingham, Alaska 99576 or call our office at 842-5970., if you have any comments, questions or criticisms that you'd like to bring to our attention. There's one thing that I've felt pretty badly about is that we've not been able to go out to the smaller villages as I would have liked to. I did ask for a substantially larger budget than I was given by the Legislative Council. I asked for \$100,000 at that time and I was given \$40,400 and this of course limited the ability of the committee to travel to the small villages that I know are going to be substantially effected by D-2 legislation and whatever Fish and Game regulations that are going to be developed in behalf of the people in the future. We did not intend to ignore the smaller villages. We wanted to visit at least 25 smaller villages, we were criticized earlier on that we're going to go to the typical hearing villages such as Dillingham, Bethel, Kotzebue and Nome and that's essentially what we ended up doing and that was basically what we were able to do with the flexibility we had in our budget. So I would apologize to those smaller villages on behalf of the committee and I would say that if we had the necessary funds to do the traveling to the smaller villages, we would have done that.

Representative Cotten has joined up early on and I did not recognize him and in addition to Representative Cotten is Representative Al Osterback who is Chairman of the Resources Committee and I felt that was extremely important that he be in attendance and listen to the comments because the legislation that the Interim Committee on Subsistence does draft will more than likely will to to his committee as a first committee so we don't have to

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON-too much internal fighting so our rules committee Chairman can keep that in mind. Very briefly, I would like to outline some of the things that we are going to be doing in response to the testimony that we've heard through out the state- we've already drafted 4 pieces of proposed legislation. We are required by the rules of the legislative Council prior to the time that these proposed pieces of legislation are made public but essentially I'll summarize what they are -first one is that we are going to be changing some hunting seasons, in response to those communities that have stated that the hunting seasons are more they lean towards making things better for the sports hunter rather than subsistence hunters. We're going to be looking at subsistence fish and game quotas. We're going to be looking at subsistence fish and game quotas. We're going to see if we can increase those where it seems quite obvious to the casual observer that the numbers of fish that are allowed for Alaskan people to take for their use all winter long is too small.

We have already drafted a resolution asking the President of United States to direct the Secretary of State to allow the hunting of migratory birds in the springtime.

We have developed legislation that would regionalize the Fish and Game Boards with the full authority of each of the individual boards of Game and board of Fish.

We have created legislation that would create a division of Commercial Fisheries, Division of Sports Fisheries, Division of Gam, etc.

I also will be making a recommendation to the legislation

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - to the legislative Council and the full legislature that a standing subcommittee of Subsistence be established as a permanent standing subcommittee of the Resources Committee. We are also looking into the funding of the funding of the Department of Fish and Game. There was one comment made that stated - A critical statement made of the Department of Fish and Game - that a large amount of their revenues are derived from the sale of licenses. This in my mind indicates to me that the criticism is logical and makes an awful lot of sense. What we will attempt to do is take the funds that are derived from licenses and their sale to go directly to the general fund and any funding for the management and development of regulations for Fish and Game and will be taken out of the General fund so that no special interest group will think that they have more say than any other group in the State of Alaska on how rules and regulations are going to be developed.

I want to congratulate and compliment those of you who have survived this long because I've been associated with Conventions since 1966 and it just amazes me that there are this many of you left. Thank you very much and this hearing is adjourned.

END OF TRANSCRIPT

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON
REPRESENTATIVE SAM COTTEN
REPRESENTATIVE JOE HAYS
REPRESENTATIVE LEO SCHAEFFER
REPRESENTATIVE AL OSTERBACK

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

DOROTHY LARSON, STAFF ASSISTANT
ADELHEID HERMANN

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC. CONVENTION
WESTWARD HILTON HOTEL
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

DATE: November 12, 1977

TIME: 5:00 P.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BYRON MALLOT.....1,
Representative Nels Anderson.....1,2
Betty Miller.....3,
Rosita Worl.....4,5
Doug Motig.....5,6,7
Carl Jack.....7,8,9,10,11
Evelyn.Pete.....11,12,13,14
Byron Mallot.....14,15,
Larry Edwards.....15,
Luke Titus.....15,16,17
Nelson Frank,.....17
Bill Wood17,18,
Nick Lunde.....19,20,
Dorothy Pegan.....20,21
Peggy Woodly.....21,22
Charlie Johnson.....22,23
Ed Thomas.....23,24
Byron Mallot.....24,25,
Representative Nels Anderson.....25,26,27,28

PUBLIC HEARING - ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC. CONVENTION

BYRON MALLOT - Those workshop moderators that are going to give reports I will be calling on you. When I do call on you please come forward to one of the mikes to make your report. As we announced earlier all of the workshop reports will be made part of the subsistence hearing that Representative Nels Anderson and his members are holding throughout the State.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Thank you, Byron. I would like to ask the members of the subsistence Committee to come forward and join me up at the front here if they would. There's Representative Joe Hayes, who has been very patient along with myself and Representative Leo Schaeffer from Kotzebue, Why don't you guys get your tails up here so we can get this thing going. I don't know who else is back there. While the members of the Committee are coming forward I'd like to say that I appreciate the opportunity to be here - this thing has turned out to be something all together different than what I had anticipated in my little bush mind, but you'll have to forgive me for that. The Interim Committee on Subsistence, is a committee that was established by the Legislature this year. It was put together - by my insistence because the State of Alaska, in my opinion does not really recognize the deep need for subsistence hunting, fishing and gathering activities in the State of Alaska. Members of the Interim Committee are Senator Pat Rodey, he is the only Senator that is serving on the Committee, Representative Steve Cowper, Representative William Akers, Representative Al Nakak, Representative Leo Schaeffer, Representative Joe Hayes, Representative Sam Cotten, who I think was in the area earlier and myself. I think possibly many of you already know the pur-

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON-Testimony continued

Representative Nels Anderson - pose of the Committee. The Committee is to hear comments from the public in as many places as we can get to with a very limited budget to get the people's feelings throughout the State of Alaska on what they feel about subsistence. Questions that we ask are three basically - 1) Should the term Subsistence be defined? 2) What do you feel about subsistence- what are your feelings about subsistence? 3) What should the State of Alaska do about protecting subsistence? At this time I'll officially call the Interim Committee Hearing to order and we'll begin to hear the presentations that the Alaska Federation of Natives has prepared.

BYRON MALLOT - Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members. We have during, and we do apologize for the length of time it took us this afternoon. We hope that you understand, I'm sure you did. The AFN, during its annual meeting has had a series of workshops in three broad areas but they relate to the overall question of Subsistence. They have to do with Native Culture and Lifestyle. The role of regional village and regional non-profit corporations and the whole role of State and local and federal governments, policy as they affect our lives. The entire convention comprising some 800 people actively participated in those workshops. The reports of each workshop will be done in writing and will be made available to you as well as the results of questionnaires on those issues that were filled out by members of the annual meeting also. At this time Mr. Chairman I'd like to call on the recorders and moderators to give their reports.

BETTY MILLER - I'm a stock holder in Cock Inlet Region Corp. - I'm scared to death. We were told to give a synopsis of some of the things that we covered in our group and I think the feeling that I got from the groups I attended was first of all the Alaska Natives need to unite and to work as one unit toward one goal. If we don't do that everything that we've worked for - there will be no problem of subsistence because there will be no villages. That slowly the villages are going to go away because there is poor management and no communication between the villages and the regional corporation.

There are language barriers that are not being met. There is no communication between regional corporations and village corporations. This came out very strong in all of the meetings that I attended. I think that most of the people felt that villages can survive on subsistence but a cash flow into the villages enhances the life of the village - in other words some villages could just live on subsistence but money into the villages helps them in buying sugar or if the airplane doesn't make it to the village they don't have fuel to cook their food or whatever. I think that the thing we got out of most of the meetings was that we need to communicate more not only among ourselves but among people. It seems that what we are talking about, our problems are falling on deaf ears and I noticed that the president of Cock Inlet Region did leave as we were about to make our presentation. I feel like on a meeting like this there should be stockholders, villagers, and regional corporations sitting down and talking together instead of being separated. Thank you.

ROSITA WORL - I did prepare a statement on Subsistence based on my two years of experience in the Arctic Slope and my own personal experiences as being raised in a subsistence based economy. I will submit to you that statement, however, I would just like to give you a very brief account of what I view to be the important elements in Subsistence. The three elements are economics, social and cultural. The primary focus of subsistence has been on the economic aspect in the harvest of resources and also on defining the boundaries within which those economic or subsistence activities occur. That's been the primary focus of all subsistence works and generally the subsistence legislation. It is my feeling that if legislation is to protect or insure the maintenance of subsistence then the other aspects of the social and cultural elements must be taken into consideration. And, in that respect, social aspects I'm talking about the organization of social relations in which the harvest is secured and in contemporary society that social relations encompasses a relationship between the actual activities, the person who is going out and also financial support. Now that might sound like economics but the relationship of social in that group of people go together to secure a subsistence harvest. There are two aspects to it- 1) Subsistence requires economic income or monetary income and that monetary income is secured in various ways either by the person actively going out to work himself part time or else he may receive financial support from other members of his family or other members in his community and in return those resources are shared within the community and so to legislate on an individual basis, my feeling, would be detrimental to the survival of subsistence.

The other aspect of subsistence that must be considered in

ROSITA WORL - Testimony continued

legislation is cultural. The Athabascans case which was discussed today is a very good example of the Cultural values of Subsistence. Cultural is a very complex issue and it deals with apsyhological feelings of going out and being on the land, the continued relationship to the lan, the manifestations of subsistence in your arts and in your oral tradition in your literature and those must all be considered. I guess the final statement that I would like to day is that the fate of subsistence today lies not so much in the hunter pursuing his game in the field but it lies on legislation that will either inhibit, or restrict his or her activities.

DOUG MOTIG - I've been accused of always being ready but that's not the truth. We discussed and agreed and recommended that the following:

Subsistence is a village way of life both for bodily well-being and spiritual, emotional well-being. Since being deprived of a subsistence way of life would cause death of a valuable culture and economically would be impossible to replace adn if deprived and has caused alcholism and other kind of disenabling activities. Education of the subsistence way of life should be keyed to the environment.

Utilizing Native people on the local level, There needs to be a more clearly defined set of duties for each corporation. And more important the corporation work cooperatively. We recommend communication between the corporations and people should be provided for. An ombudsman serves a role as a mediator, to

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

communicate the business of the corporation and to communicate to the corporation of the people's wishes. The non-profit could probably serve this role better and we also recommend a directory, informational booklet be developed as to what and who is the Native serving corporation and that book be distributed to the village people. In the past the regional corporation have had self serving roles in terms of advocacy, they have as can be seen served the best interests of the whole. However, for better services to the local community the regional profit corporation should advocate more for human services since they have more available dollars and political clout. Alaska Federation of Natives, has in the past served as a forum for general issues to be discussed at the Convention. This has provided for a better response to the people's needs on a village level. They have also served as advocates for the solutions to problems of village people. This activity should be continued with more provisions for effective communications to village people recognizing that villages are distinctly different and that we are living in a grace period of no taxes of heavy competitors in terms of economic viability we suggest a set of alternatives be drawn up to meet the future needs of the villages economically and action be taken to insure a stable economic base.

Two of the current bills facing the population of Alaska Natives directly are the D-2 Bill and Senate Bill 2046 concerning D-2 lands Bill it is the responsibility of the Secretary of Interior to respond to the subsistence issue by writing in to amend the Bill to address itself to the subsistence concerns in response to the Native way of life in Alaska utilizing face to

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

Doug Motig - input and participation. Senate Bill 2046 does not allow for implementing the right to self - determination for local communities to become autonomous. There must be language in the Bill to insure the viability of local government control. Granted there are some communications needed, there are some communities needed extra technical assistance. It is our position, that only way to insure self determination of Native peoples is to clearly assist with the intention of establishing local autonomy. Thankyou very much.

CARL JACK - Thank you Mr. Cahirman. The delegated from the Association of Village Council Presidents during the last two days have met as a group to establish the regions position. Since the convention here deals with an emphasis on subsistence we have reviewed the resolutions that hve been passed at the convention. I have submitted those resolutions to the resolutions to the Resolutions Commettee. We also have reviewed the results of the last conference that was sponsored by AVCP in August 4,5,6, in Bethel and I have been directed by the delegates to submit the results of the Conference. I will touch on the main important parts and will submit the results of the Conference. I will touch on the main important parts and will submit the written text to the Committee here. Fires on dealt with the Wildlife Management. The adoption of the Soviet U.S. Treaty on Migratory Birds that allowed for the Harvest of Migratory birds during the current closed season based on need. AVCP also supports an earlier opening of the September 1, full hunting period for rural Alaska to allow AVCP villagers to leagally harvest migratory birds

DOUG MOTIG -Testimony continued

DOUG MOTIG - for food in August before they leave the region in abundance prior to September. The retention of management of marine mammals by the Federal Government and the retention of the Native exemption as enacted by Congress. AVCP does not support the State of Alaska obtaining management control for the State refuses to regulate game based on need of the rural Alaskan Subsistence hunters. AVCP would only support State management only if Sports hunting is clearly restricted when and where it interferes with subsistence hunting of marine mammals for food. The establishment of subsistence hunting zones for moose in the entire AVCP region, the elimination of all sports hunters. These hunters increase competition for the surplus moose and force rural villages to resort to illegal hunting during the closed periods to obtain meat for their families. Subsistence hunters must hunt legally and the State of Alaska contributes to the crisis in moose management by continually declaring that urban hunters have the same right to the limited moose resource as rural subsistence hunters. The elimination of a \$500. permit fee for the hunting of musk ox and the closure of musk ox population to sports hunting when subsistence needs require all surplus musk oxen for local food.

On fisheries, that the subsistence way of life be linked to management of regional fisheries both within its rivers and the sea. AVCP desires that fishing of salmon stocks in the ocean by foreign countries must stop immediately. And that the Congress of the United States must take steps to recognize importance of management of fisheries as an important part of the management of AVCP land mass as an ecosystem That the AVCP be made an integral part of the fisheries management program

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

Doug Motig - of the Federal Government in the formal management arrangement as part of the regional Federal Land Management Program, The formal cooperative arrangement between the federal land management and AVCP must exist. That both the Federal and State governments. That the Federal Government must refrain from disturbing the land where the fish spawn and the animals live to protect the regions fisheries and wildlife. On OCS- that all studies be completed before the decision to lift the suspension on ocs (inaudible) and that these results be shared at Government expense be shared with the villages. That the village be informed how the information was obtained. That AVCP and it's villages have the power of local review prior to the initiation of studies while the studies are going on and in reviewing the studies. That AVCP be part of the management system of Federal decisions to lease OCS where and when leases occur and be involved in all decision making in the operation and maintenance of the project to insure continuation of Yupik lifestyle.

On CZM -that before initiating CZM in the AVCP region that AVCP be notified and be given the opportunity for recommendations for it is the people of AVCP who will suffer the hardships. That the Federal government give money to AVCP to do the studies in education of the villages and that these funds not be given to outside groups. That AVCP wants preference in contracting for local people because we know the information is best.

When the Government classifies its land and AVCP have full participation in the classification procedures. On interim conveyance, reconveyance and navigability. Reaffirm the decision of Energy Transportation Workshop that we have had to wait for the land rather than be forced into accepting easements and immediate

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

DOUG MOTIG - conveyance. People are concerned with integrity of the land, and the subsistence problems that can accompany many easements. AVCP recognizes that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is not as good as promised and that D-2 Bill might be able to correct some of the bad parts of the Settlement act particularly sections dealing with easements and navigability. AVCP supports a definition of navigability that gives as much of the river beds to the State of Alaska so that villages can receive high grounds. There was a special concern at the conference on the issue of hereing. In the eastern Bering Sea the herring is an important subsistence fish to the coastal villages and will be an important commercial industry on the coast line in the future with or without the village participation. In 1977 unexpected fishing success was achieved in Togiak area by American Fisheries. The total of 3,200 metric tons was harvested in just 3 weeks and a full season in 1978 could net someplace between 6 or 7 thousand metric tons in the Togiak alone. The state of Alaska supports the commercialization of herring as a renewable resource industry. AVCP does not support commercial fishing of herring but does encourage on the coast line to join with Bristol Bay villages to establish the rules for the state and the Federal Government on this fisheries. The rules that could protect subsistence by establishing registration for gear, tonnage quotas and mechanisms to insure village control and profit from any commercial herring fisheries. AVCP moved that the state and federal government must do a complete study of the eastern Bering Sea Herring Population for not less than 10 years and all important information must be made

DOUG MOTIG - Testimony continued

DOUG MOTIG - available to the coastal communities. This study would determine the spawning sequence, the areas of distributio, seasonal fluctuation, age, sex ratios, fisheries management conflicts as well as conflicts with set net tradional sites for subsistence harvests in Hooper Bay and Nelson Island Region. If the results of the studies so that commercial fishing of Herring would be detrimental to the subsistence harvests and commercial fishery closure should be extended to the agreed upon date. These are the most important parts that came from the Land Donference and as directed by the delegates, I submit them to you.

EVELYN PETE - Subsistence for hunting, the Copper River people have always depended on Subsistence fishing and hunting. All of the fish that we take is used to survive. When we kill an animal like a moose or a caribou we eat everything. We do not use the head for a trophy we eat most of it. We eat the stomach and all of the meat. We use the bones to tan the hide and we use the hide to make mocassins and coats. Our position on Subsistence fishing - now the sports fihermens cash economy to the state seems to be more important to the state than the subsistence fisherman. The Copper River people cannot survive without fish or game. The regulations won't work with us. We use all the present limit of 30 fish a year that the Fish and Game Department forces those who make over \$5,000.00 a year to live on. We have to take a stand on this issue because without Fish and Game our people will die. We do not have a heavy

EVELYN PETE - Testimony continued

Evelyn Pete- cash economy and it is so cold in the winter that even big contractors and big pipeline companies have to close down so how can our people live then? They have to go back to our old way and get enough meat and fish to live during the winter months. D-2 will greatly effect the Copper River by the Wrangell proposed withdrawal, the Denali Withdrawal and the McKinley park extension. The Copper River region needs to have control over the results of the rules and the regulations regarding D-2/

The AGTNA position of the roles of profit and non-profit corporations. There is a lack of communication between village corporations and the regional corporations which could be eased through use of correspondence, meeting of minutes of corporation minutes to shareholders of village corporations, telephone communications, questionnaires and village visits where applicable. There is a need of equalization of representation on the Board of Directors in some regions such as in the AHTNA region. Revitalization of the interests of the stockholders is essential. There exists the responsibility of the stockholders to demand and secure information from the region. Regional boards could increase communications by sending a list of board members addresses to stockholders. Non-profit corporations need to inform stockholders of status of grants and contracts monthly. Training for board members is needed. Nominated individuals need to be evaluated for qualifications and capabilities. Regional corporations should have representation of federal and/or state level and governors offices for a stronger political base.

Social issues need to be presented by a unified front of both

EVELYN PETE - Testimony continued

Evelyn Pete - Profit and Non-Profit corporations. There is a need for two branches of AFN, one to continue to implement Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and the other to meet individual needs and to provide technical assistance and support. In answer to how the village corporation could maintain the economic stability there is the need to keep ongoing costs to a minimum. In part this can be done by using the resources of the regional corporation.

There is a need to increase interest in bi'lingualism in the home. Program should be developed to provide bilingual education for young adults and/or parents who are not bilingual. Cultural activities should be continued to be stressed in school programs and to the school board.

AHTNA's position on government problems facing rural Alaska. There is a need for any elected representative to the legislature or a lobbyist to represent the interests of the region. We hope the AFN could provide support and communication between the villages and the State government. There is a need to get Native people in key positions in industry, business, and education. There is a need to get younger people involved politically as well as socially and culturally.

The group wants no more transportation corridors across our lands unless we have control over commercial enterprises that are on the corridors of the land. There should be education by rural Alaskans to help urban Alaskans understand the special problems of rural villages. These rural people would be chosen by rural people. State monies from the surplus oil revenues should be used first

EVELYN PETE - Testimony continued

EVELYN PETE - of all to help rural areas in the field of education, Health and industry. As this is accomplished excess monies could go to the permanent fund. There is a need for the state to provide more assistance in providing planning for all state programs and information on current and future state programs.

I'm going to take advantage of the floor and speak about another issue that we felt that should be brought before you. We have been discussing all of the issues and making positions known that are very important to all of us. But we haven't addressed the real issue that is before us and that is alcoholism. Some of us can come to this convention and go to all the parties and drink and know when it starts to hurt our lives then it's time to quit. Some of our people are here and observe us but they cannot draw that fine line and quit when it is hurting them because alcohol has taken control over their lives. We believe that we have in just getting together a meeting of Natives from all over our state, sharing ideas, problems, goals, objectives and just being together. Alcohol is a relatively new problem to Alaska Natives since the white man has only been here around here 100 years with his booze. We should at least be aware of the dangers of alcohol in our own lives and also be aware that people we represent are watching us and know alcohol used without caution and self awareness is dangerous to all human beings.

BYRON MALLOT - I would like to ask in the interest of time and to the germane to the Subsistence Hearing that those moderators

BYRON MALLOT - Testimony continued

BYRON MALLOT - that still have to report - report only the Subsistence sections verbally, the reports on the other sections will be placed in the written records.

LARRY EDWARDS - Mr. Presiden, I don't have any notes or anything on this subsistence living thing but I would like to point out the "In order for one way of life to live and one to die- In order to keep both ways of life for our people that it is essential that we better our fish and wild life laws. And I would like to see more Native input in there- they are the people that know more about our wildlife adn animals in this country. Also on the subject I'd like to see that the fish adn game board take action on that and not have so many board members from guides or know big game hunters and stuff like that. Also on the roads - I would like to see that they don't have so many roads in Alaska expecially if they are Native lands. I urge all the corporations to ban the roads.

LUKE TITUS -In our group defintion of subsistence. We came up with this definition-the utilization of ny renewable or non renewable resource by inhabitants of a region as directed by their native culture. Subsistence and culture go hand and hand the subsistence lifestyle is the way of excercising the traditional rights of the people. Take away those rights, you will practically kill the identity of the people. There are nine effective ways of dealing with this issue 1) Changes in the management scale and regulation of fish and ame to fit the native way of life as an example the setting of seasons for hunting to

LUKE TITUS - Testimony continued

LUKE TITUS - follow the rural area. 2) Set up fish and game management boards in each region to get more input and more control over the game and fish in order to address local issues. 3) Small game limit should be compativle with subsitence needs of the villages. Game management quota levels have historically been set for the sportsman hunter and not for the on going needs of a rural or regional area - examples - inequity and the ptarmigan quotas mentioned such as one that you have two ptarmigan tht can be caught - how will two ptarmigan feed a family of 10? When a sportsman hunter will be really happy to shoot two shotgun shells for two ptarmigan. That's a thing that we're talking about 4) Set up regional fish hatcheries to rehibilitate depleted fisheries resources 5) Where an area an area of subsistence may neighbor a wildlife reserve the native can be given first preference for utilizing that natural resource if it is a renewable resource 6) Rotate areas for hunting to control turnover of game each year an example 100 sq. miles used for hunting one year and the adjacent 100 sq. miles not used then the following year rotate to the area of use. 7) The native themselves should be made aware that a renewable resource will be depleteed without proper management. 8) Educate the general public recognition. I'll speak to this a person who is on subsistence hunting will take all the game - If I go out hunting I will eat the intestines of a moose before I do anything else where as someone from the city went out and caught the same moose they'll probable leave the intestines and some other

LUKE TITUS - Testimony

Luke Titus - part there of the meat. -Also 9) To educate the public about the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act with due regard subsistence level of our native people. That is our report on Subsistence.

NELSON FRANK - Thank you Mr. Chairman. My group is terms of Native lifestyle and culture came up with the following conclusions. That subsistence defined is a total way of life that includes cultural preservation as well as being economically feasible. The values that were discussed were as follows: The villages were started and exists because of th around subsistence lifestyles. Subsistence is seen as more valuable than a cash based economy and is still far more desirable and there is more honor in providing for your own family and taking responsibility for those in the village and far less degrading than accepting welfare. There was a discussion on the issue between subsistence and sport hunting and fishing with the conclusion that subsistence utilizes far more of the game and less abuse of the regulation and that the state provide more technical assistance in balanceing out and protecting the subsistence aspect of the game versus the sports fisherman and were given at the state stocks for sports fishing and very little is done for subsistence. Some of the other solutions were that the village lifestyle should be the sole responsibility of the villagers and that subsistence be incividually defined by each area reflecting its own unique needs and therefore formulatin its own regulations and that the state just provide technical assistance for that purpose.

BILL WOOD - Thank you, Mr. President, I would also like to thank

BILL WOOD - Testimony continued

Bill Wood-you for eliminating all of the testimony except subsistence. I was one of I think two people that was involved in moderating four or five different tables so my eight pages are now down to one. I would like to just summarize some of the statements on subsistence that have come from the four tables that I was moderating. Due to the lack of game resources villages are concerned about selling their land and thereby eliminating the billages. Eklutna was specifically concerned about this area. As far as the definition of subsistence is concerned most of the group felt that it should be defined in the context of rural and urban not in the context of Native and non-Native the feeling was that politically this may allow for more non-Native during the coming years of reapportionment.

The profits should invest in the non renewable resource as one of their priorities. For example, fish hatcheries, moose, caribou and deer ranching etc.. That all people should be allowed to subsistence hunt, trap and fish as long as they don't abuse that privilege. The group agrees with some of the other groups testimony that has already been given on that area. They also stated that on a regional basis and in regional lands that maybe a portion of the hunting and fishing permits cost should be returned to that corporation in that area. A caution is that they should be careful when defining subsistence so as to take into account the culture, current lifestyle, and heritage of the areas that are involved. That the Native Corporations should have some say into the control of the subsistence activities in their area and on their land and finally that we would like to ask consideration that in the definition of subsistence that it be taken into account not only cash based economy but also those subsistence activities themselves.

NICK LUNDE - I have had the honor of being a moderator for two different groups. One from the remote villages and another from a group of students. I thought the contrast on what they chose to discuss was quite relevant. The first group being from the remote villages discussed the lifestyle as it was known over the years prior to the culture of the non-native peoples were brought into the State of Alaska and impacted the manner in which they had to survive. For years they were able to get what they needed from whatever was available, essentially not having to concern themselves with the preservation of any kind of species as they were sufficient numbers available to them in their geographic location to survive without any kind of difficulty. What created the difficulty for them to survive was the influx of the commercialization of all the products. And the overuse by mechanized means such as being able to get to hunting and fishing with outboard motors, snowmobiles, the use of firearms and these kinds of things. So law had to be created which in turn limited their ability to secure life giving commodities such as birds, animals and fish. By having those kinds of things, so laws had to be created which in turn limited their ability to secure life giving commodities such as birds, animals and fish. By having those kinds of elements reduced created the need for the modernized process of going out and earning a dollar and being able to buy something that in order to be able to supplant what was taken away by law.

The discussion went on to that being for a good long time and one of the end results for that discussion was that there is insufficient numbers of Natives that are required by the manner in which they survive being left out of the decision making process. Those individuals that are dependent on the commercialization for their livelihood. I believe the focus in was legislators that were

NICK LUNDE- brought in from locations from locations other than in the small communities. The store owners, the big game hunting guides, these kinds of individuals are the ones being used because of what they call "expert knowledge: on the various subject matter. What are not relied on is the localized expert knowledge and as such the local community individuals that rely on these things for survival are being eliminated from the controlling bodies that develop the laws and regulations.

From the students standpoint - the students happened to be a group from Barrow and very strongly in their minds was the Bow-head Whale situation and they talked about this for a considerable period of time and recognized that in the generating of laws or the limiting of any individual being able to take question came up was "What do we know about the elements that we are attempting to control?" The laws themselves directly impact the species such as the Bowhead Whale those aren't what the law is aimed at but the end result is that those laws also take away from the nutritional needs of the people that rely on them for basic life and also along with that are traditional cultural kinds of activities that occur after all of these things have accomplished. So in the process of enacting laws we need to consider everything that goes into these kinds of things not just what is being regulated for the mere sake of survival of one specific species that is such as whale, or seal, or moose, or caribou or anything of that type. They also went into the area of the discussion of enforcement but since this group is not interested in that I will just submit this in written form.

DOROTHY PEGAN -- Thank you Mr. Chairman, most of my remarks will address what the groups I moderated felt were important for

DOROTHY PEGAN - village survival and not necessarily directly concerned with subsistence per se. So my remarks will be very brief. Most of the subsistence problems have been covered and I would just like to reiterate and solidify some remarks made a littler earlier. It was very strongly felt by the groups that I moderated that the villages must forget their differences and pull together in a cooperative to present a stronger and more unified voice in both State and Federal Legislators. And that whereas it is recognized that villages even close to each may wish to maintain different lifestyles, traditional and new and that both of these lifestyles should be allowed to exist and it is further recognized that regardless of lifestyle choosen there will be some degeree in each of reliance on both the traditional and the new and that both will face the same subsistence needs so should unify to protect their resource. It was recognized by the group that there are different subsistence needs for rural and urban areas and that although the needs of both should be met, these differences should be recognized. It was strongly felt that the regional fish and game boards should be empowered with regulatory powere for their region and not just be advisory boards and that special hunting regulations should be set up to restrict both the sports hunters who are going into the rural areas and taking the game and also the Urban Native population who apparently have enough mony to charter planes to go out into the rural areas and again deplete the game of the rural native Alaskans.

PEGGY WOODLY - I was asked to submit the summary presented by the groug at table 20 that Frank Peteerson moderated. The Alaska Native should be given preference. Welfare is no acceptable

PEGGY WOODLY- substitute for subsistence. In my life I would never have made it without subsistence fishing. There are too many registered guides in Alaska 1,722 today. Last year one guide brought 45 Swedes in and Air taxi and they got 40 moose. The people living there on subsistence can't stand that kind of competition. The new people coming up to Alaska are causing the wildlife habitat to shrink. It would be better that they didn't come. There are things that money can't buy. I don't get the satisfaction eating the white man's food that I do from eating subsistence food. We don't want welfare. Welfare. My family never would have made it when I was a kid without subsistence food. The rest of my report deals with other subjects.

CHARLIE JOHNSON - The Bering Straits Association met and took a position of a couple of items that we're discussing.

We view the road system as proposed by the State highway department as probably would be the biggest detriment to subsistence activity and would do more damage than any rules or regulations that the state legislature or any game board could come up with. You only have to go around Anchorage or Fairbanks to find that out and I think those residents here would agree with me fully. We are completely opposed to the road that the State highway system is proposing to Nome from Fairbanks to Anchorage.

Secondly, we would also like to point out we would oppose the proposed regulations that the State fish and Game Board is suggesting that would put income requirement, the permit system, and all of those. We feel if this goes on pretty soon we'll have to report every Tom Cod that we take and we'll have to start counting those things so we don't break the law.

CHARLIE JOHNSON - Thirdly, we would like to see that the local board be franted some regularatory powers rather than just advisory. We know that the State is back there on this D-2 issue, proclaiming that it has all these local boards and it listens to these local boards and that it alone can really properly manage the resources of the State. We feel that if this is in fact true, then the local boards must have the regulatory powers that is now held by the one State Board. We feel that the one State Board has to compromise to satisfy for example Anchorage Sports Hunters requirements and compromise as the interest of the people in the bush, the Native people. We have to go (inaudible) miles in one direction, 30 in another, adn 50 in another to take a moose, It was suggested by some local residents that perhaps the reason for that the tourist would have something besides Eskimos to look at. I think that has some basis. Another good example of that is that Brevig has a lot of moose but can't take that but they have to go someplace else quite a few miles and it's very difficult for the people of Brevig to hunt moosewithout breaking the law.

The last point we would like to bring up is that our board would like to suggest that the State Legislator strongly back the position of the Alaska Whalers and they also support the position taken by Governor Hammond that we be allowed to continue taking the whale.

ED THOMAS - Mr. President, on behalf of the table in which I was moderator, I would like to express a point of view and a consideration at future AFN, Conventions, that the time allotment for

ED THOMAS - for hearing the points of view of the individual tables be at a better time rather than at the end of the convention. Our table was very grateful for the opportunity to actively participate in the conference and make recommendations but some of them I thought were very good but they won't be able to be heard and benefiting the rest of the Convention so our recommendation would be to have the hearing of the individual tables at a better time. The points of view from the people at the table were pretty much already covered here pertaining to subsistence use however there were a few other additional considerations. The people at the table felt that the regional profit, and non-profit corporations controlled by the Natives should take the initiative in developing or influencing legislation with access to D-2 lands. They feel that the people in those regions are more expert on what is happening in their area than somebody who would be on a statewide basis.

There is a feeling that sports hunting or sports usage of subsistence items should be based on need whether it be for physical things such as food and clothing, and cultural needs. There is a feeling that the hearing should be nearer to the people, out in the villages where people who utilize the subsistence lifestyle would have an opportunity to present their points of view and be able to do it without getting into large investment to travel to the larger communities. There was a feeling that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Management and policies should change. I will submit the rest of the points in writing on other issues.

BYRON MALLOT - That, Mr. Chairman concludes AFN'S formal testimony before I turn the chair over to you I'd like you to

BYRON MALLOT - indulge me for one minute that I do apologize to the moderators and the workshop recorders who worked so hard to get the written reports as you are all aware that AFN meeting happens once a year over a period of three days period we try to get as much meaningful kind of involvement. And as much meaningful kinds of information out to people and the people control the convention and every once in a while the best laid agenda of men and mice sometimes go a wry. I would like to thank the moderators and the workshop recorders for the fine work that they did I think the the process is and excellent one. I'm certain from what I've seen that the written reports AFN will prepare on the workshop process, the response to the questionnaires will be very helpful both to legislators who are concerned with these issues, as evident here, as well as to the Natvie people themselves and to other government policy makers. I would like to extend particular thanks to Cliff Black and his staff for the work they've put into in and helping to make this part of the AFN Annual meeting a success. With that Mr. Chairman, that concludes AFN's testimony.

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - Thank you Mr. President. The comments that have been made have pretty much summarized those comments that have already been made to the committee in our travels however there's one unique difference is that there have been large groups of people discussing an issue and you've come to a consensus and have made this known to the Interim Committee on Subsistence. I'd like to also invite those people

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - to write their comments and send those comments to the Interim Committee on Subsistence, Box 234, Dillingham, Alaska 99576 or call our office at 842-5970., if you have any comments, questions or criticisms that you'd like to bring to our attention. There's one thing that I've felt pretty badly about is that we've not been able to go out to the smaller villages as I would have liked to. I did ask for a substantially larger budget than I was given by the Legislative Council. I asked for \$100,000 at that time and I was given \$40,400 and this of course limited the ability of the committee to travel to the small villages that I know are going to be substantially effected by D-2 legislation and whatever Fish and Game regulations that are going to be developed in behalf of the people in the future. We did not intend to ignore the smaller villages. We wanted to visit at least 25 smaller villages, we were criticized earlier on that we're going to go to the typical hearing villages such as Dillingham, Bethel, Kotzebue and Nome and that's essentially what we ended up doing and that was basically what we were able to do with the flexibility we had in our budget. So I would apologize to those smaller villages on behalf of the committee and I would say that if we had the necessary funds to do the traveling to the smaller villages, we would have done that.

Representative Cotten has joined up early on and I did not recognize him and in addition to Representative Cotten is Representative Al Osterback who is Chairman of the Resources Committee and I felt that was extremely important that he be in attendance and listen to the comments because the legislation that the Interim Committee on Subsistence does draft will more than likely will go to his committee as a first committee so we don't have to

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON-too much internal fighting so our rules committee Chairman can keep that in mind. Very briefly, I would like to outline some of the things that we are going to be doing in response to the testimony that we've heard through out the state- we've already drafted 4 pieces of proposed legislation. We are required by the rules of the legislative Council prior to the time that these proposed pieces of legislation are made public but essentially I'll summarize what they are -first one is that we are going to be changing some hunting seasons, in response to those communities that have stated that the hunting seasons are more they lean towards making things better for the sports hunter rather than subsistence hunters. We're going to be looking at subsistence fish and game quotas. We're going to be looking at subsistence fish and game quotas. We're going to see if we can increase those where it seems quite obvious to the casual observer that the numbers of fish that are allowed for Alaskan people to take for their use all winter long is too small.

We have already drafted a resolution asking the President of United States to direct the Secretary of State to allow the hunting of migratory birds in the springtime.

We have developed legislation that would regionalize the Fish and Game Boards with the full authority of each of the individual boards of Game and board of Fish.

We have created legislation that would create a division of Commercial Fisheries, Division of Sports Fisheries, Division of Gam, etc.

I also will be making a recommendation to the legislation

REPRESENTATIVE NELS ANDERSON - to the legislative Council and the full legislature that a standing subcommittee of Subsistence be established as a permanent standing subcommittee of the Resources Committee. We are also looking into the funding of the funding of the Department of Fish and Game. There was one comment made that stated - A critical statement made of the Department of Fish and Game - that a large amount of their revenues are derived from the sale of licenses. This in my mind indicates to me that the criticism is logical and makes an awful lot of sense. What we will attempt to do is take the funds that are derived from licenses and their sale to go directly to the general fund and any funding for the management and development of regulations for Fish and Game and will be taken out of the General fund so that no special interest group will think that they have more say than any other group in the State of Alaska on how rules and regulations are going to be developed.

I want to congratulate and compliment those of you who have survived this long because I've been associated with Conventions since 1966 and it just amazes me that there are this many of you left. Thank you very much and this hearing is adjourned.

END OF TRANSCRIPT

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels Anderson, Jr.,
Chairman
Representative Leo Schaeffer, Jr.
Representative Sam Cotten

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorothy Larson, Staff Assistant

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH ASSEMBLY
BARROW, ALASKA

DATE: December 12, 1977
TIME: 7:30 P.M.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Address</u> | <u>Organization</u> |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Eben Hopson | Mayor, Barrow | North Slope Borough |
| Michael Jeffery | Box 309, Barrow | Barrow Office, ALSC |
| Eugene Brower | Box 492, Barrow | North Slope Borough Barrow Whaler |
| Morgan P. Soloman | Box 589, Barrow | Alaska State Human Commission |
| Eugene S. Lawn | Box 1586, Juneau | |
| Diane Baum | Box 607, Barrow | |
| Jonah Leavitt | Box 244, Barrow | North Slope Borough Hunter |
| Zachariah Alumalak | Box 135, Barrow | |
| Daniel T. Leavitt | Box 361, Barrow | Whaler |
| Morgan A. Sakeagak | Box 586, Barrow | |
| William Thomas | Box 106, Barrow | Arctic Slope Regional Corporation |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|----|
| 1. TESTIMONY OF | Eben Hopson, Mayor, Barrow..... | 2 |
| 2. TESTIMONY OF | William Thomas, Box 106, Barrow..... | 19 |
| 3. TESTIMONY OF | Daniel Leavitt, Box 361, Barrow..... | 22 |
| 4. TESTIMONY OF | Michael Jeffrey, Box 309, Barrow..... | 25 |



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman
P. O. Box 234
Dillingham, AK 99576 Tel: 842-5970

DECEMBER 12, 1977 - BARROW PUBLIC HEARING

Representative Nels Anderson, introduction of panel. On my left is Representative Leo Schaeffer from Kobuk, on my right is Representative Sam Cotten from Eagle River, other members of the committee are Representative Billy Akers from Chuloonawick, Representative Steve Cowper from Fairbanks and Senator Pat Rodey from Anchorage. We are hoping we can get as many people as possible to testify tonight to the committee so the people of Barrow and hopefully from the surrounding villages want to give us their ideas about what subsistence means. There are three basic questions we're hoping people will address this evening, of course it's not necessary for people to restrict their comments to the three things that we'd like to hear about. But one is what, if anything, should be done by the State of Alaska in land and water use planning, when that kind of management policy is developed, what should the State of Alaska take into consideration. Two, should the term subsistence be defined and three, what should the State of Alaska do to protect subsistence.

We've been holding hearings throughout the State of Alaska, we've been receiving quite a response from various people with many different kinds of backgrounds, people who are commercial fishermen, people who are sports hunters, people who are sports fishermen and a great part of the testimony has come from people who are subsistence users of the land and waters of the State of Alaska. The basic purpose again, of our committee was to again, collect all the

views we possible could so that we could make a presentation to the State of Alaska and to the Federal Government on what changes there ought to be in Fish and Game, management structures, policies and regulations and investigate alternatives that are justified and propose legislation that may be required as a result of these investigations that we've conducted. I would at this time, like to as Representative Schaeffer if he has any opening comments and also Mr. Cotten and after they've made their opening remarks, I'd like to ask Mayor Hopson to lead us off in testimony.

Representative Leo Schaeffer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It's always a pleasure to come to Barrow and I suppose I should apologise to the citizens for not being able to get here as often as I should although I just want to assure the people here that although I'm not here physically as often as I should be I'm here, for the most part, in spirit. So, thank you very much.

Representative Sam Cotten: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is my first trip to Barrow as ah it's my first trip this summer to many places in western Alaska, I've lived in Alaska for 30 years and it's really been my first opportunity to tour the state, if you will, and especially in connection with this committee, to hear from the people that live in the outlying areas as to what their subsistence needs are and it's been a real education as well as a pleasure for me and I'm happy to be in Barrow. Thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Mayor, would you be so kind as to lead us off?

Eben Hopson: Where do you want me to sit? Here? Are we on tape or air or what do we do?

Representative Nels Anderson: I think we're on the air at this time, Mr. Mayor, although I'm not positive, I'm not exactly sure but I think we are on the air.

Eben Hopson: Mayor, Barrow. I don't have anything prepared, although I do have some comments as to the subsistence needs and particularly in the rural areas. I do have a copy of your notice for public hearing, the announcement, and a few questions you just mentioned. The ones that are generally asked at one of these hearings. As to question number one, I haven't been too heavily involved with consideration of any legislation dealing with D-2 although we have submitted some written testimony but depended mostly on the involvement of the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation to deal with that matter, outside of presenting our own position with respect to how the complications should be handled with respect to D-2 lands. Aside from that, I would suggest that any consideration as to the classification, particularly on the D-2 legislation that classification that most fits particularly in the rural area, that would permit uninterrupted use by subsistence hunters be taken heavily into consideration at your discussion on how the classification ought to be considered on the D-2 legislation.

I might add that the word subsistence hunting and fishing, I think it's one term that has been more arbitrarily dealt with unjustifiably by the legislature itself, the administrators, the Fish and Game Board, the Fish and Game committees because if I recall correctly, in the year 1959 when subsistence was first inserted in the statutes of the State, the purposes for which it was used, was to permit those living in the rural areas to exercise their right to hunt particularly if they were low income people. That description of the word subsistence as far as the administration of the state law is concerned, has

become very inadequate because the administrative bodies that deal with subsistence have continuously rejected the applications and used it only on those people that have low income. In other words, affording them the opportunity to hunt caribou, moose, fish and permitting the take based on the needs of those low income people. As I said earlier, that interpretation of the word subsistence is very inadequate and the classification of the D-2 legislation it's so hard to make sure that all kinds of subsistence hunting is permitted on those lands that are being under consideration for the purpose of classification under the D-2 legislation.

As to number two, the definition of subsistence, I have suggested to another group, the definition for the word subsistence it may apply to those people that have traditionally hunted for their meat supply. In other words, the personal application would prohibit me from using that because of my salary. I am an Eskimo, I was born an Eskimo and once an Eskimo, you're always an Eskimo. What does that mean? I need some native food to keep my body and my system going. That's the difference between what I'm about to say and the application of the word subsistence since statehood in 1959. It's applied to low-income people that the Fish and Game board recognizes as having the need to hunt. Let's see if I can make a better description of the word subsistence. A term was used in a court action recently that I think I would much rather use and have it inserted by the legislature to apply more adequately to all of the native people that need to hunt for their subsistence. The term used by the court in Fairbanks on a answer to a suit by the sports hunting with respect to the caribou moratorium and the limitation that was imposed last July. They suggested the use of the word, I think it was four words, "minimum maintenance of subsistence needs". It should be somehow engineered so that in your statutes that description of subsistence should be

inserted so that the application can be more widely used for all native people that have traditionally used native food for their sustenance, maintained their sustenance, which means, like I said a few minutes ago, an Eskimo known for his character as being a meat eater, we eat meat all the time and because of one person, an Eskimo who was growing up and lived utilizing caribou meat, whale meat, walrus meat, seal meat, you name it. Just because a guy, in one of his years happened to train himself so that he could earn a lot more money and escape the classification of the low income person, doesn't mean he's going to stop eating caribou meat, doesn't mean he's going to stop eating muktuk, like I said once an Eskimo, you're always an Eskimo. And the application of the word subsistence needs to be more described in a broader term to include what I just mentioned, and the suggested definition of the word subsistence is "minimum maintenance of sustenance needs." And that would apply more adequately to all of the native people that must hunt to sustain themselves and that is the reason why we have been fighting this whaling ban, making all kinds of trips to Washington, D.C. and just last week to Tokyo.

We're not satisfied, incidentally, with the results of that meeting but we have an opportunity to work to continue our fight and increase the products established by the IWC. I think that state's effort should be, I don't know, let me make this suggestion, you should probably suggest reorganizing the Alaska State Fish and Game Board. You might have already. You already have two committees, am I correct? One for commercial fishing and the other for hunting? One for fish and one for game, is that it? The board of Fisheries and the Board of Game. I want to suggest to you that perhaps you need a third body to deal with subsistence only because we're still subjects in the exercise of our subsistence needs, we're still being governed by somebody

that isn't necessarily involved in commercial hunting. When you take a bunch of fishermen from Kodiak, Bristol Bay, ha, ha, Mr. Chairman, southeastern Alaska, perhaps all the way to Unakaleet and Nome! What do they know about my subsistence hunting in Barrow, Nuiqsuk, Wainwright, Point Hope (inaudible) They don't know the first damn thing about it and that's why during this past year, particularly we have been suffering from moratorium of the taking of caribou last summer. Merely, because some stupid little jerk down there who claims to be a biologist for the Alaska Fish and Game suggested one time, that "My God, they've lost a hundred thousand caribou overnight! Last year there was two-hundred and forty thousand and now there's only a hundred fifty thousand, what happened to them?" Of course the immediate argument was that the Eskimos did an overkill. But, it never occurred. So, being subject to regulations by people, 99% of who is concerned has nothing to do with subsistence hunting. I think it's very bad. In other words, for a third group to be organized that must deal with subsistence hunting, not a bunch of commercial fishermen or some of these sports hunters that wanted to kill the animals whether there was too many out there or not but people that do not understand the need for subsistence hunting.

You might want to take that approach to your state legislature when you go back because again, your dealing with this whaling problem, the moratorium was imposed by 16 countries and that makes up the International Whaling Commission. Try to picture with the United States and it's not now involved in any commercial hunting and whaling. The newspaper release, if you read just a few days ago that came out of Tokyo saying that I angrily walked out of the IWC meeting is a fact. But let me explain to you. The hundred percent of the membership, including the United States chief delegate, had never even visited a whaling camp once. They don't know what whale hunting is all about

as far as we are concerned. Again, the reason for imposing the whale moratorium was because some scientist we kept, we landed 48 whales 2 years ago and at the same time there were 87 or 86 whales struck and lost and the concensus committee whose responsibility was to inform and keep the International Whaling Commission informed stated that these are facts and you must respond to them in some way. So the ideas was to say that we'll impose a moratorium. That action is going to be challenged and we're about to file a jurisdiction or two against the IWC because we strongly feel that the IWC has no jurisdiction over subsistence hunting. The IWC was originally formed to control commercial fishing and has absolutely no authority to control subsistence hunting but they did it. Supposedly the IWC took for granted what they (inaudible) these figures are facts and you must respond to them. We repeatedly told them that these figures were too unreliable and that the honor of such figures as a strike in the (inaudible) part of the whaling country. And the method of collecting such information was very sketchy and we know exactly how they got that information. So I merely say, to inform you that again there was another incident where a group of people had absolutely no knowledge of why we hunt the bowhead whale, indeed imposed this moratorium and again our arguments for about three months last summer in July the Fish and Game Board arbitrarily against our own recommendations, imposed the moratorium on the caribou, so I'm suggesting to you that the approach you might take as to how the state might protect subsistence, what to you is subsistence, is by organizing another committee to deal with subsistence alone. And, of course one other area as far as land and water use qualities are concerned as is primary to do with what legislation you might go ahead and pursue with respect to D-2 lands and wherever possible that you imply that whatever the regulations may be for those segments of the population that need to exercise their right to. For subsistence hunting to permitted at all times and I might add, subject to whatever controls this committee might

come up with respect to subsistence hunting. I'm not saying totally that you have to control subsistence hunting just for the sake of controlling it, I think what I'm saying and which we included in our statement with respect to the bowhead whale is that we don't have a real reliable scientific study I think it should go for both caribou and any other species that we normally hunt for our subsistence hunting. We want to be sure that in the regulations of all the animals, birds and everything else we regulate our management by a good scientific program and maintains that you know stays abreast of the modulation figures for caribou, walrus, seal, fish and everything. It can work.

You have to depend on in this instance like the International Whaling Commission but it doesn't have the slightest knowledge of why we hunt the bowhead whale in the first place and have them impose a moratorium on you is not a very easy pill to swallow. And they paid for some of our travel, the State Department and the Commerce Department but North Slope Borough ended up paying for most of our expenses and our travel to Tokyo and I think the State is going to pay for only about three tickets of the twelve that journeyed to Tokyo to make our presentation. So I think all I'm saying here is that we must get a better handle in the regulations of our subsistence hunting in the State. I don't know if you have any questions. I don't have a prepared statement or anything but I'll answer any questions you may have.

Representative Nels Anderson: Does anyone have any questions at this time?

Representative Sam Cotten: Well, this is the first time I've heard any of your reports on your trip to Japan so I'm real interested in what your next moves are going to be and you pretty clearly said, you know, that you were going to file a suit. I just wondered what sort of time table you were talking

and what the chances look like as far as a change in the IWC's position.

Eben Hopson: I'm not sure but we were delaing with this in Washington. We decided that it depends on how we felt at the Tokyo meeting as to whether we filed a juristicitional suit or not. By ending up with a very small quota actually in itself lifts the moratorium now that we're under the quota system the quota system is totally inadequate, and I'll tell you why. Unless I meet with our whale commission say by March or maybe February and come up with the distribution of the twelve authorized takes (inaudible) situation could be that because St. Lawrence Island and Point Hope, Noatak and Kivalina start their whaling seasons two weeks before we do here. It's a possible chance that all the twelve may be taken by these four communities even before we send out our first crew in Barrow. Because there is a two week time period to go to Point Hope, usually when we hear somebody got a whale in Point Hope. It's going to be two weeks before it arrives here. So we could end up with that situation.

But as far as timing, ah, I need to consult with both Billy and Charles Edwardson, Jr. and our attorney in Washington, D.C. as to whether they agree with me that we should now file our jurisdictional suit. It's possible by asking for even a temporary judge on the quota because of their lack jurisdiction. We may be able to negotiate a little higher price with the Commerce Department with Interior support and negotiate a larger number without having to go through the IWC. The suit itself will challenge the authority of the IWC to impose the maratorium or a quota as far as our subsistence hunting is concerned. Even a temporary injunction agreed to by the court, we can negotiate for a higher number. So, I don't know exactly what the, as far as any legal action is concerned, what the time tables would be, but the next meeting

of the IWC is going to be in London, I think maybe in January, the latter part of January or February. If not the latter part of January it's going to be in February, the next regular meeting of IWC. So if I can get on the phone and get the consent of at least four people, our lawyers in Washington Charlie and Billy; of course, I've got both Arnold and Jacob Adams here so between the six of us we'll decide how soon we're going to file the jurisdictional law suit in an effort to improve the quota, the numbers that are being dealt with by the IWC. I really don't know exactly what the time tables...

Representative Sam Cotten: Yes, but how did they arrive at such a ridiculously low number, how did they arrive at that? Did they just pick it out of a hat or...?

Eben Hopson: Well, no, before we left for Tokyo the United States position came out. We got 30 and 15 that was the two figures we got. In other words, we can make a strike on 30 and land 15. That was the United States position and it turned out that they, we managed to talk to the U.S Delegation and managed to compromise that down to 18, it was 18. Then it struck me that was absolutely nothing to us but their position was 15 take and 30 struck, struck but lost. Which meant absolutely nothing to us, but we had to increase that by three from the United States position at 18 so they (inaudible) 18, we told them, we have stated in our position that we have minimized the terms used by the IWC which is to strike and land as far as the use of weapons are concerned. We have eliminated the reason to (inaudible) that was contributing to our struck and lost proposition by eliminating the (inaudible) method by which each crew claims the whale. Traditionally, if you shot a whale 30 feet away with a shoulder gun and later on some other crew puts a line on it you have a right to the whale. The first person who puts a bomb into that whale had a right to claim it. So

in our position, we eliminated that. You cannot use the shoulder gun unless you do it simultaneously with a shoulder gun or a harpoon. You must have a harpoon. The first person who puts a line on that whale, makes a strike, must have an immediate kill, or if he lets loose of his line and they float, someone else pick it up over there, the guy that put the line on it first claims the whale. We have eliminated this charge by the IWC that was ending up that a bunch of reckless young kids that want to use the shoulder guns for distance although they're not going to kill it. Just for the purpose of putting a bomb into the whale.

Representative Sam Cotten: When you say a shoulder gun, you didn't mean a rifle?

Eben Hopson: No, whale gun, bomb.

Representative Sam Cotten: Well, then there's no line on that.

Eben Hopson: No line on the shoulder gun bomb. You have to throw by hand the darting gun in order to put a line on it, that means a very close, very close distance. So we've eliminated this.

Representative Sam Cotten: Was there any other dealings with the other countries that were involved, the other 16 countries that make up this whaling commission?

Eben Hopson: I was hoping you wouldn't ask that but I will tell you that now. Of all the countries, Canada spearheaded the fight for a very low quota and they won out on three votes. Canada delegates, they wanted a quota of six for the whole native whale hunting community, I don't know why. But they had two

native advisors over in Tokyo, Sam Raddy and one other. But the instructions given to the Canadian delegate came from Trudeau and that son of a gun wouldn't listen to his native advisors, who were supporting us 100 percent. He wouldn't change. He not only did that, he was very vocal, and really talked against the Alaska Native for its higher quota. It was Canada and I think South Africa, two that were outspoken.

Surprisingly enough, the two countries that were our heavy supporters were Japan and Russia. Surprisingly enough, they supported us, voting for us each time. But, you see, in this vote, we needed 12 votes, they needed three quarters of the total commission in order to agree to the moratorium. In other words, this vote lifted the moratorium that was imposed by the Commission in July. So, we needed, in order to come up with an agreeable quota, we needed 12 votes. Now, the whole table changes around if the Commission wants to enforce another moratorium, or lower the number 12 down to a smaller figure, they are going to need 12 votes, not us, we will only need 4 of the 16 to block any effort to cut that down. But in this instance, we needed the three quarter vote, so we had problems. I'm not sure, the Netherlands, Canada, South Africa and I don't know, one other, I can't think of the other. There were four votes that were very much in doubt as to whether they would go along, and Canada lead the whole fight, all during the day. Does that answer your question Leo?

Representative Leo Schaeffer: It is surprising, you know. Especially coming from Canada, you'd think that they would lean more in our direction.

Eben Hopson: Yeah, well, Sam Raddy, you know Sam Raddy?

Representative Leo Schaeffer: I know Sam real well.

Eben Hopson: He wears those colored glasses, he's blind, you know. And there was another kid that took him to Tokyo. They were, as usual, they were 100% behind us, but the delegate himself, the voting delegate got his instructions from Trudeau, and there is no way that you could sledge him with a sledge hammer and he wouldn't change, that's what the situation.

Representative Leo Schaeffer: All those countries that make up this Whaling Commission, I think the United States is the only one that partakes in subsistence whaling, is that pretty much true?

Eben Hopson: Our information is that subsistence both in Japan and Russia.

Representative Leo Schaeffer: Oh, there is.

Eben Hopson: Yeah. As a matter of fact, Etok and Billy went to Hokaido on the day we left for home trying to make some observations as to exactly how Japan conducts its subsistence hunting. They have some. And I understand in Russia they hunt the real young, baby whale. Certain part of the year, when they are real small and tender. That's the only time that Russian whalers, subsistence whalers go out, otherwise I have no information that the bowhead whale is taken by the commercial whalers. There is some subsistence both in Japan and Russia. We're the one that historically kill the bowhead. When the United States abandoned its commercial whaling fleet, way back in 1926. There have never been any other whaling activities. That's the reason when you read the newspapers that I want the United States government to reject the quota and get out of IWC. We would be in a hell of a lot better shape because some of the information they were giving the commission, some countries as long as you not a member, a participating member, of the IWC, you can totally disregard

their regulations. And because the United States is a part of IWC, the IWC uses the United States as a vehicle to impose this moratorium on the Native subsistence hunters just because the United States is a member. That's the reason I suggested that we ought to pull out of IWC.

Representative Leo Schaeffer: How do they get into a position like this, are they appointed by the President of the United States, or how does that work?

Eben Hopson: No, no. I guess any country that wants to join the IWC, they can do so at any time. In our country the appointments are made, I think the appointments are made by the Commerce Department. There was a shift made, remember when I blasted off here that Dr. Aron, who agreed to this thing initially that he should be fired and everything else? Well, the situation was the enforcement director of NOAA, National Atmospheric Oceanic Administration was the enforcement director of NOAA became the official delegate for the United States, Richard Frank. Dr. Aron, who was in that position, became just advisor, status like we were, the three of us from Barrow. There is another guy, by the name of Tom Garret who was the Deputy Director, but both Garret and Aron made some real bad remarks about the Eskimo culture previously in Washington D.C., but they were also in Tokyo. But there was some shifting done and I'm under the impression that it was done by the Commerce Department. It might have been done by the State Department, I'm not sure. But, I don't know officially, exactly how you get involved in IWC. My impression is that any country is that any country may join IWC at any time. And that country appoints its own delegates, not by (inaudible)

Representative Nels Anderson: Sam, did you have any questions?

Representative Sam Cotten: I just had a general question as to what sort of support the State has given your cause here. Like right now the legislature isn't able to do anything here because we are out of session, but has the Hammond Administration been cooperative in your efforts?

Eben Hopson: Hammond's office by using Chuck Meacham, Chuch Meacham was over there, I think he was helpful. And also the State office, what's his name, the guy who holds the governors state office in Tokyo. He was also logistically helpful, with our needs over there. The cooperation was great. But (inaudible) to some extent the Washington delegation but the problem was the other 15 members of this delegation, who for no other reason, obviously, they want to show the United States a little lesson. They want to show what we can do to the United States and they did it. Arbitrarily, they went ahead and did it, so, although we had it lifted and I can go out and shove off next spring with the whaling crew without violating the moratorium, the quota system is very inadequate. We have some hope of improving that by working with the Commerce Department, if in fact, we're going to file this jurisdictional suit.

Representative Sam Cotten: I don't have any thing else.

Representative Leo Schaeffer: I just wanted to tell Eben, that any future endeavors as you might consider as far as filing a suit, I can't speak for the committee as a whole, I can speak on my own behalf, is that I'll support you 100% in whatever comes out, it will be whatever the people up here can live with.

Eben Hopson: The situation now, is I haven't coordinated with all the people

involved, but three weeks ago, we agreed if we don't fare too well in Tokyo, we'll go out and file this jurisdictional law suit. It just depends upon my coordination with the other guys.

Representative Nels Anderson: Eben, is there anything specifically that the legislature can do? Do you think, for instance, that a resolution coming from the legislature, asking the United States to withdraw from the IWC would be helpful or would that interfere with...

Eben Hopson: It wouldn't interfere Nels, but you want to understand that remark was made just a few hours after the IWC imposed this 12 quota and I was still hot under the collar when I made those remarks and I guess it needs to be thought out a little more before you follow through on my remarks over there. I was still hot under the collar when the press conference took place and I might have been out of order making that remark. We know that is a possibility. Although the United States may never agree to that. The United States Government has been used by the IWC to impose this moratorium merely because the United States government was a member of the IWC although for all intents and purposes, there is no commercial whaling in the United States.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, if you'll recall, Leo and I did send a telegram to the President of the United States asking him to, at that time there was another argument going on, whether we should object, whether the United States should or should not object. I don't know what good that telegram did, but it did get some publicity. I felt rather helpless at the time, the session, the legislative session not being in session, there was very little I could do.

Eben Hopson: All of us suffered terrible setback when the United States Supreme Court rendered that ruling, that was one of the reasons we felt at that time, a couple weeks, about 10 days after the ruling we were called into the White House to talk to Mondale, and it turned out Andrus was there and to talk business because of the Supreme Court ruling against the objection that we were going to have the United States make. We felt at that time the instructions that were coming from the Vice President were alot stronger than what actually took place in Tokyo. They assured us that they wanted to change this whole thing so that all of us may end up either by doing away with the moratorium or come up with a quota that all of us could live with. That came from Vice President, and not exactly what the United States delegation did in Tokyo, so we have a reason to believe that we have the mechanism to do it with we might be in a position to work on this quota.

Representative Nels Anderson: Eben, can we go back for a moment to your suggestion on the Board of Subsistence? I personally think that is an excellent idea. It is something that I haven't considered. What I have considered though, and for your information and those others in the hearing audience, is that we have devised a piece of legislation that would create a Division of Subsistence in the Department of Fish and Game where you would not only have a Division of Commercial, Sports Fisheries, and Division of Game, but you would also have a Division of Subsistence that could go out and be totally responsible for gathering information as you suggested, rather than be relying on information that comes from commercial sources. You would have information coming from people like yourself and others where this information is far more in my opinion, valuable, than that which we have in the Department at this time because the subsistence user and the commercial user and sports user are all looking at different aspects of the utilization of fish and game. And, I think I would

like to pursue this, and ask you, if you would consider it a great deal further, put a little meat on the bone, so to speak and if you have any specific legislative suggestions, our Committee would be very happy to receive something of this nature and I think we'd like to push that as far we we could.

Eben Hopson: I want to make it a point to include that because we have on our schedule on the 3rd of January, here in the Borough, meeting with the Assembly and our advisors, and our lobbyist and we're going to come up with a legislative program for the North Slope Borough. We'll make it a point to include that in one of our recommendations.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you, that sounds like an excellent idea. I don't have any other comments, except that I think I would like to share with you that there are many people who feel that salary or income should not be used as a criteria for defining subsistence because there are many people throughout the State of Alaska who have grown up on foods that they really feel that they need and if they don't have access to these foods there's something missing that you can't buy in grocery.

Eben Hopson: I might add that I participated when this word subsistence was being applied for the first time in the Statutes of the State of Alaska. For while, it was satisfactory, we permitted those at that time to be able to hunt because they were in fact low income people. But as we went on and on I think we lived out the necessity for having this classification. If you're going to qualify for subsistence use and particularly after we organized the North Slope Borough it came out quite obvious that with the concerted effort by the Fish and Game Board, (inaudible) out different kind of limitations and moratoriums that I learned that the description of the word subsistence

the way it has been administered is very inadequate. I might have a suggestion here, but we might be able to pull out and introduce it for your legislation.

Representative Nels Anderson: Any other questions, or comments? From the committee members. If not, I'd like to thank you very much for taking the time, I know you've been travelling quite a bit and appreciate your comments and especially appreciate that suggestion of that Board of Subsistence. It should, I think be created.

Eben Hopson: I thank you for the opportunity and I wish I had a written statement to make, but I had forgotten about the dates, otherwise I would have had something prepared, but anyway thanks for the opportunity.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you. Do we have any one else who would like to testify at this time?

William Thomas: My name is William Thomas, and I'm with the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. I'm here to send Jacob Adams' regrets, he's not able to be here because of a Board of Directors meeting, this evening, however, he would like me to say a few words regarding some of our feelings on subsistence but we will submit a refined and a more definitive statement to the State at a later date. ASRC has taken the lead in inserting corporate economic development in the regions, however this assertion for economic corporate development is not to be interpreted as demeaning or relinquishing the people of the North's rights to continue in the lifestyle of their choosing. Well, that is our responsibility, we also recognize the responsibility to respect to allow people to continue that lifestyle, and to that end ASRC has pledged its support in all of its activities to maintaining the subsistence

lifestyle that truly reflects the needs of the people. ASRC has been critical in the past of the States role in game management and probably will continue to be critical, critical in a cooperative nature. And particularly critical of the State's management in the Northern Alaskan caribou herds. I'm sure what I'm saying here merely mirrors much of what Mayor Hopson already said.

In the issue of D-2 and subsistence, ASRC recognizes and hopes that the State will recognize with it, that it is going to be a very difficult road in coming up with subsistence legislation out of that Congress that are going to meet the needs of the people throughout the State. We hope that the State can join with ASRC and the people of the north in trying to meet those needs.

In regards to the whaling, and I intend to be very brief here, ASRC is in full accord with the recommendations of the Alaskan Eskimo Whaling Commission which Jacob Adams is the Chairman, and we would ask the State to review those recommendations very carefully and that it could be done in conscience and in a cooperative spirit, the State endorse those openly. And the ASRC thinks that would be a positive step toward recognition of the Federal Government of the Alaskan Eskimo Whaling Commission. We think that it is very important that the issue of subsistence gets out of the international forum. The vagaries and the whims of the political maneuvering on an international level are too complex and too non-relevant on such a vital issue to the people of the north. Those are the major points that the ASRC would like to assert at this time and we intend to assert and amplify those assertions at a later date in writing.

Representative Nels Anderson: For your information, the Committee will be dissolved by the Legislative Council on January 7th. And, if we could get your comments in writing by that time, we'd certainly appreciate it because

we are preparing our, this is our last meeting in a series of many meetings we've had throughout the state and we will be taking whatever information we get and compiling it into a final report to the Legislative Council.

William Thomas: Thank you and thank you personally and ASRC thanks you for the opportunity for being here.

Representative Leo Schaeffer: I have one question. The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission regulations you were talking about. Where can we get a hold of these?

William Thomas: I can supply you with a copy of those regulations that were endorsed by the Commission, tomorrow. I assume you will be leaving on tomorrow's plane.

Representative Nels Anderson: Yes, we would like to have a copy of these. Any other questions or comments? Thank you very much. We appreciate your comments. Anybody else who would like to testify? Is there anybody else who would like to testify, Dorothy?

Dorothy Larson: I just passed the list around.

Representative Nels Anderson: You mean to tell me that Eben and Mr. Thomas have said it all for you?

Representative Sam Cotten: I would like to comment on Mr. Hopson's testimony. That was sure a wealth of information on the particular issue that's had the most publicity when talking about subsistence. I think it was very comprehensive and I certainly would be surprised if many people could add much to "

Mr. Hopson's testimony.

Eugene Brower: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Leavitt here would like to give you a little story on the way of the Eskimos up here, if you'd like to hear it.

Representative Nels Anderson: Yes, we would very much like to hear it. Morgan, or someone, are you going to interpret?

Eugene Brower: Morgan can interpret.

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay, yes, we'd welcome it.

Daniel Leavitt: I won't talk about your life you talk about here. I never been to school. I suppose I'm the oldest here, I'm 60 years old. I have a brother over here who's more than 60 years but he's got little more than I have. I think Mr. Sakeagak can get all my words in Eskimo, I suppose.

Morgan Solomon: Well, not all of it. I'm a little rusty. Mr. Leavitt proceeds in the Inupiat language and Morgan Solomon translates his testimony below:

This man here was born here in Barrow in 1916. There were only two houses here in the village of Barrow. He was born where there was no doctors, no hospital quarters or anything that attempt to help his family, his wife or whatever. Since the time began he realized he is fighting for the (inaudible) subsistence hunting that has been (inaudible) ever since he can remember. Every since I was 10 years old I can remember that my family lived in hunting way of life. Looking forward to the day or the following day that they would have

something to eat in the way of hunting. Since the time he can remember he realized that the hunting was the only thing that kept them alive. And ever since that he was 16 years old trapping and whatever that he can remember that the laws that was before him made him suffer. And ever since he was 16 years old he can remember that on December 16 or 15 he can, he had to go ahead and put up his traps so that he could provide for his family with the little money he got from the trapping. He can remember and recall that trapping stopped around April 15 that he really had exceeded those days, he can recall that he will be picked up by the commissioners if he had broken that law. Then he knows that when this happens he know he had broken the law and that he must protect himself. And that from the time December 15 through the 15th of April if he had broken the law, what could he utilize to provide his family with. And then in doing so that he must go to a store where he can purchase line items like coffee, shells, tea, flour, whatever. If he didn't get those animals between those two days he must turn around and try to utilize something else to buy whatever he has to eat from December until the following winter.

During winter times he is allotted twenty shells and then with those twenty shells he had to provide his family with caribou, seal, ptarmigan or whatever. Without those shells you can't do nothing. During the summer time his dad had to take them out in the country to provide the family needs. Fishing hunting and whatever even though he knows the time is short. And up to this day the subsistence hunting style here is so critical that he can't do whatever he wants because he days are beginning to get short.

And then when the days are beginning to get longer around April, April 15 or somewhere around there, his father must travel many miles between Barrow

and the point wherever he is from to hunt whale. And then during that time his brother and him must go out whaling so that he can get a fair share of that whale that they catch for that season. And then during the whaling season the people that hunts whales must share with every catch they have, each boat having its share and sharing with the community. And then as far as he can remember he will never recall of any ways to shoot that whale ever since he can remember out hunting. Even the whale bones, the backbones, the rib cage, the whatever, is taken into the shore. And then every since he can recall, he knows that natives are never wasteful and that he is happy with that particular thing. And then he is happy that his father had given that privilege to him so that he can learn to hunt whatever he must get from the ocean. Every since he can remember there was six in his family and every traditional hunting thing he had learned from his father, he must carry on up until today. And he uses that traditional way of life up until today. And he doesn't work. And that he know the difference between an Eskimo's way of life and an non-native way of life. The non-native way of life is your lifestyle at present. Up to today he is saying that the Eskimo way of life, the traditional way of life, today is very critical and it hurts. The non-native way of life from an Eskimo's way of life is much harder. The native way of life is very hard because when you are looking towards an (inaudible) or approach you must be sure you follow the rules applied to that particular area. And up to today, he sees that when the government had taken away our caribou, and our whales, the native way of life is at turning point. And that he is a whale hunter up to today and that he can catch a whale whenever he wants to. And he would like to see that this traditional way of life, this way of hunting, he will continue it until he is 6 feet underground or whatever. He had seven boys and 1 stepdaughter. And up to today, his 6 sons are not what he was brought up to be, they don't know how to hunt to well. Up to today, he has

put his sons through school up to the 12th grade level and some of them had finished college and some are continuing. And then up to then since he had been giving the privilege to his kids to learn how to hunt. And then this way while he was not out on the ocean, they caught one whale.

And it would be that we should continue to live our lifestyle just the way it is. He will continue to live his life under the traditional style as it is today. And he says that he will be the first person to be in jail or to be in prison if he should break the law. On the month of May he has prepared all his weapons, his boat and he is going out into the ocean. And that he would appreciate that you go ahead and utilize some of what he has said and he would really appreciate it.

Daniel Leavitt: Thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that would like to testify? If not, I would like to invite the people of Barrow and the surrounding villages of Barrow to write us a letter on how they feel about subsistence if they would like. I would like to invite any letters or testimony before January 7, 1978, because at that time the legislative council will wipe this committee out, so to speak, and hopefully by that time we'll receive more testimony from people in this area and other parts of the State of Alaska as well.

Michael Jeffrey: My area that I travel through is the entire North Slope Borough except for Point Hope. I'd just like to share with you, obviously you can see I'm not a person born in Barrow, I can't speak with the experience of Mr. Leavitt, Eben, Eben Hopson, or other people you've heard. The only

thing I can bring to you is to try and share with you some of the things that I've been hearing in some of the villages as I travelled over the last year and one point in particular, that hasn't been said tonight, that I think needs to be said, is the strong feeling that people have for local control. In other words, if you're going to have silly things that happen, take as an example, the village of Kaktovik, now the village of Kaktovik on the map over there on the wall is the one that's over there near Canada, on the far right, right by the Canadian boarder. As it happens, when the caribou hunt was stopped, they stopped it in Kaktovik also. Now, actually, the caribou that the village of Kaktovik hunts is not the western arctic herd, it's the Porcupine herd. The Porcupine herd comes in through Alaska and also over into Canada. The Porcupine herd is in great shape, it's very large, there's over a hundred thousand in that herd and yet the Statewide administration scooped up Kaktovik and included them in the same moratorium. They did, they were farsighted enough to open hunting in Kaktovik earlier than the other villages. But even then, they missed the boat. Because even then they opened the hunting, the Porcupine herd migrates up near Kaktovik and then it starts going back and I may have the month wrong, I think it's around in early August. The Fish and Game opened Kaktovik's hunting just as the herd was leaving or gone. Now that, I hope that they did not intend that, that it was simply a mistake and that next year they will take into account the particular circumstances of that village (inaudible)... But that's just an example of the problem that's going on that is lack of local control.

When you see tomorrow, as Bill Thomas was saying that he'll provide you with those Alaskan Eskimo Planning Commission regulations, you're going to see that those are very complete. Many of us that are here tonight were at the meeting here in Barrow when the Alaskan Eskimo Planning Commission and also

when those regulations were passed. It's a beautiful thing, it was packed, with whaling captains from all over the North Slope and also from St. Lawrence Island, down around Kotzebue, it was a statewide meeting. And they went through all these regulations and they drafted a different set and it was translated into Inupiat and people made their comments. It was obvious that this would be an effective thing. When the whaling hearings were held here in Barrow, the question that was asked of me, I guess probably because I'm a lawyer, I guess, the hearing officer wanted to know, "Will it work, will it work, does it mean anything, or is this kind of like public relations or something?" Well the point is, that it does mean something and it's the only thing that's going to work. In the early drafts of the Whaling Commission report, they pointed that out. It's cultural, it comes out of the culture of the people here. The captains regulating themselves. And that is the kind of thing, there's so many reasons for having multiple control. One is, that the people here have the knowledge, they have the knowledge of where the caribou are, or the status of the whales, they have the knowledge of how best to regulate it to keep the herd at a level where their own hunting can continue. And also, from the point of view of the culture of the people, that is the way it's going to be effective. Instead of having a bureaucrat coming in from outside, there's a lot of enforcement agents coming in.

There's a lot of feeling in the different villages that the State Department of Fish and Game is too new in the way it administers the regulations regarding hunting or mainly in the interests of the urban sports interest. There's a vague feeling that there needs to be more understanding and feeling for subsistence hunting. I think you all obviously recognize this. That's certainly the method that I would hope that you would hold with that would strengthen is local control. Now I know there are statutes that exist right

now for that. But you are aware that they're not working right now. For some reason or another. The legislature should look at that. Why aren't they working? Why argue if (inaudible). The only other think that I'd like to share with you is that when we were talking about a census, if I could just share with you the census of whaling. Rosita Worl did a study for Arctic Slope Social Economic Subsistence Complexes, which are a lot of big words, but it's a study that came out of her extensive experience up here on the slope where she lived for quite some time but she also brought here academic background. But she just says whaling is an expensive undertaking. As in the past, only the wealthy could amass a fortune to support a whaling crew. Then she lists, you know, snow maching - \$2,000, a sled - \$250, a tent - \$200, camp equipment - \$200, gas, food and bombs for the whaling \$200, clothing \$300, oovrik s-ins to make ikoomiat \$300, skin sewing - \$300, and the frame for the boat - \$600. \$6,150.00 and she says this is a minimum, a bare minimum, you having to support an average of 8 crew members for the 6 weeks whaling season. And that kind of underlines what Eben Hopson was saying earlier, and that is we must not put a monatary limit on the definition of subsistance. These days, subsistence could be expensive. But when you compare it to the price of the equivalent as your NANA Corporation studies have, when you figure out how many millions of dollars came into the economy of the NANA Region from (inaudible) they did the whole study, it's over there. It's obviously true of the North Slope also. I mean dollars and cents, itmakes sense, it is expensive, it takes cash and so you can't just limit to low-income people. It should be instead limited to areas. A wealthy person, say in Anaktuvik Pass, who might have got a fair amount of money in construction jobs or something, that still doesn't mean he has access as you well know, to adequate food supplies. It's just not there. If he can't go out hunting and supplement his diet that way, his family is going to be hungry. They're going to be eating hash. I

mean, when you go out to Anaktuvik, when I was out there during the caribou ban, I go to these village families. and what are they feeding their kids, they're feeding their kids T.V. dinners. Taking a T.V. dinner out of the oven, cans of hash and things like that and you know how expensive that is when you have 10 kids. A T.V. dinner is not only to start with is more expensive than they would be in Fairbanks or Anchorage and on top of that you've got 10 kids. But that was all they had. And so you know it's really important to look at the location of the places and define the subsistence needs in those terms rather than in terms of income. And I just, one last think, and that is, this is just beautiful and it's not off the point but it's, I don't know, it's a poem in the Tundra Times that was just out, but let me just share it with you, it says:

"An old man on the bank of the Yukon where it embraces the sea,
Stirring his cookpot fashioned from a 55 - gallon drum.

I'm nourished by the whale,
The flesh of the whale strengthens my flesh,
The blood of the whale sustains my blood,
The spirit of the whale runs with my spirit,
And I travel ever deeper to the sea of my beginning,
And laugh at the clouds to feel the song of the whale thunder and whisper in
my heart,
Smiled in his wrinkles of great beauty,
His eyes soft and deep,
As all the ages, he silently sings."

Those kinds of feelings, although beautiful, I don't know who wrote that, someone named Tundra Voice, I don't know who it is but it's those kind not articulated that way perhaps that I'm feeling up here as a new person on the North Slope. But underneath all of this, underneath the feelings of the people here, actually are more in line of something like this. They're not simply shoulder guns, or harpoons and blood and things. It's more like this and that's the kind of feeling I'm beginning to appreciate up here and that's what you all are trying to protect. Anyway, it's just some comments.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much Michael, appreciate it.

If there is no one else to testify at this time, all I want to say on behalf of the committee is that we appreciate all the work that people did put into having us here this evening, it may not have been the best night in December to hold the meeting but we do appreciate the comments that we did get. And I want to wish every whale hunter a successful catch.

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

Female:

Okay, this is just briefly--like I've summarized what everybody said in there--you know--should I come out with the names or just--everybody just recognize their comments.

On the definition for subsistence, first comment was it should be laid to low income users, and subsistence users should be considered those who hunt, trap and fish and use the products of that either to the extent of selling the skins or crafts made from it. The next one was thought subsistence was traditional hunting and fishing and maintaining the culture. Next was subsistence means enjoying the fruits of the land and being able to hunt and fish, and also this person pointed out that being a seasonal worker and the limited income, and even though they are employed a part of the year, they need that game to supplement their home as many people are seasonal workers here. He also pointed out that the welfare limit of \$5,000 is too low and that it should be scaled and there is a lot of welfare families that are poor and live on a little over \$5,000 a year.

The next comment was that subsistence should be limited to those not living in a cash economy. Next comment was that this man feels that he should be able to hunt and fish now the way he was able to do all his life, and his father before him, and his grandfather before him, before the white man and Fish and Game Department came. And he felt that Indians should be able to get just as much game and have just as much hunting rights as they had before. And he made a comment about the commercial fishing taking all of it, and then later another man came in and said basically the same kind of thing--that he doesn't feel--he feels he should be able to have all the rights that he's always had to the fish and game without it being regulated.

The next person said subsistence fishing should be based on income, and he doesn't like to see these tourists coming out from Anchorage and Fairbanks and going down to Chitna and getting all the fish that they have.

The next one was the feeling that subsistence is a combination of lifestyle and need--that regardless of income, the resources belong to everyone and to some extent, with some regulation, everybody should have a right to get fish and game.

Next one--subsistence means making a living off the land, traditional culture. There have to be some regulations, and it could be economics.

Next comment was that people who live in the city shouldn't be considered subsistence at all because they don't need subsistence. They've got their own programs in there. And that there's too

Female: much waste going on of the caribou and moose. And that comment
(continued) was mentioned throughout the discussion, and it was always aimed toward city people coming in and killing moose, caribou and leaving parts of it.

And the next comment was subsistence means what the word says-- subsistence for sustaining life--and the word should be kept as simple as possible and other words should be used for when we're dealing with culture and things like that.

And then one person told a joke about natives use all the moose and caribou and, you know, every game they catch. And the hunters come into the area . . . There was another comment about city people wasting moose, and there was a lot of comments-- a lot of anti-urban feeling.

And the last one was the Fish and Game Board doesn't care about --it's just quote/unquote--the Fish and Game Board doesn't care about the poor Indian. And they're out there in Juneau, or wherever they are, and they don't relate to the people that are subsistence livers.

Female: I would also just ask to tell us the tally of Question 2, and after lunch we'll discuss the reasons people answered it the way they did. This is the one that says, "Do you agree with the State policy which gives subsistence a priority over other consumptive uses?"

Female: There were 14 yeses, no no's, and three people said that they really didn't feel comfortable answering the question with the vagueness of the information.

Female: Okay. And then after lunch we can discuss why people answered it that way, and on to the one about which management plan you feel is the best for subsistence. . .

Male: We're interest--we're not worried about down below--that cannery, or someplace down there. We're just interested in our own land and our area where we all live right here. We all live here together and we'd like to go hunting and this and that, and if it be here, we'd like to have something to say about it--not somebody down from someplace else. And I think the only way we can do it is to break up into smaller regions like Herc (?) said.

Female: Two people who are sort of in favor of the regionalization.
Yes?

Female: This sounds agreeable, but does that mean there would be 12 regulations books? Or 7 regulations books? So that each region would have to print their own?

Female: No. It means that each region would have to have their own policies, but in terms of the regulations per se, the Board of Game and Board of Fisheries would have statewide authority, you know, to say that this region's regulations or this region's policies are in effect except where there was conflict, say, between two regions; and then they would have to arbitrate that.

Female: In implementing the regulations probably they would just adopt what was already in the regulation booklets, or would there be a great reform?

Female: It would depend on how the regional boards, you know, wrote it up, how they proposed it, what--I get the feeling that essentially what would happen would be that whatever the regional boards proposed would be the plan for that region unless there was some reason why it shouldn't be.

Female: The twelve regional areas that are along the guidelines about, you know, boundaries of the native corporation--that would give each region the power to stop moose season, or something like that, if the moose were being depleted, and not have to wait six months for it to be all gone and then stop it by the time it goes to the Fish and Game Board.

Female: That's right. They would have the--well, as I said earlier when we talked about options for the amount of authority under these boards, it's still unclear that they could--at the very least they could vote to do that. Now whether or not they'd actually have the enforcement authority to do that is unclear yet. At the very least they could say, "We want this stopped at such and such a time," and send that to the Board of Game or the Board of Fisheries, and the Board of Game or Board of Fisheries would have to have a reason for directing that, if they did. They would have to make a public statement as to why they did not comply with the regional board's wishes, if they didn't. So at the very, very least, what you would get would be--

Female: So you'd still be sending it to the Board of Fish and Game anyway--you couldn't have the power to stop it.

Female: No. One option, which I showed you earlier, is that you would be able to have the authority and the top option here to make the final decision, and that the Board of Game or Board of Fisheries could only override you in the event of conflict between regions. And then, as I said in the middle one, you

Female:
(continued) could reject proposals that you didn't like, but you would have to pass all the others on to the Board of Game or Board of Fisheries for their final approval. So you would only have rejection powers in this middle one. The third one is just an advisory level where you just comment on all proposals, good and bad, and pass them all on, and again the Board of Game or Board of Fisheries would make all final decisions. So this one the regional boards are making the final decisions; this one they're just rejecting some bad ones and kind of weeding out what they feel are not good but passing on; this they're passing them all on but making comments on it.

Male: That's essentially what we have now.

Female: This third one--yes. That is essentially what is going on now, except that there is no regionalized structure to make comments, and you're getting comments from all over the state on an advisory basis, which a lot of times is kind of conflicting. It has no kind of coherent statement for the help of the resource unit. A lot of people feel that the regionalization wouldn't be good unless they had this much authority, however. So, that's some comment you can offer in your statement on whether or not you favor regionalization. Maybe you favor it conditionally, and that condition might be that you'd want them to have a lot of authority, or you'd want them to have a minimal amount of authority, or you'd want them to have the current amount of authority. Yes?

Male: I don't know--I think a lot of that authority should come from the regional area instead of, really, from this big Board because, like they said, we live in this area. We don't plan to move around or anything; we plan to stay here. And I think we're concerned enough to worry, and worry about the game and all the animals in the area.

Female: So that the regionalization for you would mean--

Male: Sure, you know, because I think it's really important for us to have these things, and I can't see going all the way up in the Fairbanks area to do some hunting. We can watch this place ourselves and work out some kind of way to control it instead of they control it down in Juneau. Because like, for instance, these people that are elected to this board coming out of the governor up there, it looks to me like it's a political thing there. One year you have Democrats; the next year you have Republicans. And we'd rather have the people here.

Male: In terms of the legislature having to ratify those board members, it's really not quite as much influenced by the governor as your (indistinguishable). I think the threat is much more the

- Male: legislators' threat than it is the governor's in terms of those
(continued) people being--a prime example being last March, April in
Juneau where proposals for dealing with the area of subsistence,
eight Fairbanks legislators stood up and threatened the Board
of Fisheries, and two of those Board members are no longer there.
In other words, when they were up for reconfirmation, they got
eliminated because of legislators' threat, not the governor's
threat. You know, I think the threat is much more at the legis-
lative level than it is the governor's.
- Male: But that's still a political body--
- Male: Looking at the regional boundaries here seem to be covering the
entire watersheds and, if we're trying to manage the fish, it
has to manage the watershed. Now if you divide that up into
regional corporations, are you going to have a regional corpora-
tion that is dominated by commercial fishing fighting against
a regional corporation boundary--not the corporation but the
boundary lines that are subsistence. Like this regional cor-
poration in the Ahtna region is basically subsistence fishing
whereas if you look at the regional corporation south of us,
which is basically commercial fishing, is there going to be
inner strife there because of the two different interests?
Where this boundary managing the whole watershed might give a
more unified benefit to the entire fishery.
- Female: One viewpoint on that from the administration's point of view
has been that the largeness of these regions has not (indis-
tinguishable) but it is purposely created that way to make the
conflicts resolve themselves at the regional level before they
go on to the higher level--to the statewide level--so that it
forces people who have different interests to come to some sort
of conclusive idea among themselves on a regionalized level
before it goes on. There is some support there. We'll take
some more comments on the plan. How about--could we just have
a show of hands as to how many people do favor the regionalization
over the other, over the current plan? How many people think--
- Male: Do you want to be more specific on that?
- Female: Well--
- Male: Do you mean this region what you have up here?
- Female: Do I mean whether it's twelve regions or five? No, I would
rather be kind of just vague about it because it's a matter of
just the idea of breaking up the state into any regions--any
number of regions, be it five or twelve, based on, you know,
native things, has not been decided yet. And so it's just the
idea in general of breaking it up or maintaining the present
structure.
- Male: Well, a comment on that. I couldn't vote on that because I would
not vote for breaking it up and splitting up a watershed, but I

- Male:
(continued) would favor managing the watersheds. So by making a blanket statement, "We should chop it up," I think that would be very unrepresentative of many feelings.
- Female: Then we should vote three ways, then, whether it was like this, or whether it was on regional corporation boundaries, or whether it's the same.
- Male: That's gonna argue because what you're trying to say, you're trying to divide up the natives, or you're trying to split that other group on the end, so the majority wins. Just like I'm talking about Anchorage. They could outvote us any time.
- Female: Uh, huh. I see what you're saying. What about the units as they're set up now?
- Female: The twenty-six game management units?
- Female: Right. What's wrong with that?
- Female: There's nothing wrong with that. That's how it is, and that's how it will continue until it's changed.
- Female: And this is what you're trying to---?
- Female: No, this is what I'm trying to get a feeling for, whether or not the change--whether or not it's more favorable to take 26 game management units and--I don't know how the fisheries, you know, things are divided, but--however they're divided, and to put those together in some larger scheme so that--I don't know how many game management--how many game management units in this area.
- Male: Two.
- Female: Two. And so to take those two--
- Female: You mean 11 and 13?
- Female: Rather than have 11 and 13 be separate, it would be one management unit, then. Is that based on that kind of a line? Would that be two---
- Male: That would be two with one exception--well, that includes parts of 20, part of 14, part of 16--
- Female: So then we're talking about maybe six game management units-- putting them together into one area. And whether or not making a plan for those six or seven game management units on one area-wide basis is preferable to having the current plan which has different regulations for each unit?

- Male: I think--I believe this is it. The game of those areas are split up by the mountain ranges?
- Male: Which, these? Or the game units?
- Male: Well, the game that you're talking about right here--
- Male: Pretty much except where the line runs north and south down to Cook Inlet there. There's no mountain range there. I don't know what they use--
- Female: Well, now, you're talking about different game regulations for each game unit. Wouldn't you have the same thing under different regional---
- Female: How are you going to get it straight if you're going to hunt moose in Unit 11 and hunt at the Ahtna regional corporation level? How are you going to get--it's pretty hard--
- Female: It's fairly easy right now--to understand what's in the regulations.
- Female: But if you add another--
- Female: No problem at all. What I'm wondering is why they don't leave it as it is?
- Female: Well, these boundaries--
- Female: Well, that is an option. I think the main feeling on this is that there's been so much complaining about how it is right now, Federal managing appears to be very imminent because there has been so much complaining on how it exists today. I mean, it's so unsuccessful today. So therefore the Federal government is at a point where they're about to take over the management of everything, you know, because of all the number of complaints that subsistence is not maintained and that the animals are being threatened. Do you think that this group in general favors some regional concept? I mean it's really hard for me to say--I can't offer you anything more than this map and then Herb's idea, which is the AFN position, of going to the native boundaries. So they're two points on that. They're not the same, and they would have very different kinds of implications for you. But is that--even given those great differences and all the varying kinds of options, is that more preferable than continuing our present structure and hoping that the Federal government doesn't take it over. I don't know.
- Male: I think that most people in this community right here are only interested in two areas. I believe that's Unit 13 and 11.
- Female: But what if you were forced to deal with more than that? Would

- Female: you be interested in having that much responsibility in
(continued) management, or would you just rather leave it up to the State
as it is right now?
- Male: I'd rather leave it up to those people live in that area.
That's where they live.
- Male: Let's pose two votes: one vote saying, "leave it as it is
or divide it up." And then vote on, "if it is to be divided
up, what means should we divide it--either divide it into
watersheds or the 13 regional corporations."
- Female: Okay, that sounds really reasonable. Does everyone think that's
a pretty reasonable question? Leave it as it is or divide it
up. So let's try that for a vote.
- Male: I was in a workshop--I guess, Herb?-- where they had this
same meeting. We were talking about this regional concept;
that's what we agreed on.
- Female: You feel that dividing it up is better?
- Male: You mean the twelve regions?
- Female: Um, hmm.
- Male: Yeah.
- Female: Okay, let's have--can we just take a show of hands so I can
take down some sort of numbers? How many people would like to
leave it as it is right now and not do anything different than
the way it is? Okay.
- Female: Could I ask a question, please? You say the Federal government
--there's a threat that the Federal government will take over our
fish and game management. What areas have caused the problem?
What is this issue about the Federal government?
- Female: It's in the (d) (2) legislation, essentially--it's what is it.
It's where the Federal government has been looking--as they came
out this last summer--to take hearings on (d) (2)--the testimony
that they received was testimony based on the use of the land,
what people want to do with that land. And what they wanted to
do--many people talked about maintaining a subsistence lifestyle
on that land.
- Male: Here, though, what everybody wanted to do was not have the (d) (2)
bill.
- Female: We did not want the (d) (2) bill.

- Male: And one erroneous decision based upon another one doesn't make the first one right. I just wanted to get that said.
- Female: You mean the (d) (2) and H.R. 39 bill just spawned this whole subsistence thing? Is that what it is?
- Female: You mean in terms of the language? Yes. On the Federal level-- is that what you're talking about?
- Female: Well, evidently, it went to the highest offices--
- Female: The thing that is probably the most clear--
- Male: It's mainly AFN's position that when the land claims was passed, the section in the act which addressed--directed the Secretary of the Interior to protect subsistence rights to natives. And he's never done that. And so we've really pushed hard for this (d) (2) legislation to address the subsistence issue and protect the subsistence rights for the native people and the users in the state, knowing for a while that the State on its constitution cannot actually do that--protect one group of people over another one in the taking of fish and game resources. And so, it had to be a Federal mandate from Congress directing the State to take action on protecting the subsistence resources for its users. And in doing that, what we proposed was the regionalization of boards and the requirement for the directive to the State to provide a--mechanism to provide the protection for subsistence resources on Federal lands. That's where it's at right now.
- Male: Could I ask one more question here? As far as the Federal government--as far as taking over some management--I think this also has very commercial fisheries implications as far as the limited entry position and is the State going to have the right to control its shellfish, bottomfish and salmon fisheries as it is done now (indistinguishable), or is this going to be turned over as Federal control over bottomfish in our continental shelf in Alaska? And I think this is some of the implications as far as Federal taking over. Is that correct or incorrect?
- Female: I think that if the Federal government would want to take over the management of any kind of resources they are not currently managing that the State at some point or other would be in some sort of litigation to decide the authority to take over.
- Male: Okay, is the State presently, through the Limited Entry Commission and the interim use permits, trying to establish historical rights in management for a court case so the Federal government cannot take over management.
- Female: I have no idea. Do you know anything--?
- Male: All the legislation does is require the State to provide some management system in protecting subsistence resources and natural resources. Now it supposes up to the Feds to determine whether

- Male: that plan will meet the needs of subsistence users, and if it
(continued) doesn't, then they'll probably have to step in to guard our
own.
- Male: I think this is half the story, but what faces commercial
fishing---?
- Male: I don't believe that the, you know, the bill he's talking about
has significant implication in the offshore business. That's
Federal management and another game. What the State's game plan
is there I don't think any of us are really--you know--
- Male: Okay, but this still has every bit to do with fish and game
work, because they are presently controlling the fisheries--
that's being spoken to as far as limited entry and negotiations
with foreign fleets and harvesting bottomfish--
- Male: Okay, right. But the thing he's talking about is strictly sub-
sistence quality--that's the only thing that is spoken to there.
So the three or four basic regions will be only speaking to
subsistence. They won't be speaking to commercial fisheries
and their regulation.
- Male: It advised that it would be strictly subsistence, but it's not--
uh--not clearly established, I mean, you know, given that people
go down the road on legislation, it can be changed, that's just
a matter of a few words of language, to change it from one to
the other.
- Male: Is it not possible what we'd be looking at here is not a choice
between these two but rather a choice between what we have now
alone and both of them--what we already have plus this. In other
words, we'd have twice as many boards and--because you're not
going to take over (indistinguishable) or (indistinguishable)--
you're not about to manage the other resources. You may have
priority over them, but once they are out, there's nothing in
the subsistence boards, at least in the way you're trying to
fit them in, that would allow you to regulate those. So somebody's
got to regulate them.
- Male: Right, the State's got the regulatory authority--
- Male: These boundaries are specifically for subsistence. There's no
commercial implications that these ballots can be used for?
- Female: That's right. How many subsistence users are there in this
State? And how many will there be if this subsistence thing goes
through? And what is the definition?
- Male: Oh, well, this permit to the Copper River--

(Four or five talking at once--indistinguishable)
- Female: But if it is recognized the way it is then there will be many more

Female: subsistence users---
(continued)

(Four or five talking--indistinguishable)

Male: Can we have a vote on the question?

Female: We're getting a little bit away from--we are getting a lot away from what we started to do on this last question. And it was proposed that we ask whether, you know, first of all, whether to divide or not divide, and then, secondly, how to divide if we were to regionalize. So I asked already whether anybody favored maintaining the current structure, which would call for not to divide, and I got no response on that. And so I'm assuming that people would like to divide, so let's have a show of hands on how many people favor dividing the state in some way. Okay, fourteen. And are there any who don't have an opinion, one way or the other? (None)

And now the question is--the question now remains whether or not you favor dividing it in larger regions approximately five, or at the maximum seven, regions in the state, or whether or not you favor dividing along regional corporation boundaries, which I believe are twelve. So let's go far first of all, how many people would like to divide in the bigger regions of either five to seven regions for management? Let's have a show of hands on that--the regionalization. One.

And how many people would favor dividing along regional corporation boundaries? Eleven. And how many have no opinion? Three.

Male: Didn't I tell you--I already tell you how this vote was going to come.

Female: I'd like to vote for 26 game management units--

Female: You want to vote to maintain the current structure, okay?

Female: No, but if we're gonna divide I'd like 26 game management units---

Male: This proposal is for subsistence only, is that correct? And, say, we'll have this system as far as subsistence is concerned, but we'll have to retain the old system of the advisory committees for other--for recreational and commercial?

Female: No, no. I've confused you somewhat. The zones are for subsistence, but the proposal of this is for everything--it's for all regulations--commercial, recreational and subsistence--so that the structure here is for all, but the zoning--like this--is for the subsistence plan, the development of a subsistence plan. So what this group has said is that they would like to see

- Female: subsistence plans developed on a regional corporation basis
(continued) with the regionalization concept going into effect.
- Female: Isn't that what (?) was saying--that the Alaska native people are more--they qualify more for subsistence than any other peoples. They sort of quietly stated that. It seems to be kind of disturbing thought. If we get into kinda accepting that we're abdicating to the native management--they're managing it.
- Female: Well, actually subsistence is not what we're voting on for all the regional--more or less more game management area. Isn't this what we're voting on? In fact, we're changing it from the twelve--the units--the game units--to regional game areas.
- Male: No. You're saying we're reducing it from 26 to twelve game units? I don't think that's what we're trying to do.
- Male: We're reducing 11 and 13, or 13 and 11, into one unit---
- Male: --for subsistence policies, correct?
- Female: No, we're--just what we're doing is instead of having one seven or however many regional boards they've got right now, we have twelve regional boards and each regional thing will take care of their area. That's the native corporation boundaries are being used because the white people have only been here a hundred years, you know. We've been living on our land. We don't go out and kill moose for the trophy and stuff like that. We eat everything--we eat the head, we eat the stomach, you know.
- Female: If it does favor natives, I sure hope it does.
- Female: I mean I'm not trying to make a race war out of it or nothing, but, you know, it's been there for, you know, thousands of years.
- Female: One other comment on the whole question which this man right back here brought up and that is that when you move on, not to talk about subsistence but to talk about the commercial uses of the resource, you are in fact entering not only a national scale, a Federal scale, but an international scale. And I'm sure many of you followed say, for instance, the northern--I think it's called North Pacific Rim fisheries meeting that was in Anchorage not too long ago--the meeting with the Japanese and the other people taking of the resource. So it's not--the question of subsistence is not something--although management of it might be limited to a local area, the whole question of it versus commercial/recreational is not a local issue. It's a State issue; it's a Federal issue; it's an international issue. And that always has to be borne in mind when we're talking about how much resources can go how far. I thank you all for your comments and stuff. If anyone else would like to talk to Nancy about the permanent fund, she's out here, and she will be happy to outline for you.

Female: Carol Conroy can also give you a very elaborate discussion of
(continued) the permanent fund.

And please return the tabloids, either by mail or you can leave them, if you filled one out. We want to be sure to take your comments back with us. And if you didn't fill out a blue card, please fill one out so you'll get a final report. These can be mailed in just by folding them and mailing them in, if you haven't had time to finish. Thank you.

(LAND DISCUSSIONS - Tape 3)

Male:I guess we can get started. I guess you all know her. My name is Tim, and I'm working with the Public Forum staff, going around the state holding meetings like this. The question we're dealing with here is land . . . (continuation of introductory remarks by Tim)

Herb: Well, I guess you know, in 1971 the Land Claims was passed and we got on our way with implementing it. And part of that settlement was 44 million acres of land to the natives of the State of Alaska. Our region contains about 18 million acres of land. It goes from Metaska Lake to Chitna up to Cantwell, and totally taking in the Copper River Basin. Out of our 18 million acres of land we're allowed a total entitlement, both region and villages total, will be 2 million acres--approximately 2 million acres. I think the latest deal on estimators is about a million six right now, but it's subject to change. The reason why it's subject to change is that the enrollment process is still going on. There's villages that still have been challenging the courts and haven't been certified yet. That makes the determination of how much land we will get percentage wise on a per capita basis. There's certain things that the village and regional corporations are required to do with the lands under the Act. One is (continuation of background of land claims act and history relating to Copper River Basin).

Male: (Tim) (inserted statement about state administration activities and negotiations with federal government re (d) (2) lands; explanation of the Delta/Tok sale of thousand acres proposed for this next spring--)

Male: Well, that should be very good because if you get five acres back behind and then you have to get to it--an access--and somebody else has already got one or two and it's all crisscrossed up and you just can't get there--you walk through--you try to walk there, and you walk through somebody's yard and you don't like that--and you certainly need an access.

- Male: Yeah--and I think the State will be providing that access, too. That was one of the things in this homesite bill we passed last--said that it had to have some sort of service connection through roads or, you know, it doesn't have to be within an organized borough but it does have to be within the service area, which means probably roads--
- Male: I think maybe stateside around--on every section line there's actually a way to get into the area where maybe the section line would be across the lake or something but still there would be a way to get to the back part of the property.
- Male: Was it worded "customary access and customary utilities for the area"?
- Male: I don't think it was--I don't remember it being customary. I've only read the bill a couple of times, but I--it's vague--and what's happening now, Ted Smith, at the Division of Lands has been holding meetings and getting together a set of regulations that would just break out what this means, what service actually means--does service mean from a road, from a section line like this gentleman mentioned, or could it mean access via a State airport, perhaps. So it's not real clear, and those regulations will be coming out really shortly if they haven't already--I'm not real sure.
- Male: This doesn't pertain to this area, but in other areas of the state, water is a very customary road. So is an area going to be eliminated because there's no feasible road to it when water is the customary transportation mode?
- Male: No, not necessarily. That would be a good point to bring up at these regulations hearings is that you can't--if you've got navigable rivers--or the ocean--those should certainly be considered as service access anyway.
- Male: You know on the state/federal land trade deal--I think it would be a really good deal--in the Tanana Valley right now I believe there's what--a \$650,000 acre agricultural project underway where they're turning up the ground and make farms of 1700, 2000 acres, piece them up--and under the present (d)(2) deal, the way the (d)(2) deal is set up now, if it goes through the way Udall has it, it will grab about almost a third of that agricultural ground will go back under (d)(2)--
- Male: --and this land right now, it's federal land--what was the designation that was put on it?
- Male: Uhh--I don't really know--no, I don't know if it's state or federal, but anyway, I know the Soil Conservation Service, the one that has the farm plan and the one that made up this whole thing, I believe they probably have something like 2,000 acres

- Male:
(continued) already in the process of clearing right now, but I do believe the total acreage is something like 650,000 acres to be put into, probably, small farms, basically, roughly 2,000 acres. The land is up for lease; you lease only the agricultural rights to it. And there is a market for all the grain; it is to be a grain project. It's well suited there, but the way I understand it, the way the (d) (2) program is worded now, it will take up approximately one-third of that acreage. So if they can do some trading, I think it's a real good deal.
- Male: There's another plan to put some agricultural land in that area-- into farms next year on an auction block type of thing.
- Male: I do believe that's probably the same project I'm referring to, but, again, all you buy is the agricultural rights. There's no way you can subdivide it--do this, do that, make something basically commercial out of it--it's gotta be kept in agriculture.
- Male: That's strictly a State program, Lou?
- Male: Yeah, I think so.
- Male: From what information I have from the Department of Natural Resources, the total acreage in the state is somewhere around 365 million acres. Of that probably 200,000 acres is good for hardrock mining and not much else. They've identified in the whole state no more than like 15 million acres that would be considered really good intensive use for agriculture, for residential, for recreational development, for industrial development, what have you. I think within the state--the plans that the State has to date--let's say, not to date, but of the total percentage of land that the State will get--that 105 million acres, they've identified only about, I think, 5 million acres that will be suitable for farming or for residential, and a lot of that is around the existing communities already. This one, Fairbanks, Anchorage, on the Kenai Peninsula. There's some other things around those communities that a lot of people have been asking us about, and I haven't got the answers necessarily. But what they've been saying is that there's a hell of a lot of land in trust around communities--either mental health lands or university lands or public school--and they're held in trust so that they can be sold at some future date to help support mental health and public education and the university system, which have in and of themselves very little revenue-generating capabilities--by themselves. So I don't know really--I feel kind of embarrassed about this--but I don't really know what the amounts of State land are around here and what the designations are. I was trying to get some people who are in the Division to

Male: come over here, but---
(continued)

Male: Generally, the State lands are in Tazlina and there are some in Copper Center, and there's some in Glennallen--right in Glennallen, almost--it's mostly State patented land. And from about ten miles towards Anchorage to Sheep Mountain is practically all State selected or patented lands.

Male: Oh, is that right? And that's--is that the roadway right out

Male: Um, hm. It goes clear back to Lake Louise.

Male: You said from where to where now?

Male: About ten miles towards Anchorage on the Glenn to generally Sheep Mountain is State selected lands.

Male: They cut quite a wide swath out through there---

Male: It goes clear down to Tazlina Lake and clear up to, oh, Lake Louise, Klausman(?) Lake, that area--State selected or patented. And practically all of the Tazlina area is State patented land.

Male: Where's Tazlina in relation to---?

Male: It's out about six miles--generally from where the Ahtna office is clear to Simpson Hill is all mostly State patented land--or private ownership.

Male: It's patented, then. So is there any special designation on that?

Male: There's a lot of university lands in this area that are usable for residential use, and in my dealings with them, is that it's harder than heck to get any kind of use of those lands, you know, because they have to be approved by the Board of Regents, and then the money--it has to be some kind of income-making--the use of it--such as the lease lands in Copper Center is all university land. And so they can't give a free use permit to extract gravel, they have to sell the gravel off it. And, as I understand, the money does go into a trust fund in the university.

Male: Isn't it correct that the university can't sell the ground--they can only lease it?

Male: That's right.

ALASKA PUBLIC FORUM
COPPER CENTER
November 19, 1977

- Male: But they may be able to sell the material off of it?--
- Male: Yes, they have sold the material off of it--this one gravel pit up here at Six Mile I think is 106 --
- Male: Yeah, well the gravel pit the pipeline used, too--
- Male: What about the timber resource fund on the university lands? Would they--would it be sellable?
- Male: I think they can sell it.
- Male: I got a woodcutting permit from them--
- Male: Uh, huh. It's pretty reasonable, too, I think, for timber--
- Male: (indistinguishable)... State Division of Lands, Anchorage.
- Male: Would there be enough resources to be able to make a small sawmill--make products--wood products available to this area--for building or anything like that--would there be enough timber to do that?
- Male: Just in spots. Not enough---My permit is just for dead and down stuff. I can't have anything over 6" in diameter 4½ feet from the ground. You know, even if it's a big tree this big around if it's laying flat, you can't touch it. But if it's only 6" in diameter 4½ feet from the ground I can cut it--
- Male: I'll be damned--that's interesting--
- Male: No explanation..yeah, they told me at one time that they figured that maybe some of those big (indistinguishables) the eagles would nest, or roost in them or something. I mean that's kind of an absurd thing. The guy said well maybe that's what it is. But I don't know--you can't have a big tree if it's dead but you can have a little one.
- Male: I think it's unfortunate--but you know, you can have a stack of big trees and you can say they're all dead even though you just cut them down.
- Male: That's true, too.
- Male: Then there's some more additional, I think, State patented land, that is around Gulkana Airport down to the junction of the Glenn and Richardson--that's all State patented in there.
- Male: Yeah, that's a good chunk--it's all poor, though.
- Male: Yeah, it's pretty poor land, but the State did sell of a lot of land in there in '73. They didn't provide for access, either, to

November 19, 1977

Male: those lands back--
(continued)

Male: Was that--tell me what program--was that for leasing or sale?

Male: That land was sold.

Male: And all we got out of it was a bunch of realty sellings--

Male: Okay. Would those State lands that we've been talking about benefit this area at all? Would people be willing to commute that distance if they were able to get a nice chunk of land from the State? Are private land prices high enough that people would be looking for something perhaps under market value or on a lease type of situation from the State?

Male: With present land prices, sure. Three years ago--or four or five years ago before the pipeline went, why they were dirt cheap anyway. But now, anything that's in private ownership now is sky high. So if you can buy something under that, why, they're gonna grab it.

Male: There's a crying need for people who just want to build a house and to have a piece of land that they can call their own so that they can afford to put up a dwelling on it.

Male: Has the regional corporation made a policy on their land? Are they going to try to use some of it?

Male: We're open to any kind of options or suggestions for use of this land. We've already got offers for leasing some of our lands--small parcels--for business and for private homes. But we certainly will--I think that's why the plans that we have in mind is to sell and lease land.

Male: Are you going to sell it outright, or do you just want to--?

Male: It depends. Just depends. I think some of it could be sold, you know.

Male: Well, do you think that the primary need then for people in this area would be for small parcels for just a home, or for a single dwelling? Or would there be other needs as well? Is there a big demand, or a need for, say, agricultural lands, or---

Male: I think there will always be a need for agricultural land. If it's truly agricultural land, I think it should be kept in agriculture. You've got a utility ground, recreational grounds and

- Male: (continued) that nature like, why, steep slopes--anything of this nature-- why, the best use for it is recreation or homesites or anything you might want. But if it's really good soil, level ground, you got enough top soil, you're in an area where you got moisture content, or moisture, why--and it can be made into a farm ground, I think it should be made into farm ground, probably kept into farm ground. There again, I don't know whether you best lease it or sell it. If you sold it to a person and he found out he couldn't make a living, he'd probably sell it or subdivide it--and why not? And then you've got another village started or so--perhaps if it were leased under agricultural preference rights, you might say, it's very possible it will stay in agriculture. Someone will farm it even if it's in small tracts. On the other hand, if we got some steep hillsides out here, some rocky ground not suitable for farming, I think it's probably a good deal for it to be in recreation or whatever you might think.
- Male: Is there much access to recreation areas here? I understood that this area is pretty much surrounded--you've got the Wrangells and so forth--and there's a lot of recreation potential here.
- Male: Oh, I think the Copper River Basin is probably one of the most terrific recreational areas you might say--when you want to go hunting, fishing, snowmobiling--whatever it is--with all the lakes, the streams, the works--I think it's probably the best in the state of Alaska. It's accessible.
- Male: During winter months.
- Male: Yeah, and then again, there's some good agricultural ground around here.
- Male: Has that been---
- Male: There's generally good agriculture land down in the King Lake area. It's under village selection now, preferential selections. The only other agricultural lands that I know of is in McCarthy-- McCarthy road area--and that is State patented or State selected.
- Male: From my observation, the biggest problem--agricultural problem-- there's just no water.
- Male: Not--in Kenney Lake, there's no water, but near McCarthy, I think, there's a possibility there.
- Male: You have the Copper River flowing by but for an individual it's inaccessible to a water supply--a joint venture it could be feasible but for an individual thing--
- Male: That's at the Kenney Lake?

- Male: Like in most sites where, if you're talking about large scale irrigation--a private individual on a small tract--you know, there's just no possible way.
- Male: That's true.
- Male: Across the Copper River, of course, it's inaccessible. I've never been over there myself to--I've never even taken a boat across the Copper River to explore the area, but, I don't know-- what that land, how is this classified? They claim that it's agricultural land, parts of it.
- Male: Yeah, it is. It's under village selection, practically all of it. It's just a belt that runs generally from King Lake up (?) through Gulkona--on the other side of the river.
- Male: Well, how many miles toward--up through the Shattuck(?) country would that belt take in--just a few sections or is it--
- Male: Oh, I think it's a fair size--it's probably about five or six miles wide.
- Male: Well, of course, in miles (indistinguishable) there's 40 or 50--that's boats--beyond that--there must be lots of pretty flat, pretty desirable land.
- Male: If you'll notice in the spring, though, as it rises in elevation the snow covers it in little ponds. Got ice on it pretty late in the spring and pretty early in the fall, so far as agricultural ground up on that slope in the Wrangells, it becomes a bit limited.
- Male: Well, there's uh--what about instead of large, let's say, large 2,000 acre tracts for agriculture, is there--I mean it seems maybe more logical that--like myself I have a 20 x 30 foot garden that, you know, just keeps me in frozen vegetables for the winter. Would that be something that the people from this area would favor--with small tracts like that?
- Male: Oh, I'm sure they would do it.
- Male: But would there be a problem of getting--say, like on the Kenney Lake site--would there be a problem of getting the water even on individual small plots like that?
- Male: Yeah, most of it--on their wells.
- Male: One thing you have, though, when you're in the valley here and

- Male:
(continued) you got the mountains around, why, you get a pretty good set of rainfalls. When you lay out in the wide open flats--they're no mountains there--there's not those clouds, then you don't get any rainfall. And I don't know whether they're really short on moisture in this area or not.
- Male: Well, in our annual precipitation there's only about ten inches.
- Male: Is that right?
- Male: Yeah, that's pretty dry.
- Male: That's Copper Center and that's speaking of (indistinguishable) of ten inches. I know to get my garden to grow last year--
- Male: When I was over in the Bethel area earlier this year, talking to the non-profit corporation over there, they're starting on using some of their money to start hydroponics and, of course, they're some places over there that are good for just out-and-out farming.
- (end of tape)

(Proceed to Page 22)

- Male: ... we're working too hard on trying to get our land in the first place. One thing at a time.
- Male: I think that's something anyone can do if you got a basically controlled environment. Might take a few bucks but you can do it. You can ward off the frost--you'd have it under cover.
- Male: Is there really a market, though, for the large-scale vegetable type agriculture in this area? You talk about thousands of acres of grain; you can put it in a truck and you can ship it anywhere in the world. But is there a substantial market in Alaska for agriculture in Copper Center? I mean in this valley? They can grow a much better and easier crop in Palmer, in that area. I just don't see that there's economic stimulation for large scale farming for this type of crop in this area.
- Male: Well, being on a road area, maybe it wouldn't be all that expensive to ship it to Fairbanks--you know, fresh tomatoes or that kind of thing. I don't know. You might have a point.
- Male: Do you think that in this area we can, say, have pots of tomatoes? I doubt if we could ship them from here. Our costs--that's expensive--you could ship them to Seattle--
- Male: Like Seattle--uh--this big project was planned for Big Delta--why not all this grain? They definitely say that they have a market for every pound of grain they can produce--Japan--provided they can produce enough. They don't want 100 bags or nothin' like this, but they'll buy thousands of tons of grain. They want it.
- Male: You think overall, then, that the largest need for people in this area would be for someplace to build a home? What do you think?
- Male: I think ground for homes is something that many people are looking for, ground for small businesses, uh--but these people that are going to be living in these homes and businesses, there has to be some means for them to support themselves, too. You just can't have homes and no cash flow--
- Male: So that would almost eliminate the wilderness idea--the home-steading type of idea, where people are removed entirely from community where there's a source of income?
- Male: No, I wouldn't say that.
- Male: Not necessarily? There might be a percentage of people who would want to live that way--more or less a subsistence lifestyle of --you're just hunting game or living away from the community where they get into town maybe once every couple months or something. There'd be a substantial number of people that you know of that would be interested in that kind of land use?

- Male: Substantial in percentage form, I would have to say no. But there are many people I've talked to that would like to participate in that activity. But if you're talking about a state--are you talking about a policy for this area or are you talking about a statewide policy?
- Male: Well, for the most part, today here, we're talking about for this area. I talked to a fellow on--we had a t.v. show in Anchorage on subsistence, and we got a call from a fellow who's been living in the Wrangells for twenty years doing just that. You know, a nice sized log cabin and he traps and hunts and is raising a family and doing just wonderfully. And he wants to continue to do that. So it sounds like maybe there's some other people who would like to join him.
- Male: Well, I think, say, if you put up 2,000 acres here in 5-acre tracts, they wouldn't last ten days. They'd every one be taken up. You bet. Maybe not all by people who want to live that type life, but there's going to be somebody--they'll all be grabbed up. And there are a lot of people who want that type living. Lots of them. I'm doing it myself--right now. I own property down in Palmer--got a farm down there. But I also live up here at Tatalina Lake--got a 5-acre tract, and I'd much sooner be there than I would down there in the ratrace.
- Male: Do you think 5 acres is enough for a subsistence type life, though?
- Male: Uh--it isn't really a subsistence type deal. I do trap, I fish, all like that, but I have to go somewhere else in the summer months to make a living so I can live there.
- Male: This 1500-foot elevation here at Glennallen makes it a little bit of a hassle to raise your cabbages and stuff. They'll freeze down in June, they'll have frost in June, frost every month sometimes. Pretty discouraging to them to think about raising this garden stuff. Although I've tried it myself, I raised cabbages this year. Most years I raised a real good carrot--crop of carrots. I've raised a hundred pounds, maybe hundred and fifty pounds of carrots. They just grow wonderfully, but you gotta know how to plant them on a raised surface to keep them away from the cold ground or they won't grow long. They'll just settle down in cold ground and won't grow. And you have to learn how to raise the stuff.
- Male: There is one more think on these small tracts. We'll say from five to ten acres on up. If they are on agricultural ground, you'll be surprised what you can raise on that if it's in an agricultural area. And what--you'd be surprised what these small tracts may contribute to--what you'd say--the other man keep eating, too--the family-sized farm--160 acres--is basically on the way out. To go out here and buy 160 acres now, to develop it,

Male:
(continued)

put machinery, buildings, what not--the whole works on it--get it up into production. I would guess that you're going to have upward of \$500,000 in it--that's machinery, buildings, turning, the developing, the whole doggone thing. And why would a person do that when I can go out here and make \$12-\$14 an hour with nothing but an investment in nothing but a lunchbox. So that family-sized farm deal is gone. There's gonna be a big corporation or there's gonna be some guy here that's got fiye acres that's working somewhere for his livelihood and he's got this extra acreage for a hobby farm. And he's going to contribute something to food and fiber for his neighbor that lives in the city. He--people are getting tired of city life, and it's one --uh--if they can get out of the city, they're really one more form of government. They get out here and they find out that they can actually live here basically cheaper. They don't have the monthly assessments for sewer, water, garbage and this thing--they can live here cheaper. And then they find that if they can produce some produce on that--sell it to some stores, sell it to the neighbors, what not, that place is likely paying for itself, in a sense. Probably putting a few dollars in his pocket plus his own groceries--some of his groceries. So, I don't know. I think that eventually, I believe that the small hobby farmer is going to be contributing a great deal toward producing food probably for man here on earth--eventually. Because the family sized farm is gone. It's either going to be a big corporate thing or it's going to be just a little bitty hobby farm that's going to be producing it. The family sized deal, 160 acres, is out. They just can't make her any more.

Female:

I agree with that, and I would like to see larger small tracts instead of 2½ to 5 acres, like 15 or 20, where you've really got some room to do something. Not a real large scale, but you've got enough to work with.

Male:

For that very idea--for small tract farming? Taking care of a communal type of situation--three or four groups of families in the area?

Female:

Well--for 15 or 20 acres, just one family.

Male:

Just one family.

Female:

Yeah.

Male:

With a little bit of planning and some ambition, you can do a great deal on 10, 15 or 20 acres--you'd be surprised.

Male:

Yeah, I was really surprised. I just have a small plot; the few vegetables I do grow supplies winter vegetables for myself and another family that lives in the same area. I was surprised.

- Male: Is--this is a little bit off the subject--but I got to thinking about storage. If something like a small scale farming thing did get going, is electricity cheap enough now that you could have a fairly good size community freezer or packing plant or something like that?
- Female: Electricity is not too cheap.
- Male: What we need is a power plant.
- Male: It's not cheap--the rates were just raised the first of November.
- Male: What did it raise to?
- Male: I don't know but it's going to be raised with a chance to pay it back if they charge too much.
- Male: Okay, what it sounds like then that perhaps the major desire for people of this area would be for providing small to medium sized tracts for--that would be near existing communities--and some emphasis on agricultural use on a small scale for individual families. --And small businesses--you mentioned small businesses earlier. What kind of small businesses do you think would be feasible right now for this area? Something like guiding or recreation-oriented, or would it be something different?
- Male: I didn't have any comment to that.
- Male: Would anybody like to see the lands that either the native corporations get or the State has in this area kept in trust, which means just leave it for some other future generation to make the decision on what the use of that should be?
- Female: I think that's really important that some percentage be left in trust.
- Male: Okay, do you feel that the proximity of Federal lands that will be in (d) (2) classification will satisfy that need or do you think that the State needs to look at providing some land for the future.
- Female: I think the State should provide some.
- Male: Anybody else have some thoughts on that?
- Male: I think that the land that will be patented to the native corporations--that it would be wise for the State to reserve some of their land until it's observed what the native corporations are going to do with their land, so there will be an alternative in the future.

- Male: There is in the (d) (2) legislation that AFN has requested and statewide support for is a trust--land trust--Alaska trust--land trust--and everyone, including the State, has the opportunity to put their lands in this trust. And part of that is that it still can be used like public land but it is not subject to taxation.
- Male: That would be like a--
- Male: ---and you couldn't take it all out at once. You'd take it out at a percent rate.
- Male: So it would be like a consortium of all land owners kinda pooling?
- Male: Yeah.
- Male: Well, I feel that there should probably be some land--a limited amount--put in trust; however, if there is some renewable resources on that, they should also be used.
- Male: Kinda getting back to that multiple use concept that, uh--
- Male: Very much so, yeah. I hate to see a great big tree sit there and die, lay down, fall down and rot, and don't use it. They could cut that tree and plant another one in its place. But there's other renewable resources on there, also. But I think the resources should be used if they're renewable, and they could set some aside, but no terrific acreage. A reasonable amount of acreage--let's put it that way.
- Male: Well, let's put it in perspective a little bit. If there was say, say, for every thousand acres that the State had to put into use of some sort, what would be your recommendation for a percentage of that thousand acres that should be held in trust of some sort? Do you have any estimation?
- Male: Just a roundhouse figure, it would be 10%. Now I may be way, way out in left field, I don't know. But it's just a figure off the top of my head.
- Male: Actually the problem would depend on how much land the State got.
- Male: True.
- Male: The larger the amount perhaps the larger the percentage?
- Male: Um, hm.
- Male: In Scandinavia, like Norway, their latitude runs through this part of Alaska here--it's about the same--and it's pretty heavily populated with people, you know, the people are--population is increasing, why, probably in another ten or 15 years there's going to be many more people that will want to be living in, say, the Delta area. It's a lower elevation, and, say, it's agriculture

Male: possibilities is greater than this 1500-foot elevation we
(continued) have here. And there's gonna be just a lot of demand for land because these people are going to spread out and they're going to be just clamoring for maybe 15, 20 acres to call their own or develop or farm. And this is going to be within the next ten or fifteen or twenty years. There's going to be a great change in the overall picture.

Male: That bring up kind of an interesting question. Let's say, for a hypothetical case, the State had a thousand acres to open up here right away like they're planning on doing up in Delta. There's a--especially if they let it go at a lower price, that acts as kind of an incentive for people to move into that area, in a way. Do you see that as being a problem for the Copper Center area of encouraging people from, say, Anchorage, who can't find adequate space there to move out to this area? Would that be a hindrance or a help to the types of service that you can provide those people, or would you rather see that acreage first go to residents of this area and then perhaps think about inviting people from other parts of the state to come and live?

Male: What mechanism can we use--I mean, how can you have a sale and limit it to people in this area?

Male: I'm not sure you can. What I'm looking for, actually, is just some ideas that you would have on growth of your community. In other words, if you open it up to all state residents, which I guess is a constitutional demand, how do you feel about that in terms of increasing the population in this area by another hundred families? Do you think offhand that that would help the economy or that it would hinder the government to providing a bigger school, more roads, more sewer and water? Do you have any ideas about that--about the potential growth in this area and what opening up more lands--cheap lands--would do for that concept of growth? I'm just kinda curious.

Male: It could work two ways. If you had a big land sale and a bunch of them moved in here and there's no work available, they're going to end up on welfare rolls. However, if you got some guy down there brings a lot of beans up with him, it can be a shot in the arm. So--kind of a bummer--hard to tell.

Male: Yeah.

Male: I would doubt very much that anyone with any green stuff to amount to anything would actually move out of where he's at. He'd probably end up being on the welfare rolls.

Male: That's true. I mean if they do open up land like that, I don't think it would be any outsiders moving in...cause there's not that many jobs around.

- Male: I think if you open it up to small subdivision, I think you'd probably get mostly local people. Like I say, there's a lot of families---
- Male: What is the--I've dealt with the State in trying to get land in this area, and it's virtually impossible to do it on a negotiated basis. They want to (indistinguishable) for sale. The last sale we had was about four or five years ago now--and I think it will be five years ago in June--and prior to that it was about that long. And if the State is going to be letting land go in the area in five-year increments, then this past five years that certainly doesn't reflect the economic growth of the area. That's a bit inconsistent.
- Male: The only thing I can tell you about State plans for this area is from talking to those folks at the Division of Lands, and they said that they are looking at a homesite program here again. But that could mean two years from now.
- Male: It could mean five years.
- Male: It could mean five years from now. So--the other possibility--and again this is a long shot--would be trading some of those trust lands for--opening up the trust lands by trading them across the board for other State lands in the state that would be further away from communities that would be held in trust. So you take a thousand acres that's inaccessible at this point and a thousand acres here, that's right now got university classification, and you swap uses, so that this land here opens up to some community uses. And that's something they're looking at, also, but again, that may be three or five or ten years away.
- Male: Looking at it from the university standpoint, why would the university want to give up more valuable land for land out in the boondocks?
- Male: Well, they might not want to give up more valuable land. It would have to be a comparable swap, and it might mean the thousand acres here would be swapped for 20,000 acres somewhere else. It would have to be comparable or exceeding value to warrant their giving up that chunk of valuable land around the community, but it seems as it perhaps that's not the university's decision, but your decision and my decision and how we relate those needs to the State--people who are making those decisions.
- Male: My understanding of it is that it's not my decision--it is the university's decision.
- Male: Well, let's say, for example--that's true. And I think that's a real problem with communities in rural areas where the State--the university has lands--is that they don't participate in development or recognize the needs of the local communities. They have large chunks of land that could be made available to different types of uses. One problem we had was sanitary land fill.

- Male:
(continued) And you couldn't get use of any of those university lands that were suitable for sanitary land fill. They would not let it go one bit.
- Male: Well, these may be liberal thinkers that I'm talking to in Anchorage, but they are thinking of that concept. So perhaps--
- Male: Well, I think definitely, I think---with some descriptions that I think you should get rid of the university lands and turn it over to the State Department of Natural Resources. The university does not participate in the local community--
- Male: They sure don't.
- Male: --and they own large chunks of, you know, valuable property.
- Female: They own a lot of land out here, Herb?
- Male: Oh, yeah--yeah. Not at Tok--not a whole lot--but very valuable land right in the community--Copper Center--
- Male: They could only select land that had been surveyed--only logical land that had been surveyed--known that's valuable and had been surveyed.
- Male: Well, that's the kind of information we're looking for. You know--substantial things that if people in Copper Center get together and say they want the university to start thinking about the community but they're--they've got land around--and start thinking about getting rid of it or trading it so that the people can use it. Those are the kinds of things we're looking for--
- Male: I don't think those two are the only alternatives. I think their lease program is adequate as long as it's used. But I believe the function of the land is to support the university. If it's sitting there and not leased, it's not bringing in any cash.
- Male: And I guess as far as the program goes--it would make little difference as far as I'm concerned if the university were to lease its lands now and be putting that money into a savings account of some sort, making interest off it, but that interest would be far less than the interest that they're getting because of the accumulating land price. The leases are only 55-year leases, and some shorter than that. So they're looking at the re-evaluation of the land; they're looking at half-century increments. And I don't think that for an institution of that tenure that that's outrageous at all--I think that that's quite reasonable. There's a lot of people that are upset with that--they're State people, naturally--who are thinking that that 55-year lease is unreasonable from State revenue prospective. In other words, they wouldn't be

Male:
(continued)

realizing nearly the amount of money from leases off those lands as they would if it were re-evaluated on a yearly basis or on a five-year basis, because they figure, well, if they set up a price now that's market value and the first time they can re-evaluate that is 55 years from now, that 55 years from now people will be paying X amount of money for that lease, that is totally unrealistic when you take a look at the per acre price for that. From the consumer it's a great deal.

Male:

Okay, then you're saying that the government and the State bureaucracy is setting up the program to fend inflation, into supporting and expecting that there will be inflated prices in the area and they want to stay on the bandwagon rather than trying to set up a program that would enable the local government and the local economy to become more stable, because if prices remain the same, this is anti-inflationary.

Male:

Yeah, I see what you mean. They're looking at it strictly from a viewpoint of--well, if the university lands are set up to make money and they put them out on a 55-year lease, they'll be making money, but it won't be keeping up with inflation. And, so I'm sure, I think that you've got a good point there--that perhaps they're not looking at it so much from the standpoint of--"hey, we've got people there and we've got a community there that really needs this. Let's not worry so much about the revenue to the university system--rather, let's take a look at the community needs and opt for using the land for the people instead of worrying about the bucks for the university. That's interesting.

Male:

I'm not limiting that just to the university--or mental health or any state lands. The State lands, from what I can see on how they've portioned out State lands, it's very much on a real estate agency outlook. It's not on a land use outlook--and very inflationary with respect to--definitely--a land sale.

Male:

Well, this leased land, like you said university land, I don't know how it works but, say, within the last five years, if you leased a five-acre tract or something and built your home on it and you was geared up with whatever that lease started out say five years ago, down on the Kenai the Forest Service is very flexible. I have--still have a Forest Service lot down there, and I started out with it twenty years ago at \$5.00 a year. Now, and I got my bill in the mail just a couple of days ago, it's just around \$700 that they're charging me now because they're plowing the snow on the roads in the winter, and there is electricity in the area. But that's been very flexible. They're keeping up with inflation, I tell you, on the Forest Service lots. I just wonder what's happening to the university tract. Don't they charge more to take in more money because of inflation, even if it's a 55-year lease? It won't be the same amount they

November 19, 1977

- Male: charged five years ago in the next ten years if it's according
(continued) to the Forest Service lots. They'll hang right on up there--
- Male: I think right now there's a big hassle about that, and I think
it was generated last year about some State and university
ground that the Teamsters' built on in Anchorage--land hassle
about increasing rates after you've established capital improve-
ments on the land. And I think right now that there's a
program where you can refile and you can get 25 years'
frozen payments. But it's still in development. I think any
basic answer on that question is still in the hands of the
politicians.
- Male: Still kinda uh--yeah, right. True. Well, based on this dis-
cussion, does anyone have a feeling for whether State lands,
when they become available, should be leased or sold outright,
and if they're leased, should it be short term leases or should
it be long term frozen leases like you're talking about?
--kind of address that second word.
- Male: Well, I'll go in NIC(?) if it's small tracts, it should be sold.
If it's large tracts, very possible lease it. At least on
agricultural ground, on the larger tracts. That would keep it
in agriculture that way. On the smaller tracts, I would say
cash sales. There's a great deal of pride in ownership. You
do more with it if you own it rather than lease it. That is my
opinion.
- Male: And in conjunction with that, if you're going to lease it, I
would think long term leases would be far better than short term.
Long term I would define as 50 years, 55 years.
- Female: Is that with an option to re-evaluate it every five, ten,
twenty years? (end of tape)
- Male: ---zoning and because title seems to be more desirable to these
people. Then they've also got leases on, you know, not for
real property but for agricultural purposes and stuff like that,
which would allow the use of the land for grazing, shore
fishery use, timber, material or water, allow the use of the
land or resources without conveying title. And you can't
exclude other uses from that. So, what do you think? Do you
still think that private ownership would be more logical in
small parcels?
- Male: On small parcels, anyway. Really, I haven't decided on the big,
but I don't know. I look at everything through the agricul-
tural end of things, so as far as subdivisions and all this
sort of thing or small businesses, well, I can say very little.
But we're going to run out of agricultural ground some day.

- Male:
(continued) I can look right down here in the Matanuska Valley right now. I've lived there for over forty years, and from what I saw when I first came here, boy, to what it is now--it's really a bedroom city for the city of Anchorage. Boy, I mean it. That whole new Parks Highway has only been through there a matter of--what?--eight or ten years--buildings and subdivisions from the junction clear to Willow. And a lot of that is primary agriculture ground--real good stuff. Some of it has never actually been put into farming, it hasn't even been cleared off, but it's still good farm ground. Some of it was old farms that--what the heck, why farm it when I can sell it and retire? We'll subdivide it--so we're gonna run out of farm ground. I still think the 5-acre farmers or hobby farmers are going to be providing a great deal of our land in years to come.
- Male: Well, that's very evident there in the Palmer area. You see nice fields that would raise very good hay ground and you could cut bales of hay on it. Here they're putting in foundation footings and going into building because the taxes are so great they can't sell that bale of hay and get any return off of it. And they got to get a bigger return because the taxes are too great.
- Male: Okay, how does everybody feel about that third part of the question. Who of any of the list that we've got there should be getting some sort of subsidy for that State land? Should anyone be getting it at lower than market price? Should people, let's say, who intend to use it for agriculture be given some sort of a financial incentive to do agriculture?
- Male: That's a tough one.
- Male: Well, it's just like a dry season. If you had agricultural land and it was so dry nothing grew, why, if you couldn't have a little break on the cost, why, you'd be obliged to go into bankruptcy. You just wouldn't make it that year.
- Male: How about giving price breaks to people who don't own land, based on a residency thing, people who've lived here longer should get a higher break on price--
- Male: I'll take that one to task. I don't feel that it should be determined on who owns land because I worked in a lot of pieces of ground. I feel I should not be limited to participating in State programs that makes land available to anybody in the state.
- Male: So even though someone, say, from Anchorage who owned some commercial property downtown and has got an income, say, a

- Male:
(continued) hotel on it or something, they should have as much right to any of these parcels of State land that we're talking about as the guy who's been here for twenty years and doesn't own a piece of property but is looking for a place to retire?
- Male: Okay, that's one extreme, and the other extreme is a person that owns two acres of ground out in the middle of nowhere and wants another piece of ground somewhere else. That's the other extreme, and why should that person be precluded.
- Male: Right, that's true. So you can't really differentiate between how much land and how wealthy a person is--it would have to be equal across the board--is what you're saying.
- Male: That's not what I'm saying. It's how can you say that the person that owns the commercial property, and you say "if he owns other land." Now you're putting him in the same bracket as the person who owns one or two acres somewhere else. Now how are you going to differentiate if you're putting everybody in one class--they own other land--that's what it says right here--all right, you're covering a lot of ground and I think very unjustly.
- Male: You think that there should be--or you're a cating classification?
- Male: No, I--if you start classifying it, what are you going to do? You break it down if you own land worth \$10,000, you can't participate? I guess it would be very unmanageable.
- Male: Okay--so we shouldn't even consider that option?
- Male: In my opinion--no.
- Male: Okay.
- Male: I'll go along with that.
- Male: Do you think that any of these others are bad options? Do you think people with low incomes should be considered? Or people with farms? Or people who want to become--who want to start farming? Or people who are loggers, or people who are fishermen, or--should any special interest get less than the full price of the land?
- Male: When you're saying full price, is this, like the lease program for the farm ground that the State is leasing--well, I think in one of the brochures I've looked at they say this ground is being leased at a very reasonable rate. Well, now, this is in the lease program. Now in the outright selling of the land,

Male: are you saying that this ground should be sold at less than
(continued) the market price? And how are you going to do this? Is this
going to be labeled "This is worth X amount of dollars, and
you can buy it for this"? But if it goes to public auction,
well----

Male: Well, that's what they're talking about. Perhaps a public
auction isn't the best way to do it because, as you mentioned
before and it's really true, that by putting it up for auction
you're putting the State in the real estate business. And
when it does go to auction, many times the price that's finally
settled upon for that piece of land is higher than the assessed
value, because I think they start off at assessed value and then
work their way up. So this would have to be a new kind of a
program that looks at the potential of the land--let's say,
take farmers, for example--take a look at the land and decide
that it's best for agricultural use, and, because you're not
going to have it for subdivision, the assessed value would be
much lower than market value, market price. And so yet you
would be selling it for a use at a lower price.

Male: I think with an auction sale, the guy with the money and the one
with the most backing or financing behind him would be the
land owner where you and I probably wouldn't even be able to get
in the bid. It's sure not--the State may make more money that
way, but as far as the little guy wanting a chunk of ground, he
might as well forget it.

Male: That's exactly the way it is. I've been to land auctions, and
I've bid on acreages up to where I figured I'd let it go. Well,
somebody with more money and more cash on hand, why, he just
keeps on bidding and he gets it.

Male: Well, can anybody think of a more equitable system? Perhaps
either through sale or through auction--I'm sorry--either
through sale or through lease? Would there be a more equitable
way that would sidestep the problem of the guy with the most
money gets the best piece--to assure that little people, the
little guy, gets a chunk of land? Can you think of any equitable
method that perhaps we could relate to the State--get them
thinking about it in other terms?

Male: That'd take a terrific amount of screening, wouldn't it?
You gotta do some accounting and the whole cottonpickin' works
and have to fill out a financial statement and--boy--I don't
think any one is more entitled to it than one person than the
other, really.

Male: Well, let's say, under lease option, it's almost like on a first

November 19, 1977

- Male:
(continued) come first served, then, which would then make it equitable for everybody. If it's on a sale thing, it may depend--I mean, under our present system--it may depend on who has the most bucks in their pocket at the time.
- Male: I don't think that's at all true. On a lease--you bid on how much you'll pay for a lease.
- Male: Is that right?
- Male: You don't bid on "I'm gonna pay \$10,000 to have this lease." You bid on how much you'll pay annually for that lease.
- Male: Okay, yeah, you're right--
- Male: What I was thinking of was the homesite type of thing where you've got subdivided pieces of land--uh--and you apply for that piece, you know, for any one piece. Everyone, then, under that application, if you can afford the \$10 application, is looked upon as equal, and when you have competition for the same piece under that system, they talk about first come first served basis. But, okay--
- Male: They also talk about seniority--
- Male: Yeah, exactly--
- Male: Well, first come first served may be first in the state but not first in application. See?
- Male: Yeah, first in the state as well as--no, okay, first in the state, that's right. So you don't think that anyone should get a price break? Does everybody feel that way?
- Male: Well, I think it's unclear in my mind what you're asking. You say, "No one should get a price break." Say the ground is zoned agricultural--should this land be sold at less than fair market value? What is determining fair market value? Because if you took and subdivided that land, you'd be getting X amount of dollars from this, so by putting it in agricultural ground you are already lowering the price because you can't compete in the (indistinguishable) development area anyway, so then the free market value on what agricultural ground is worth, doesn't that automatically discount its value?
- Male: I'm not sure I got that last part.
- Male: Uh, okay. If you're zoning a piece of ground for X use, and this use is not the most valuable use of that land as far as what you could get in cash out of it, aren't you automatically devaluing the land in that respect rather than having to appraise a price on the ground for that use and then evaluating it again on a percentage basis?

Male: Yeah, I think you would be.

Male: So is that what you're asking in this question?

Male: I think in a way, yes. Because if you say, for example, if you check No. 1, farmers, that would, then, advocate that process which you just mentioned. That would tell the State farmers need land that they can't afford under the current land market values, so that would say to the State, "Find out where the agricultural land is, look at it in terms of agricultural values rather than subdivided value, and sell it or lease it to the farmer at that rate rather than at the accelerated rate for subdivisions.

Male: Well, is that how you interpret this question? Just--I want an opinion from someone else?

Male: Well, I think that's the angle--that you---at agriculture rate--uhh--that the farmers might be able to handle it, but as a subdivision, why, they couldn't. So they'd put near have to have some kind of a break.

Male: Right, okay. I think what this question is asking is a little confusing. Uh, you take the farmers, we just went through that, what it would mean if the State would have to do to put land into farmers' ownership. You take a look at the next one-- "people with low incomes". What would the State have to do to put land into ownership of people with low incomes? First off, they'd have to have a screening process which would say, "If you make over \$5,000 a year, you do not--you cannot--apply for this land." Then they would also have to find the land in an area where these people with low incomes--this is all hypothetical--but each of these options has inherent in it something that the State would have to do to favor that group. The agricultural land--it means not subdividing it, and selling it at agricultural rights--keeping the rights inherent in that land. People with low incomes, it would have to be a somewhat different process, just as with loggers, anything else. Each would tell the State--let's say everybody who came out to the Public Forum felt that people who've lived here in Alaska a long time should get land cheaper than people who had been here less than three years or something like that. That would mean that they would have to revise the constitution to some extent to get around the constitutional problem of everybody is equal under the eyes of the law. Then they would have to make available some land, probably near a community, let's say, that low income people alone could file for it and live on. And it would have to be at a decelerated rate. So what this question is asking is do you think that the State should pursue any program that would allow any of these groups of people here to get land lower in price than what you and I would pay for it.

- Male: Personally, I don't think so. No matter--you go through all those and somehow or other you're going to be showing partiality. You went out here and made something of yourself, you've got yourself a pretty good little income coming in--\$6,000--low income is classed as five--you can't buy a chunk at the reduced price. Uh--no matter which way you look through here, if there's any differential in the price, you're gonna be showing some partiality somewhere. Just 'cause some guy's a bum and maybe boozin' down here in the corner bar and he don't have a dime to his name--he can go out and buy a chunk and I can't. It don't make sense. If he does buy a chunk, he pays a lot less price than I do, so it's gonna be awful hard to go through that without showing partiality one way or another.
- Male: Okay, although we did---go ahead.
- Male: You said that--your final statement in that was "than you and I can pay for it." Again, that confuses the issue. If you're going to designate ground for farming, then what I should be able to pay for that ground for farming--but by designating as farming ground, the price will be less. And I do favor that policy.
- Male: Okay. I was just going to say it seems as if what we're saying here is that if you put a specific use on that land, either mining, or lumber or agriculture, then, yes--keep the integrity of the land, keep it classified and use it for that, and let the person lease it or buy it at a reduced rate--reduced meaning lower than subdivision cost.
- Male: Fair market value for that use.
- Male: Right, okay, fair market value for that use--that's a good way of saying it.
- Male: Right, I'll go along with you.
- Male: And what you were saying was that other than those specified uses, people should not be chosen on the basis of their longevity of residency or on their income or on their color or creed or anything else?
- Male: Right--it's all equal as persons.
- Male: The program now that--where limited entry's evolved to--now that ground there on these lots has been proposed on preferential rights--people over twenty years--and they have a different formula for them obtaining ground. I don't disagree with this policy. I find this policy, on that tract level--you're talking five to ten to twenty acres--on that level I find that applicable, but on that level competing for farm ground, where you're talking

Male:
(continued)

about many thousands of acres, then I see it's not applicable. So--I--a general policy there, I think it has to be broken down a little bit on what the ground is going to be used for, and what programs you're involving. I have a lot of empathy for the program on the selections right now as far as the open entry or the State homesteads. Now, I do think there should be a greater opportunity, though, for the ground to be selected by the people participating in it. You were saying, "This is the ground, these are the lots." Fine, but before this ground is selected and these lots are subdivided, I think there should be a more equitable and an avenue for people who are interested in this area to participate in how this ground should be split up and where these lots should be. I can think of many areas where I personally participate, and I've also seen ground split up by bureaucracies that, after they've split it up, the ground is virtually useless for the intentions of the people participating.

Male:

That's a really good point. It brings to mind a program that's going on in Southeast Alaska and a little bit in Southcentral but not very much with the National Forest people--the Chugach and the Tongass National Forests surround a lot of communities in Southeast. And under the Statehood Act those communities are due X amount of land for community expansion. The program that the Department of Natural Resources is doing, which sounds a lot like what you're advocating, is having a team of people that work for the Department of Natural Resources go into each community and ask the community people where are the lands around your community that you would like to use. You know, they've got maps of the whole area. They've got outlines of where the State lands, or where the boundaries are, and so forth. They ask the people, "What do you want to use the land for, and where do you want the land to be?"--and then take that back and they work with the National Forest people to work out some sort of a deal so that the people actually do have some input into that use--

Male:

To take that one step further, you're asking for a group to say to the State, "This is how we want to use this land." I also think that there should be--if you want to put it on a form where you draw a map and say, "This chunk of land right here." It's a specific chunk of land--I would be interested in if this could come up under your homestead selection and when you're surveying this out that there could be a consideration that this piece be laid out in such a manner. And if enough people made their applications prior to the survey, the surveyors, or whoever's chopping up the ground, will have the input of the people. And

November 19, 1977

- Male:
(continued) obviously there's going to be some controversy and some people that won't be satisfied. I think the end product could work out to be more satisfactory, and there might be areas chosen one or two plots two miles away from another plot, so you're not looking at strictly people having to move into 5-acre subdivisions rather than 5-acre lots spread out a little bit on the State ground. And this could also be worked into your access problem and everything else. If a plot here two miles away from another plot--if there's going to be access there and to lots in the future, they're going to be filled in, they still have the option of providing access to areas around or through that ground.
- Male: Okay, that's good--that's a good suggestion.
- Male: I'd like to ask a question. Did any of you attend that land use thing that happened here not too long ago--that town meeting thing?
- Male: I attended it.
- Male: Okay, would you mind running over for me what was discussed at that and what some of the suggestions were out of that? Does that relate at all to what we're talking about today?
- Male: Well, the town meeting--it covered--
- Female: Didn't it have more to do with community and political organizations, I think?
- Male: Are you talking about the town meeting or are you talking about the Forest Service thing--which one?
- Male: Okay---I guess I'm talking about the Forest Service--yeah.
- Male: The town meeting wasn't too much about the land--
- Male: Okay, the Wrangell Mountains study was--they came through last month.
- Male: There was a meeting at (indistinguishable) and a meeting at King Lake and there was a meeting at Klaune (??). I didn't go to any of the meetings--generally, they're--land use auctions is what they wanted to get a consensus on, and to see if there was any changes from last year's input on the study.
- Male: Okay--and that was--?
- Male: I don't think there was anything too specific on the study--
- Male: Who was it that conducted those? Not the person, perhaps, but the agency.
- Male: It's the Forest Service man out of Anchorage--

- Male: They were tied in with the university some way--
- Male: Yeah, they contracted with the university to do the coordinating and writing of the--
- Male: Does anybody else have any comments or questions that we could throw around?
- Male: Yeah--I think a number of ten percent was brought up of what the State should reserve. I don't agree with that number just as 10%. I think if the State has excellent ground in an area, and they're going to be disbursing it over a number of years, a percentage of the ground should be let out at each disbursement-- that percentage could be made available. And in doing it in this manner, that would automatically reserve the balance for in the future, and this would, I think, enable a reasonable development of the ground in the area, knowing that so much ground would be available. And this would make an automatic percentage reserve left, and whatever is left--if that's the first offerings, they offer--this would be a maximum amount they could offer rather than a mandate of how much they shall offer.
- Male: So that if they had a thousand-acre tract, you would advocate perhaps letting go of a third of that this year, wait a few years and decide what to do with another third of that at that time?
- Male: Um, humm--a third I think is--if you're talking about a thousand-acre tract in an area, fine--but if you're talking about all the State lands in a region, a third is too great--
- Male: Too great--okay--yeah.
- Female: When you're talking about this thousand-acre tract or something like that, would that be just let out for use as homesites or agriculture, or does that include the land that would go into the park system or--
- Male: Well, the thousand acre figure is just hypothetical, of course, and I'm using that because that's the one area that they do have a tangible plan for up in the Delta area. It's just a small self-contained, all-in-one-piece thousand acres they have identified for residential use. That doesn't, then mean that if in this area that the total number of acres that's in State ownership were to be broken up and sold or leased, that--there's a good chance that some of it would end up with a certain classification like agriculture or that--you know--there would be a lot of different things that could happen with that. It wouldn't all be one thing or the other.
- Female: Okay--how about--like we were talking about putting lands in trust and letting so much go every five years or something. Those lands

Female: that are in trust--would that include the parks, State parks,
(continued) and--

Male: I would assume so--I could be wrong in that--I would assume that would be right. But that would mean that every time a meeting came up to decide what to do with that, it would have to be decided at that time how much you wanted to save for a park or something. Or they would have to do it differently and identify from the very beginning what of the total amount of State land there is, what part--identifying what parts would be saved ultimately for parks.

Male: What I think is that they need to do is to do regional planning throughout the state. Take a region like the Copper River Basin as one unit and see what they have in all types of land uses and do an investigation on the type of lands that are available--agriculture, residential, you know--start doing regional planning is what you have to do where the--like the State does now is go out and sell some property out in Glennallen because we don't want it and just go do it.

Male: --and they don't have any involvement with the region.

Male: They might sell out a whole bunch of good farmlands for commercial, and then when they do need farmlands then they won't have them.

Male: Yeah--and I think the university has the capability of doing that--at least doing an initial study on the types of soil and capabilities of the land on a regional basis.

Male: And, also, in doing this it would be very beneficial to the people and the native organizations to participate in this so that everybody's heading in the same direction.

Male: Yeah--I'm not sure that this effort isn't being done at this time. I was talking with John Dolnak(?), and he said that they are doing that for this region. I'm not sure that the State hasn't also done similar programs--classifying programs--for this area. But I'm not an expert on it, so I don't really know what they've done, or if they've done, but I will check on that. -- Do you think that if the State adopted your suggestion that they come out here and spend, oh, let's say, a week traveling throughout the area, having meetings like this to get the people to come out and identify the area that they think would be good for residential, the areas that would be good for agriculture, do you think that that would be productive for this community? Do you think people would respond to that? What I'm getting at is that a lot of towns are getting really burned out on public meetings. They just see meetings and meetings without any results. So I'm wondering--do you think that public meeting kind of a concept would work if you're asking people to make a decision on the lands around the community?

- Male: I think that goes with good planning. Whatever the ground is best--or the property is best suited for, that's what it should be used for. And incidentally, your Soil Conservation Service, which is part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has soil samples and things of this nature over just darn near all of this area. They can take a look at an area for us and tell you which is suitable for agriculture and which is not, which is sitting on real bum permafrost, which is gravel bars and like that--and they can tell you things like that. And they can probably even make recommendations, but I don't know--and I'm sure they'd be glad to do it.
- Male: I think a better--if the State is going to have a sale in that area with the regional planning in mind and have more opportunity for individual public input rather than meeting public input. I think they would probably get a feeling of people who want to be participating in the activity rather than just trying to get a consensus of a group of people sitting in a room.
- Male: How would you define individual as opposed to a meeting? Having someone like myself just spend two or three weeks in the area just meeting people in the store or post office and in the lodge, at the school, just talking to people on a one-to-one basis?
- Male: I would think--well, that might be productive, but that wasn't what I had in mind. If you're going to sell a thousand acres in this area, make it known to the people that the State is intending to sell a thousand acres in the area--and what ground, with the zoning that you people have decided, should be available? And, also, just because you've decided the ground should be used in that manner, the State bureaucracy--that that should not be final--that there should be a time to challenge that before the ground is actually marketed.
- Male: An advertisement of some sort in the paper and also, maybe, set up an office out here where we--where people could plan to participate--look at the map--
- Male: So first, maybe even before the advertisement, just say there's a need for selling a thousand acres in the valley and you want people's input on where a thousand should be sold.
- Male: So first you want them to announce that they're thinking about selling or leasing or whatever X amount of land. They come out here and spend the better part of a week, let's say, finding out what--where the land should come from and what its use should be--taking that back, deciding how much acreage is going to be sold and where and for what use--coming back to the

COPIES
November 19, 1977

Male: community for another week with their amended plan---
(continued)

Male: Sounds like it would be a good idea--

Male: When you get done with the final product, you have about two
or three meetings and finalize it.

Male: Yeah, by that time everybody in the community would have heard
about it and be pretty familiar with the uses, the sizes--
okay, well, that's good. Thank you very much.

**: PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.**

Governor Jay
Hammond:

It is a great pleasure to be back in Dillingham after too long an absence. I'd like to say to anybody that I may have passed on the street or in the halls and appeared to have failed to recognize that I am not, as some might presume, afflicted with that political shortcoming--an inability to remember names at all. I never forget names. I do have some other problems, and that was brought home to me here awhile back when a fellow got off the plane at King Salmon and said, "Hi, Jay, how are you?" And he noticed my blank look of non-recognition, he says, "You forgot my name, didn't you?" I said, "The heck I did; I just can't place your face." So he went off mumbling to himself.

But I do appreciate the opportunity to kick off the public forum. I regret that I was not here last year when the public forum appeared in town. I have great confidence in the public forum as a means of providing a two-way communications channel between the people and their government. It's an idea I had, actually, long before I assumed this office, and I determined that, if I were in the position to do so, would create some sort of an improved communications process that, with the departure of the old practice of those of us in government too often telling the people what's best for them rather than asking to find out what their needs and desires really were. Now I know that to some that suggests a lack of direction--perhaps indecision, and so forth--but I think it's evident, with all the monumental issues confronting us these days, complex and traumatic to the degree they are, it obligates that unless the public knows what's fully going on and those of us in public office as your hired hands, so to speak, communicate with you and we work together toward common objectives, we'll find that one group or another may end up on the outside with their nose pressed to the glass while some people end up with great benefits and others find themselves short changed.

I might, as a brief departure before getting into the public forum, respond to something Freeman had asked me. He said, "You've got a lot of people guessing as to what your political plans are." And I was about to tell him that I had been approached by somebody from the press the other day who asked me if I planned to run again, and I told him it depended upon the state of my health, family circumstances, and the availability of acceptable alternative candidates. He said, "Do you have any health problems?" I said, "No, but after four years of this business I may not be fit to be anything but governor." I don't know. To bring that even more dramatically home to roost, a fellow from Togiak I ran into in town here some months

ago came up to me and he says, "You've got old!" And I said, "If you think it's bad from the outside looking in, you ought to see it from the inside looking out." It really is an interesting and provocative job, and it's certainly a privilege to have been the governor of this state for the past three years; and I frankly find that the public forum process is one of the things that add to the stimulation and privilege of being governor. I frankly have been heartened by what I think is a common segment of goals--or a common listing of goals--that seems to prevail throughout Alaska no matter where one goes. You hear a lot of talk from extremist factions, a lot of charges of preservationists or ulter-developers, etc., but I find that Alaskans in general have essentially the same common objectives. I'm very much heartened by that.

I think we all agree and are willing to play our role as a national energy provider, and I think we all wish to utilize and develop our natural resources, but to do so in such a way as to retain those qualities of life that make Alaska, to most of us, the only place on earth we'd care to live.

The public forum last year provided us with a number of interesting bits and pieces of information. I suspect that somebody else will go into them in more detail. We asked questions as to what the public wished to do with their oil wealth, how they thought those monies should be expended, whether they believed that more should go into a permanent fund--and incidentally, the permanent fund was another long term goal of mine that I am pleased is now in the pattern, which will provide a sort of savings account to assure that we leave some legacy of that oil wealth to our children. The earnings from that fund should be what is used to provide for ongoing day-by-day government expenses instead of what we have done in past years--and that is to become dangerously dependent upon one time capital--what I call nest egg--oil wealth dollars. In other words, in the past every time we needed another five hundred bodies on the state payroll or another expansion of state services, we'd sell a lease in the Lower Cook Inlet or somewhere else and use those monies to expand state government. And that's a very dangerous practice. It's rather like an individual who might receive an inheritance from his great aunt of say \$50,000, and while it's appropriate to use those monies to fix the roof of his house or to repair the driveway or do something of that nature, to expand and double the size of his house to the extent that he could no longer pay for the household expenses of heat and light, etc., from his ongoing income but must dip ever deeper into the remnants of that inheritance to pay those costs, evidence what will happen when you run out of that inheritance and you don't have incoming revenues to provide for those types of governmental expenses.

The State of Alaska, much to my dismay, quite frankly, had gotten itself into a position where we were paying our day-by-day expenses from lease monies, royalty monies, one-time-only dollars, to the extent that 61% of our day-by-day costs were being paid for by that source. We had locked onto taxes that were set back in the 1960's, and instead of going to the people and saying, "Do you want these programs badly enough to permit us to extract some tax monies to pay for them," we simply fed in painlessly this lease money, royalty monies--that's where your \$900 million went. To give you some dramatic examples of what happened, in 1969 we took in through gas taxes, gasoline taxes, highway taxes, enough money to more than maintain our highways to the extent that they were maintained then, and actually were \$600,000 in the black that year. We are now \$37 million a year in the red in exceeding what we take in from highway taxes with the amount of money we expend for highway maintenance--day-to-day ongoing yearly maintenance costs that should be paid for with ongoing income. Similarly, the ferry system was subsidized to the tune of something like I think \$500 thousand in 1965--I can't remember the figures exactly. We are now subsidizing that \$18 million a year. Air fields are being subsidized \$23 million a year. We are spending so much more money in per capita services than we are taking in in per capita income, unless we do something about it we are going to find the roof will fall in on our kids, if not ourselves, in the near future.

Now, when I first uncovered these data, I frankly hoped somebody would point out where I was wrong--say "You're all wet, you've overlooked this, and this is something you haven't taken into consideration." Instead, I have not found anybody that's looked at all that data that doesn't say, "You're exactly right. Something has to be done about it."

What can you do about it? The first thing we've done about it is create that permanent fund, which removes at least a portion of those royalty bonus lease purchase monies from the capability of those of us in public office to simply feed them painlessly into government expansion. The public forum last year evidenced that the public, which I think many times more quickly grasp some of these things than do those of us in public office--the public was determined that even a greater amount than the 25% constitutionally obligated lease monies and royalty monies go into the permanent fund. They felt that those monies, the earnings from our non-renewable resources, should go into enhancing and rehabilitating our renewable resources--fisheries and agriculture. Accordingly, we have expanded substantially programs involving agricultural or fisheries rehabilitation and enhancement.

Similarly, they felt that education was perhaps the primary public service to be rendered by the State. Certainly it's a constitutionally

mandated obligation of the State. We are intent upon trying to meet that obligation. Right now we're not doing it in an equitable manner at all. We are totally out of conformity with the constitutional obligation that says you shall fund education on par for all throughout the state. We provide some with education at an entirely different level and cost than we do others. We are trying to remedy that by expanding the so-called foundation program and by providing a more precise definition of what constitutes basic needs.

But all of these things were issues addressed by the public forum in which the public spoke out loudly and clearly. One of the questions I had asked informally at the public forums was simply this: how many in the room felt that we should expand state government by feeding in one more dollar of that finite--what I call nest egg--wealth. And almost unanimously everyone would say, "No." They didn't want government funded from that source. When they found that we were currently obligated to put some \$500 million a year of such capital wealth into funding current state government costs, they were aghast. The only way that we can back off from plowing that sort of money, which is what I term our children's legacy, into funding government is to supplant it with earnings, per chance from a permanent fund investment or from appropriate taxes. Last year I tried to dramatize the point that we were certainly willing to provide services, but I was not going to increase that 61% dependency on inappropriate monies but would ask that, if somebody aspired to have new services provided, that we be provided as well with new recurrent income-engendering devices, be they taxes or more money into the permanent fund earning income.

Of course, that pronouncement to the legislature was like handing them a gun pointed at my head, because all that would have to happen was to expand the programs without providing the new revenues; and that, of course, is what happened, and in the wake of that, I was obligated to contain that 61% and keep it from increasing. I was obligated to veto something like \$30 million from the budget, which certainly is most unpleasant and an action which I'm sure affronted everybody in this room to some degree or other. So--my point being simply this: we can't have it both ways. If the public does not want to put more of that nest egg lease wealth into expanding government, we must then provide other revenues, or either cut the cost of per capita government--per capita cost of government--to the point that we can meet it with those recurrent revenues. We are a long way from that point

answers that some will. For example, if you ask somebody if you favor an increase in taxes, naturally they'll say "no." But if you ask somebody if they prefer to have services reduced as an alternative that throws a different kicker into the equation. I can give you a prime example of how, without all the data at your command, it's easy without full information to make assumptions and pronouncements. I am going to depart a little bit from the public forum because it's the first chance I've had to convey to you in Dillingham something that we've seen in the way of data regarding an issue which I know was most controversial here in Bristol Bay. Let me ask you if--I'm sure--if you were to be asked offhand if you favored say a limited entry program for fisheries that would increase revenues to the State, that would reduce the amount of gear in the water to a manageable level, that would assure appropriate and adequate escapement, that virtually doubled the collective percentage take of the fishery by resident Alaskan fishermen and was totally legal, and did not require the type of limited entry program we now have structured in the statute, I suspect that most people would say, "Hey, that sounds great!" But, believe it or not, you had it. You actually had a program that did all those things--increased the revenues to the State, cut the gear in the water by 60%, increased the resident percentage of the pay day collectively from 43% to 75%, was totally legal, and treated everybody exactly the same, and it was rejected. It was rejected because of certain elements that were more immediately apparent that the people found repugnant. I'm talking about the sliding gear scale in pooling, which was a peculiar and difficult thing for people to understand. I'm not suggesting that was a good thing or bad thing. I'm simply saying there was much confusion in the public mind, and it's unfortunate that the whole issue could not have been explored, laid out, so that people could really determine what was in their long term best interest. All of these questions have two sides to them, and one of the most interesting things I think you'll find is that when you plow into them, that what may appear black and white initially ends up as a rather unusual shade of gray. And, if we can focus in and distill those shades of gray down to some meaningful end product, there then can be a directive from you to those of us in public office as to what sort of legislation or administrative approach truly meets what you conclude to be the broad public interest, and that's what we want to find out, and that's wherein I see the public forum as providing a monumental benefit to Alaskans. I'm hopeful, frankly, that whether I'm in office any time in the future or not, that we will have conditioned in the wake of the public forum efforts of this administration--we will have conditioned the public to demand the sort of input that the public forum can provide.

But the public forum will succeed or flounder only if you see at the end of the line some meaningful hard decision or end product that

causes you to conclude that somebody out there is listening. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Governor. I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce the City people that I see here present. Mr. Dave Carlson, one of our City Councilmen, sitting here. I see Mr. Jim Bingman, another of our Councilmen. I see a third one that we have here. He's a Councilman tonight, but there's an election tomorrow, so we don't know whether he's going to be a Councilman tomorrow, but that's Duane Bell standing over in the corner. Our City Manager, Mr. Gordon Ryan. I see Mr. Harvey Samuelson sitting up there who is President of the Bristol Bay Native Corporation. And I'd like to introduce to you Miss Nancy Blunck, who is going to be the moderator for the public forum. Nancy.

Nancy Blunck:

Can you all hear me? It's a little bit high here. My name is Nancy Blunck. I'm from Anchorage. This is my first time in Dillingham, though I've spent quite a bit of time in the bush, most of that in the Yukon/Kuskokwim area, and though it was raining when I came in this afternoon, it's really a pretty place with all the trees turning fall colors. And I'm really glad to be here tonight.

I'd like to introduce a couple of people. Bill Luria is one of our resource people here tonight. If you'd just raise your hand. These are some of the people that can answer questions that you've got. Sue Green, over in the black and white striped shirt by the wall over here. There are two resource people here tonight from Fish and Game who can answer some questions, perhaps on the management and the way Fish and Game operates. And Adelaide Herman is over here. She's working on the Interim Legislative Committee on Subsistence, and when we get into discussing the issue of subsistence, she'll have a report to give on what that Committee has heard so far in the meetings that they've been holding statewide on subsistence.

I'd like to just tell you how we're planning to structure the evening tonight. As the people were coming in I heard comments like, "Ah-oh! it looks like school," and things like that. People sitting around tables and small group discussions. The reason we decided to do that is that if only one person speaks at a time then that means--we counted--there's about 104 people here tonight--and if one person talks, 103 other people have to sit and wait their turn. And so the reason for the small groups is one person can talk and only seven others have to wait their turn.

There's two main issues that we're going to discuss tonight. The permanent fund is the first one, and subsistence is the second one. And what I'd like to do is spend about an hour and fifteen minutes on each issue, and we'll begin by giving a brief presentation. You can kind of read over there on the easel. I'll be very brief--about ten minutes. There will be a chance for you to ask questions about the permanent fund, and then we'll spend about a half an hour in discussions at the small group tables.

There's a questionnaire in that tabloid that Freeman is holding up. Each one of you has a copy of that in that yellow packet in front of you, and if anyone sitting over on the bleachers wants to get copies of them, we've got them. I'm just not sure where they are. I think they're on the table over here--yeah. There's a questionnaire on the back page of that tabloid, and it's something for each individual to fill out. The questions that the small groups will be discussing are going to be a bit different than the questions that are in the tabloid. We'd prefer if you'd fill that questionnaire out tonight and hand it in to us, but if you want to take it home, it is postmarked so that you can fill it out and send it in and we'll get it in our office.

The last part of the discussion on the permanent fund will be a chance for each of the small groups at the tables to report back to the large group what that table discussed in answering the questions, and we estimate that will take about twenty minutes.

Are there any questions on how we're planning to spend the next three hours? Okay, then I'll just go ahead and start with the presentation on the permanent fund. If I step away from the mike, will it still pick up what I'm saying? (certain indistinguishable comments about operating the equipment)

In the last statewide election where you elected your legislators last year, there was an issue on the ballot relating to the permanent fund. It was an amendment to revise the constitution of the State of Alaska, and it passed 9 to 1. It's really not very often that there is an amendment to revise the constitution, so that doesn't happen very often. But the other thing that was sort of amazing was how largely the amendment passed. The thing probably that we can draw from that is that whatever it was people were voting for--like I might have been thinking one thing when I voted for the permanent fund, and you might have been thinking another thing. But, whatever it was, it was really clear the people of Alaska wanted it. And so, what I'd like to do to kind of explain this whole process is over here on this big long sheet against the wall--back here when we voted on this in November, the legislature then in the first part of 1977

session had before them the problem--at least the beginning of the problem--of writing the legislation for the permanent fund. And the main things that they were trying to decide is--was called the investment strategy, that is, where to invest the money from the permanent fund, the size of the fund--how large should it be? The law as it's written now says that at least 25% of certain monies goes into the fund, but it's written so that you could include anywhere from 25% to 100%. And the last thing the legislature has to decide is who's going to manage the whole thing. When the legislature gets together this January 15, that's when the decisions are going to be made. They are going to be weighing all of the bills, and they're going to be making a decision on it. The main players in this whole thing are the Governor and the administration as one, the House Committee on the Permanent Fund is another, and the Senate Committee on the Permanent Fund is another. In terms of the--in other words, the Governor and the administration submitted two bills last legislature that are already in existence about the permanent fund, the House Committee will be submitting one, the Senate Committee will be submitting one, and, as you all know, those will not be the four final bills. I'm sure there will be many other bills submitted and discussed. But the decision will be made this legislative session.

Kind of where we are tonight--and what we're going to spend time on tonight--is right here: helping to find solutions to these questions and beginning to evaluate these solutions. The only two bills that we've got to discuss tonight are the two that were submitted by the Governor and the administration. For purposes of discussion tonight, they're called House Bill 298 and 300. They are fairly similar; there's not a lot of big differences, and we're going to tell you a little bit about those bills as well as we're going to tell you what we heard people saying at the public forum last year statewide and what we heard people saying in Dillingham about the permanent fund.

Are there any questions on this right now? Feel free to ask questions throughout this whole thing. The information can be confusing, and any time anyone's got a question, just raise your hand and we'll answer it. No questions right now, huh? Okay.

There's five really important things to remember, and they're just keys. I think if you'll look on Page 6 of your tabloid in the bottom lefthand corner in bold print are these five keys, and so you can refer to them during your discussion, or you can refer to the graphic on the wall.

The first thing is that at least 25% of certain oil and gas monies goes into the permanent fund. That can change and can be anywhere

between 25% and 100%.

The second thing to remember is that only certain monies--certain mineral monies--go into it. Not all of the monies are eligible for going into the permanent fund. I think royalties is in there-- I don't have mine in front of me--bonuses and royalties are--

(inserted correction from male "leases, bonuses--")

leases, bonuses and royalties are the key ones that might speak to people--

(inserted comment from male "no severance taxes")

no severance taxes.

The third item that's important to remember is that the principal can be invested but you can't spend it. You can't give it away; it has to be invested, and it has to make money.

And then the last thing is that the interest that the State makes off of the principal goes into the general fund and that can be spent. And over here are some examples of what I just said. For instance, if the State put \$250 million into a savings account, that's called the principal, and that's the part that can be invested. If it makes 7% interest in one year, it would make \$17.5 million; over five years it would make \$87.5 million. This cannot be spent; that has to be invested, and it has to make money. The interest that comes off of the investment we can spend.

And here's another example. For instance, if the permanent fund made a loan to a community for a dock, and it was a \$100,000 loan and it was at 6% interest, the earnings for one year would be \$6,000. The \$100,000 could not be spent; the \$6,000 could be spent.

Those are two different examples that say what you can spend and what you can't spend. Any questions?

Question: \$250 million is for one year? That's what you're expecting--or
(female) what is expected in that permanent fund?

Nancy Blunck: The amount that we expect in the next seven years is about \$1.3
billion.

Question: Okay. If we can't spend that principal, what happens to that-like
(female) billion dollars. I hear that Texas has a problem with having too--
such a big surplus--supposed to be a billion dollar surplus--you know,
how come, and why is that a problem, and what are we going to do with
our billion dollars?

Nancy Blunck: In answer to the question, "What are you going to do with the billion dollars?"--is the billion dollars would be invested. One of the things we're going to do tonight is discuss the ways in which it could be invested.

Comment:
(female) I know but--with that principal--what I'm sort of thinking of-- I just came back from a meeting where we were talking about facilities--like Dillingham wants a building to put in a theater and put in classroom space for a university and a whole pile of stuff. We're looking toward a bond issue, but there's a question why we can't get money from permanent fund for something like that, which would be permanent, it's for people, it will always be there for people, and couldn't--you know--in something like that--what's going to be done with a billion dollars sitting only making money, and it's going to be more than a billion. I don't know what the--

Nancy Blunck: The example you gave of a community facility is possible under the permanent fund on a loan basis to a community. In other words, Dillingham, or any community, could apply for a loan at an interest rate. The money would have to be repaid back with interest, but loans for community facilities and community development is one of the possible investments. Does that answer the question, Dorothy?

Dorothy: Sort of. I still don't--that could be--oh, I don't know how many billion dollars plus the interest which will be used, but it---

Nancy Blunck: It keeps sitting there making money. The interest that we make off of it can be spent directly.

Gov. Hammond: Could I comment on that, Dorothy? It should be pointed out that this--the billion and a half you talked about respectively is only one quarter. You're gonna have \$4.5 billion over here that could be used for the sorts of capital improvements you're talking about that will have no permanent fund lock on them. But you mentioned about if we're going to have oil flowing for twenty years, aren't we going to have such a tremendous revenue locked up that should otherwise and could otherwise be working? Let me tell you a little frightening statistic that we have plotted out that shows that the annual average increase in government growth since statehood was 22% per year, and if that continued until 1985, it means that come 1985 we'll have approximately one billion less coming in from our revenues from oil and all sources than the size of state government, if we don't do something to curb that. So the presumption that we're going to be up to our hips in oil wealth is really not only premature but perhaps not as assured as some would think. I find this everywhere I go. I go back to Washington. Everybody thinks the State of Alaska is filthy rich. You don't need any help--you've got all the monies in the world. Again, another little frightening statistic you should be aware of is that we are currently obliged, and have been for the past

two years, to borrow \$200 million a year on future revenues, so unless we do something, that's the sort of thing that leads to these \$30 million worth of vetoes and some of these things that I don't like having to be the bad guy and talk about, but that are so necessary for the public to understand or we are not going to have that tremendous windfall. We've got to, I think, appropriately put something aside for a permanent fund and also at the same time curb this constant expansion of government. But to do it, somebody's gotta say no for me. But you do have three-quarters of those monies that will not be locked up that could be used for the sorts of things Dorothy's talking about.

Question: Well, for instance, the \$87.5 million that's the interest there, (female) what is the guidelines for spending that? How is that going to be spent?

Nancy Brunck: As the law is written now, it goes into the general fund, and the general fund is--that's where the State gets its money to operate. In other words, the guidelines on it are the same as the legislative money that gets spent every year.

Question: This is only for the support of government, then? It does not go (female) into the state communities or cities or things like that?

Gov. Hammond: Well, we're very-----that is, of course--revenue sharing going to communities is a government expense, now totalling what--(Sue, can you tell me?)--nine, twelve, fifteen million a year

Sue Green: Closer to fifteen, but I don't recall.

Gov. Hammond: Same thing for education purposes. We're at \$452 million, I think, education purposes. That's government, but it's monies that are sent out to the municipalities and school districts.

Nancy Brunck: Did that answer the question? Okay.

Gov. Hammond: Government isn't all bad.

Nancy Brunck: Yes (acknowledging a question).

Question: Are there any provisions to protect our principal against annual (male) inflation? (rest is indistinguishable)

Gov. Hammond: Well, that, of course, is a very serious consideration and it's one that's hopefully addressed in the manner in which you invest it--to hopefully accrue revenues that reflect an inflationary increase because you're right--if you keep just that amount in ten years from now dollars it will be worth --what?-- 50% of what it is now in buying power at the rate of current inflation. So that's a very real concern. That's one of the issues that the permanent fund investment council--and one of the reasons why they're asking the public how and what you want done with those monies.

Nancy Brunck: Yes (acknowledging a question).

Question: Is there now a provision, Governor, to maintain a certain amount
(male) off of the interest to assure that the principal maintains its current value?

Gov. Hammond: I think that idea has been proposed, and it may well be structured into the final legislation. This is one of the arguments--that very inflationary thing--we know that the price of oil theoretically will increase with inflation. Then the question becomes: are we better off then leaving those revenues, that capital wealth, in the ground where it's reflecting an inflationary increase, or are we better off translating it into dollars now which are going to erode under inflation. That's one of the reasons why, frankly, I am not of the opinion that we should garbage out all of our leases right now and get it all translated into dollars because of that. But then somebody comes along--like a Milton Friedman--who tells you that his prediction is that the OPEC nations are going to come unspooled and the price of oil may cut in half. So, you know, these are the inponderables that we're dealing with that are really interesting, to say the least.

Nancy Brunck: Are there other questions? Here's the result of the Dillingham discussions on the permanent fund from last year. It's really interesting at the first annual Alaska Public Forum meeting there were about twenty or twenty-five people here, and those people were in two different groups. The first group in terms of their priority for investing the permanent fund was to save it, and the second priority--it kind of went hand in hand--loans to communities for the kind of thing Dorothy was talking about and loans for renewable resource industries. They went together. Those of you who are here tonight who were there last year might remember this.

The second group, they had the same priorities but they just reversed them. The first one was loans for renewable resource industries, the second one was saving, and the third one was a very interesting comment to me--that they wanted--no matter what it was--they wanted strict guidelines so the politicians didn't get carried away with this.

I'm going to flip this chart, but during the discussion, if you want to refer back to it, just let me know and we'll tape it on the wall. These are very similar to what people said statewide. In fact, what people said statewide was--what we heard people saying--was the exact thing we heard people saying here in Dillingham last year.

These are the statewide results from the public forum. The first one, the most important thing statewide including the urban areas, was loans for developing the renewable resource industries.

Second of importance was saving it.

Third in importance was loans for community development, and the least important were loans for other kinds of industrial development.

What I'm going to do is I'm going to go through each of these four categories, and I'm going to tell you more specifically what it was we heard people saying about each of these categories last year. Because I didn't want to write so small it's on different pages, but if you want to refer back to any of them, just let me know.

In terms of renewable resources, which was the most important, we heard people saying the four traditional kinds of industries: fisheries, timber, agriculture and subsistence-related activities. Fisheries were really important here in the Bristol Bay area and Southeastern, in Kodiak, in the north, and in the Yukon/Kuskokwim area.

Timber was important in Southeast.

Agriculture was important in the Mat Valley and the Copper River Valley and a little bit in the interior.

Subsistence-related activities, like reindeer herding--we heard that being spoken of in the north in the Kotzebue area. In Anchorage and some of the urban areas, people also mentioned tourism as a renewable resource and developing alternative energy sources as renewable resources, but they were not heard as often as these other top four right here.

The second thing that people were very concerned with was saving the money, and the two things we heard were they wanted it made in safe investments and they wanted some kind of steady return on the money.

Actually on the questionnaire last year, the five categories were renewable resources, save it, loans to individuals, loans to communities, and other industrial development. As people discussed this in small groups, they combined two of those things. They combined loans for individuals, and they combined that with loans for communities. And so what we did this year in telling you what people said last year was we put that all under one category and we called it community development, and it includes loans for community facilities like fire halls or community halls, loans for utilities in small communities--electricity, sewer, and water are some examples that people gave--personal loans for housing, and personal loans for

small businesses. And the one thing that was very clear was the desire for loans for communities held true throughout Alaska regardless of the size of the community. People in Anchorage and the larger cities spoke of it, and people in places where there were about 100 in villages also spoke of it.

The last category that was the least favored by people was other industrial development, and that meaning any other form of economic development besides renewable resources. And that did rank low.

This is--I want to describe to you the two bills that were introduced in the legislature last year, and I want to tell you what it is they're proposing the investments be. And I want to also say the public forum tonight is not trying to tell you these are the best bills. That's not what we're saying at all. It's the only bills that are available for you to look at right now, and we want you to know what's beginning to happen with the bills so that whenever you hear "permanent fund" you perk up your ears and you say, "Is it going the way we want it to be going?" And if it is, let your legislator know and your governor know. And if it's not, let your legislator know and let the Governor know. Because the decisions will be made this January, and though these aren't the final bills, these are the first two that have come out, and future ones may be close to it or may be very different.

The one thing about House Bills 298 and 300--the most important thing that that bill expresses is saving it, and that part is matching what we heard people saying last year. The way the bill's written is it says at least 40% of the money will be invested to save it, which means somewhere between 40% and 100% of the permanent fund could be invested in this category. And the kinds of things it means are investment grade securities, and those, I think, would mean a steady return and a safe investment.

The other two categories that these bills have--they're both listed as No. 2 here. That's because they're both treated the same way. Somewhere between 0 and 30% of the money could go into economic development, and somewhere between 0 and 30% of the money could go into community development.

Community development, as defined in those bills, is pretty much the way we heard people at the public forum talking about. It includes loans for community development, it includes loans for owner-occupied homes, and it would include money for public corporations like ASHA or AHFC, which are housing--concerned with housing. The main difference lies right here in the 0 to 30% that goes into economic development. It's defined as going to "profitmaking private enterprise." Small business loans are included in this category. And the main difference is it could include money for renewable

resources, but there's no stated emphasis written into the bills. In other words, if money goes to renewable resources, it would come from this category, but there's no clear emphasis written into the bills to the extent that we heard people asking for it last year.

The other thing to keep in mind about this is, for instance, if 70% of the money went in to save it, that means 30% is left and it could all go into economic development and none here; it could all go into community development, and none here; it could all go into saving it with investments grade securities and nothing in either one of these categories. The point is, of course, the people--the group of people--who are managing the whole thing have a great deal of choice and flexibility in deciding within this formula of where the investments go. And I wanted to point that out to you as one of the things about that bill. This is a lot of flexibility, and some really important decisions will be made by the people who are managing it.

Question: Who are these people managing it?
(male)

Nancy Brunck: It isn't decided yet who's managing it. That's one of the issues that will be decided. These bills address it in a certain way, and perhaps you could best answer that question.

Gov. Hammond: Yes. That has not been decided. It's been suggested all the way from a "hiring-the-best-management-consultants-imaginable to giving you a piece of the action and let you manage your share as you saw fit--perhaps through a proxy vote or something--all between those two extremes is how it could conceivably be managed. One thing that should be made clear, and I'm not sure it has been, is the distinction between the capital itself--the monies that go into the fund--and the interest. When you're talking about the monies being used for community development, loans, etc., you're talking about the capital, I believe, and not the interest, the earnings. And that's one of the things that the public forum did not clearly resolve last year, unfortunately. They talked about should a portion of the oil wealth go into this, that or the other thing. They didn't distinguish between the oil wealth itself, the capital and the earnings. There are some who conclude that maybe the earnings should be treated entirely different--perhaps some sort of call it a dividend, tax reduction, or what have you be passed on to the citizens with that earning. Or, of course, in my view, it should appropriately go into supplanting the capital wealth we are now using for ongoing day-to-day expenses till that's satisfied. But I think that's the major

distinction that has to be made when you think about how do you think these monies ought to be used--whether they're earnings or whether it's the income capital wealth.

Nancy Brunck: Did that answer your question? Yes?

Question:
(male) There are two bills mentioned. What is the difference between the two--they're both house bills.

Nancy Brunck: The differences are really pretty small, ugh--let's see if I can think of some.

Gov. Hammond: The names of the authors are essentially. This commonly occurs. The administration will put in a bill, and the legislature will also put in a bill.

Nancy Brunck: For instance, one of the differences is--I think the first bill describes an investment committee of seven people appointed by the governor. The second bill says that group is appointed by the governor and approved by the legislature. So that's one of the differences.

(male) There really isn't much difference?

Nancy Brunck: This is the same--how much goes into save it, and how much goes here, and how much goes here--those are the same. The other thing that these two bills says is that 50%--it raises oil from 25--a minimum of 25--to 50% of certain oil and gas monies will go into the permanent fund. But both of those bills make the same change.

Question:
(female) Can you say what will happen to the interest from--?

Nancy Brunck: They both go into the general fund.

Question:
(male) I have a question. Are we going to be asked to make a decision based on the distinctions that you have there--the one, two, three.

Nancy Brunck: Actually, what we're going to do is let you decide what distinctions you want to make on each category yourselves and, through a process, come up with what percentages each group might recommend going into each category

Question:
(male) Well, okay, because I have a problem with the distinctions here because there seems to be another distinction which is important in all this issue, and that is the--it seems to be an item--it would

occur to me when we were talking about the example of the \$100,000 loan and 6% interest that the example you were using was one in which, if I'm not mistaken, that very example is one in which a municipality such as Dillingham, where the municipality owns that dock,....the experience to be able to raise that money through tax-free municipal bonds which is a powerful incentive, of course, for - in the money market - for investors to invest in that direction because of the tax-free aspect of it which would not be an incentive for the permanent fund because the permanent fund doesn't pay taxes anyway. At least I don't think so.

And so it seems to me that it might be - a very important thing to make a distinction and maybe we should consider whether or not we should maybe not spend the permanent fund money in ways - or invest permanent fund money in ways in which it would compete with the tax-free bond market in which we would be able to raise the money from that direction.

The reason that's important is that in our example there we are talking about 6% interest and interest of that nature and even lower which can't be found in the tax-free bond market because of the fact that it's tax free. There's no point in us investing money at 6% or lower interest in competition with tax-free investors when we're not getting the benefit of the tax-free aspect of it and they would. It would be better, it seems to me, that municipalities would go ahead and borrow their money from the market where they're anxious to loan it because of the tax incentive and for the state, then, to go ahead and invest our money at higher interest in areas in which they aren't competing with the money-market that would have that tax incentive. Is that clear?

Gov. Hammond:

Well, no. That would certainly be correct in those instances where the municipality had the capability of floating those types of bond issues. I couldn't agree more, but I think you touched on a very important and significant point, and it's one that, you know--for example--if you're going to provide somebody a lower interest loan than what they can get at the market rate, and use your monies to do that, it gives me a loan that gives me a couple of cuts in the percentage of interest rate, you are in essence giving me a dividend, and that's one of the major questions that I think should be resolved--whether or not, let's say, that we took the earnings of the permanent fund and said, as many request, "Okay, let's cut taxes." Let's say we eliminated the income tax.

There's a tremendous distinction between, for example, what--well, let's say what my good friend Bob Hatcher would receive in the way of a "dividend" compared to somebody who may have \$5,000 a year income. He would receive virtually nothing, and the individual who had made the tremendous amount of income would get a windfall dividend. Some of us are concerned that at least a portion of those earnings be distributed equally so that everybody gets a piece of the action--not just those fortunate enough to make big income, not just those fortunate enough to receive a low interest loan, or something of that nature. And that's one of the things I'd like the public forum concern themselves with. For example, you could give people a tax cut, but maybe it should be a tax credit that everybody got exactly the same instead of somebody saving thousands of dollars and somebody saving tens and doing it on your money. But the same thing with the municipal governments. If you give a municipality a really good deal--say, gave them money for two or three percentage points--then that means that everybody else in the state is in essence subsidizing that. That's one of the things that came through clearly in the public forum. People would say: "Hmhm. We want to see industrial development and we want to see renewable resources enhanced." But then I'd say, "Do you want them enhanced if it means that you've got to subsidize it from monies that belong at least in part to you?" Well, that was a different story, and I think that when you talk about industrial development--for example, I've been charged and accused of being opposed to growth and development. Let me tell you--I favor true economic growth, but I disfavor subsidized uneconomic growth, and that, unfortunately, is what you can do if you're not very careful in the manner in which you use these monies. You can massively subsidize some enterprise and make anything in Alaska fly--you could grow melons on Mt. McKinley if you're willing to subsidize it enough--build a road up there, warp a gas flight line around there to heat up the greenhouses, pay 'em teamsters' wages and give them a guaranteed market. Man, somebody'd love you, and this guy is doing wonderful things for the economy, but it would be on your money, subsidized, and this is one of the major concerns we have to be careful of when we talk about using either the capital or the interest. How can we give everybody some sort of piece of the action?

Nancy Brunck:

Are there other questions? We're ready to start working in the small groups. I'd like to just encourage those of you who were sitting in the back on the bleachers if you'd join us and put down your ideas on paper, too. It's really important that everyone have a chance to say what's important to them, where they'd like to see the money going, and why. And there's a whole empty table up here with Freeman and myself, and if you want to join us, we'd be glad to have you.

The staff from the Public Forum are going to be handing out large sheets of paper now and markers, and I'd like each table to just take a couple of minutes and choose or vote somebody to be the recorder. And the job of that person is--find someone who writes really clearly--and ask them to keep a record on the large sheet of paper of every single thing every person says at that table. The reason for that is that's the only record we've got of what you're saying in your small groups tonight.

Table No. 2:
(male)

-----our No. 2 table here. Two of us thought that we should save 50% of the money in the permanent fund. Some thought that was too much. There's 25 and there's--let's see--there's three of us who thought we should save 50% permanently, and some thought 25 was enough. Another one thought 50% of the money should go into renewable resources, meaning such things as fisheries rehabilitation and exploration for minerals and exploiting them if any is found and it becomes feasible to develop, and also power sources to be looked into, such as dams and windpower, and solar power was mentioned. And, incidentally, I believe somebody is experimenting with solar power here in Dillingham now. Personally, I think we don't have enough sunshine here to make it amount to anything, but, anyway, here's one person who has the opinion that we should spend, of the 50% investment policy, spend as much of it--I mean the 50% that would be put in the permanent fund--should be invested in Alaska as long as it is considered a safe investment. And by that they meant such things as helping Alaska banks and other solid enterprises. I don't think anyone meant that they should make a lot of loans that probably will never be repaid, though. But, anyway, here's another person who thought 40% should go into communities to develop cultural things, and I suppose, improve roads and docks and everything like that. And everyone agreed that a good percentage should be spent in renewable resources. And that, as I mentioned a minute ago, would be the fisheries and exploring possibly herring fisheries if people wanted, and everything like that, to make a good safe livelihood for those who are engaged in fishing. Now, I believe that's about the size of it, and I want to commend the person who wrote these things down. They're quite intelligible, I think. Thank you.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you. The next group back here.

(female)

Well, we kind of hashed over this thing for quite a while trying to sort out which monies exactly we were talking about. The first thing immediately that came to our mind was renewable resources as the immediate answer, so we put that as No. 1 without a doubt, and we were talking about salmon hatcheries, and timber, and

reindeer herding and things like this, and then suddenly it was decided that these things aren't really a sure thing as far as guarding that money. They're not really for sure, and if you had a salmon hatchery, you know, you're going to feed all these little fish and turn them loose, and who knows what kind of return you're going to get on them. So we kind of decided, then, with that in mind, that maybe we shouldn't in fact make that the No. 1 priority as far as return, a really safe return on the money, so we gave that only 10%. We really did prefer to save 50% of it, and in fact one of us was very thrifty and wanted to save 75% of it. Primarily, the reason was because we wanted to be absolutely sure there was some left. We didn't want it gambled in high risk, or even low risk or any risk at all. We wanted to make sure there was money there that was at absolutely no risk.

Then we were quite concerned with community development next. That seemed to be--paving roads, the fire department, docks, water and sewer, public buildings, and maybe a theater like Dorothy mentioned--things to better our town and our lives here. If we're making this our home, you know--don't we want a paved road some day?

And then last of all we decided that economic and industrial development might be the next sure thing as far as the good the money can do, primarily maybe going with large industry, or something like that, who would be more likely to repay the money that we've got out--or the resources we have, whether it be timber, whether it be fish, something like that. But we really did want to save an awful lot of it.

Nancy Brunck:

What about the table over here in the corner? Are you ready to give your report?

(male)

There you can see our paper doesn't have quite so many hen scratches on it as the others, and we don't necessarily agree with some of the things that we've heard. We felt that renewable resources was the No. 1 category, and primarily, I think, because of the possibility of a double return on a renewable resource. There is the gamble that the fish you put in the stream might not come back, and there might be several places where this happens, but the places where they do come back are going to be a tremendous gain, not only in just the project itself but in the fishermen, and in the--all the rest of the development that goes with it. As far as the saving it category was concerned, we hashed it about quite a bit and thought that a very small percentage should be saved in the sense that most of the safe loans that we are aware of are outside the state, and if the

money is going to go outside the state to work for others, just for the percentage of interest that we can get for it, we can do better than that.

Community development--there was a very strong sense of distrust, because of the fiasco we've seen in housing and several other projects that have come and gone. There was a mention of the possibility of development of things like hospitals, hydroelectric power, this sort of thing, that would definitely benefit everyone, not necessarily concentrating on cultural things that might benefit a small group, but things that would benefit everyone.

Economic and industrial development we didn't get into. We ran out of time. We felt it would be necessary to invest some of the money in this category, but it would have to be done very, very carefully. Like the Governor mentioned, it would be awfully easy to benefit, through low interest loans, any one area where other areas would be left lacking. Consequently, people would feel as though their toes were stepped on, and there would be---this category leaves open an awful lot of political meddling, and if the State gets involved in loaning money to industrial development, we find industry courting politics and creating problems that are unnecessary.

Nancy Brunck: Thank you. What about this table right here?

(female): When we started to prioritize, we also started out with renewable resources as our first priority. And as we got to talking, we decided that we'd better save some money as a sure thing. We feel that renewable resources are really very important, and when we were talking about it, we were talking about fisheries and hatcheries, but also investigating utilization of fish that aren't used at this time, like bottom fish. We talked about timber, but we didn't feel it was very applicable to our area at all. You know, we were thinking more in terms of the entire state. We talked about the need to preserve habitat for game and for fur bearing animals as being very important, such as not destroying beaver dams. Then there was an awful lot of discussion about tourism as a renewable resource, and the table was really, really---we spent a lot of time talking about was tourism a renewable resource or not. Some people felt that it was, and a lot of people felt that it wasn't and that it wasn't worth it for the misuse of the game, and that it also didn't bring the capital into the community, that people were hit-and-run type tourists, that they come in on the Wien and go off on a small plane and go over to one of the lodges that doesn't belong to someone in the region and that they would be gone and that

the money would never actually come into the community.

We really didn't know exactly how we were going to save the money. We decided that 65% of it should be saved, but that there really, really should be a strong input from the people on how the interest would be used. We want to see the interest used for these things that we didn't leave the initial permanent fund--expend the permanent fund money on. We ended up leaving 20% for renewable resources and 15% for community development. We put nothing down for economic and industrial development from the State.

At first we had small business loans and boat and fishing gear loans under community development. Then we changed it over to economic or industrial development. I think there's still some feeling about which is it--you know, is it really economic or industrial development or is it really a thing that will benefit the community.

Nancy Brunck: Thank you. Is this group here ready to give their report?

(male):

We picked renewable resources as our No. 1 priority, because this is the economic base for this area. The whole area is based on renewable resources. We thought that commercial fishing, hydroelectric power, the timber industry(developed at some future date or sometime), herring fisheries, and hunting and sport fishing would be the kind of the main points to look at here--not necessarily in that order. The commercial fishery should probably be No. 1 on this because it is a multi-million dollar industry in this area, so it would be the key to our future growth here.

For saving it, we think it should be put in safe investments, primarily Alaska banks, so that Alaska can benefit from the capital. Whether the banks turn around and re-invest the money in the Lower 48, at least they will be benefiting from their interest that they charge and the money would stay here in Alaska in that manner. We thought that 25% of it should be put there.

For community development, we need electricity for the villages, possibly hydroelectric power generated maybe on Grant Lake on the falls there, and transportation--better airports, possibly roads, ferry system, barge system in here, better port facilities. Community centers--places where people can meet so we don't have to meet in the high school gymnasium like this--and where we can have community college courses taught, possibly day care center, and a mental health clinic. and along with all this, a detox center, a place where the--for older people.

For economic and other development, we put that way down the list-- industrial development, because there is mining here and there is a possibility of timber in the area but at this time it is not

economically feasible to export it or to get it out. So we thought that was only worth about 10%. Thank you.

Nancy Brunck: Thank you. Is the next table ready? --- Could one of you give the report? Is the next table ready to give a report?

(male): We were really confused when we started out. We weren't really sure what we were doing, and that is reflected in what we wrote down here. We started out talking about renewable resources, and we asked the question, "Why is renewable resources important?" We decided that the reason was because it provided a recurring benefit and something for the future, something for our children. Then we asked the question, "What should we spend the money on?" And one of our people raised the issue that--several of the people in our group raised the issue--that it should be the money should be spent not only on -- we started talking immediately in terms of the fishery as being the thing that we were interested in in terms of renewable resource, and the point was made that we should not only spend the money on development, exemplified by hatcheries, but also on harvesting, money there to be spent on such things as boat loans and other things dealing with harvesting of the fishery. Both are important was the point that was being made.

Then we moved on to saving the money, and we didn't really deal with that too much. We asked the question, "How important is that?" And we really never answered it.

We moved on to community development, and we talked about that. We gave a lot of examples of what we thought that meant--remodeling schools, housing, somebody said schools again, roads, sanitation, communications, recreation, public health, airports--those are all things that we meant by community development.

And then we moved on and we talked about economic or industrial development, and again we talked about what we thought that meant--alternate industries for areas in which there was a high dependency on only one industry, this area being an example of that. We thought that it was a healthy thing if money was to be invested in industrial development, it should be emphasized on alternate industries to diversify the economic base of an area. Examples of that for this area being possibly tourism, hatchery feed production industry, fish by-product uses--what do we do with some of the things that are wasted from the fish. Maybe an industry could be developed around that. Light, high technology manufacturing--things which were

manufactured but which were small and therefore didn't depend on or weren't affected by the high transportation costs to a great degree. Most of their value was concentrated in small packages. A lot of things in high technology are like that--electronics, a prime example.

Other things--transportation, such as boats, scows, air taxis and ferries were mentioned, and other small businesses. And then we started talking about, "Okay, what's our priority here in percentages?" And we couldn't really find a starting point, so we proposed--we started it by going, "Okay, well, let's just take 25% for each one and then argue about it." And we started arguing about it, and we finally decided that the thing we couldn't buy on that was that we really didn't think 25% belonged down here in industrial development. And we said, "Well, okay, what should it be then?" And we said--and we finally agreed, "Well, 10%." Okay, what do we do with the 15%, and it ended up up here--that this is what we really cared about,--renewable resources. And that's how we ended up with 40%, 25, 25, which we just kind of left alone and ended up with 10% here, and we've got our justification here. The 15% from industrial development went to renewable resources, because industrial development has the historic ability to raise money from private sources and therefore wouldn't need the money to come from this source as this one--renewable resources.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you. What about the group back here?

(male):

This was redrafted--couldn't read the first one.

Renewable resources, 30%, and we're going to save 40. We assume this is going to be invested, this 40%, into safe investments. 20% community development; 10% for economic or other industrial development.

A lot of the reasons that were expressed under renewable resources we agree with. One area of concern that was not mentioned is that in fisheries, for example, we got a hatchery out here at Lake Nagavagaluk, as we all know, Snake Lake. There was a substantial amount of money plowed into a road, plowed into the facility, and and then you know they never did put the guts inside of it. For some reason, we think that's wrong--that if you're going to conceive this kind of program on the front end, then you ought to have monies budgeted--maybe this is not possible, but there should be some way whereby there is ongoing money available, so that the thing finally does get operational. I mean, to pull out the power plant, for instance, and to put in a smaller one, just to maintain the building doesn't make a lot of sense.

We have listed a number of things under renewable resources in the order of importance. One was fishery, the other was hydro-electric power, reindeer husbandry or herding, timber, geothermal energy. This may be remote at this time, although this area does have some potential for farming. Under water, the comment on water was, "When the pipeline is through pushing oil or gas to the South 48, we want to sell water." It's not that unreasonable. I mean they're starting to haul icebergs, they're talking about selling icebergs, let's sell water. We've got lots of it.

Community development--the big concern was with the kids. Emphasis was in recreation. In the wintertime, we think a swimming pool is a good idea. It's been an idea around here for a long time; it's never happened. Park, playground, got started this year; needs to be improved. Youth center, maybe skiing in the winter.

Under community development--sewer and water. It's been an ongoing thing since I've been here since 1965. Some of us pay taxes; we don't get the services. For some reason, I don't think that's right. That should be improved, including electrification for some of these people who are starting to move out further from town, and the cost for those who are not alongside of the road is really prohibitive. Housing is an ongoing program. It's being worked out; we just can't keep up.

Economic development--oil and gas, including the uplands, which is State land, native lands, as well as OCS.

Recreation, tourism, mining. That's it.

Nancy Brunck: Thank you, and I think a woman from that one table is going to give a report.

(female): Basically we came up with about what the rest of you have come up with. No. 1 priority was fisheries as a renewable resource. Bio-socio-economic studies, salmon, herring hatcheries, and we gave that 60%.

Under community development we came up with things like community center, a multipurpose building. Also, in addition to that, a community college classroom facility--a separate facility. Standard of living improvements, which would involve housing, sewer, water; larger facilities and staff in the employment place. Alcohol treatment was also listed under that. That was given 30%.

As industrial development we listed airports, airport facilities, roads, improvement in the roads, eventually a paved road, and that we assigned 10%.

Savings--we put 10%, and that was a low priority, also. So basically, we emphasized fisheries and renewable resources, as you did.

Nancy Brunck: Is there any table that we left out for giving a small group report? I think I got them all. Okay, Governor do you want to make any quick comments before we go on to the next issue tonight?

Gov. Hammond: Only that again I would point out that there are three sources of revenue that we are dealing with, and it gets a little easy to confuse them. One of them, of course, being the 25% of royalties and bonuses that have to go into the permanent fund; the 75% of those monies, along with the current income taxes, etc., which can be used for all sorts of programs, anything and, of course, the interest, which could be used, could go back to the permanent fund. But my concerns are--I noticed, for example, it was mentioned that save it translates in the minds of many to invest it, as it appropriately should, but we really are talking about an obligation to invest; whether we put it into renewable resources or economic and industrial development we are really talking about an investment. And the question really should be: do you want to use the monies for renewable resources or economic development or any of these other programs in a manner which in essence subsidizes them. For example, we can pour massive amounts of money into enhancing the fishery, and unless there's a return that the rest of those who don't engage in the fishery see by way of either a dividend or a tax accumulation to the State, which provides them with some benefits from that, they are going to less than entranced with the idea of taking a massive amount of that money and putting it into something that they don't see a piece of the action from.

Similarly, within economic development and industrial development. I think the important thing is again to distinguish between subsidized and non-subsidized development. Like we'd all like to see a great deal of money, whether you're a fisherman or not, go into renewable resource enhancement and expansion as long as it returns as the permanent fund is required to do some sort of an investment that everybody sees some benefits from. Now, you might think that "Well, all industrial development does that automatically." That used to be the presumption in the state of Alaska. We used to say, "Himm, come on up here, put a pulp plant in Southeastern Alaska, and we'll not charge you any taxes for the first ten years because we all know it does good things--provides jobs, provides revenues to the State." But what did we find out? We found out that more

people came up than the jobs made available, thus increasing rather than decreasing your unemployment in some places, that the amount of new revenues that the State got didn't offset the cost of providing the new services for those new bodies that came up here, so actually we went backwards instead of forwards. Now, unless we do certain things, either change our tax structure or reduce those per capita costs of government, we almost assure that what new industrial development we have in the state of Alaska is going to cost the rest of the citizens of the state more than they receive in the way of benefits.

Let me explain why that's the case. Right now it costs us--the State \$1750 a year--two years ago, rather--it costs \$1750 a year to provide for the services for everybody in Alaska. But we only took in \$1065. And worse, 60% of that \$1065--or I mean of that \$1750--came from bonuses and royalties, etc. I know I'm throwing too many figures at you in a hurry, but my point being simply that you don't automatically improve the businesslike condition of the state of Alaska for everybody by throwing money into any of these programs unless you're sure that you get some return from whatever you do with those monies that gives you a safe investment. Now, some people have asked, "How much are the people of Alaska are going to tolerate us to put in fisheries enhancement and rehabilitation?" We, incidentally, just passed a \$30 million bond issue to do that. That's great, from the fisherman's point of view. But let me tell you this. There isn't anybody in this room, including me, that pays enough in the way of state taxes to offset his current costs of services the State provides for us. So, with that thought in mind, you'd better be very careful about just automatically assuming that industrial or economic development, or even fishery expansion, unless it translates into benefits for the people now here, is necessarily going to be a good business deal. And that's why I have said repeatedly, time and again, that I'm not interested in bringing more people up here until we've done something with these monies to bring the people already here on up. Everybody--merchants, etc. that prosper as the numbers of people in Alaska grow--they don't like that kind of talk because they like to see, of course, increased population. And that's fine with me as long as it doesn't require a subsidization from these monies. But my point being, do you want to deal with economic development, industrial development, renewable resource enhancement, unless it returns something in the way of a dividend to all the citizens of the state. And sometimes you'll

find that these enterprises, and sometimes you'll find they won't. But I think we have to be very careful and bear in mind that we're going to run into great difficulty as fishermen if we ask for more and more monies to go into enhancing fisheries and the rest of the people who don't engage in fisheries find out that it's costing them because it's diminishing the amounts of money that they can use for their various interests and programs. So I think that ought to be the bottom line--that it pay some sort of return, a dividend, to the citizens of the state.

(female): Out of all the allowable revenues, what percent is actually--does Alaska receive--under leases and royalties? What percent are we talking about?

Gov. Hammond: Right now about \$500 million of the total \$840 million that is going into government--about \$500 million is coming from severance taxes, royalties and bonuses.

(female): So that's about 60-65%?

Gov. Hammond: Yes.

(female): And do you see it increasing or decreasing?

Gov. Hammond: Well, it will increase, of course, as oil starts flowing. Now, mind you, when I say--\$200 million of that is a borrowing on future revenues. Severance taxes--not royalties and bonuses--but severance tax. So what I'm saying is \$500 million is coming from oil, but only about \$150 million from the royalties and bonuses and lease monies earnings that you're talking about that would go into the permanent fund.

Nancy Brunck: I'd like to point out that on the questionnaire on the last page the question the Governor just brought up is there, so be sure you fill it out. And the question is, "If you were voting for renewable resource industries, would you still vote for that even if the money earned was less than the money that could be earned from other investments?" And that is somewhat addressing the question that the Governor brought out, and I just want to remind you again that I don't mind at all if you fill this out while I'm talking. That's just fine with me. It's on the last page, and the permanent fund questions are right at the bottom, and subsistence is above it. And there's two other issues that we aren't talking about tonight, but that we would really appreciate if you filled out and turned in before you left. I'd like to go on to the last issue tonight, that is subsistence. We really don't have a presentation on it per se. I can tell you why we're here discussing it tonight, and we have someone who is ready to describe what the Fish and Game management structure is.

But the most important part of tonight is for everyone to answer two questions. One is, "What are the problems that you see with the Fish and Game management structure?" And the second part is, "What are the solutions you suggest to those problems?"

The one thing I do want to tell you is why we're talking about it tonight. We're here talking about it because the Governor asked us to. He has made a commitment on the part of the State of Alaska to giving subsistence priority whenever the fish or the game resources are threatened. In other words, in fact subsistence has been given a priority in the past. It's just that people say it's not been reflected. It's been a State policy to give it priority, but in reality that just isn't happening. And I believe the Governor is recognizing that, and he is asking you to identify what are some of the specific problem areas that you with experience with the management structure of Fish and Game. Another reason, by the way, that we are discussing subsistence is because those people who were at the public forum last year brought it up over and over again. We tried discussing land, and people talked about subsistence. We discussed oil and gas, and they talked about subsistence. It was a very vital concern in the north and in the southwest were the two regions in particular where it came up last year. And, in fact, I guess people were suggesting that subsistence itself should be a public forum issue. And so that's the second reason why we're discussing it here tonight.

I want to mention that there is a special legislative interim committee on subsistence. That's chaired by Nels Andersen. He is not able to be with us here tonight because he's in Glennallen with a meeting on subsistence tonight, and he'll be in Fairbanks tomorrow and Nenana the next day. There's a member of his staff that's here, and perhaps during the report-out session--or is now the time you want to do that, Adelaide? She's going to give a report on what that committee has heard at the meetings that they've been going to statewide on subsistence. Is now the time that you'd like to do that?

Adelaide Herman: The Interim Committee on Subsistence was established by the legislature during the past session. The committee is made up of eight members. The Chairman is Representative Nels Andersen, Jr. of Dillingham, and if you want a list of the others I have it. And the staff includes Joe Guthrie in Juneau, who is the staff attorney, George Uttermo, the research assistant, and Dorothy Larson, the staff assistant, and I'm the secretary.

The goals of the committee are (1) to seek a consensus on subsistence by a collection of available data and information and hold hearings

throughout the state; (2) review state law regarding subsistence and attempt to determine extent of implementation of subsistence zoning under state statutes; (3) to attempt to quantify the amount of food taken from the land; (4) review subsistence activities within lands under federal jurisdiction; and (5) to attempt to define subsistence as it relates to Alaskans throughout the state.

The first meeting/hearing was held in Dillingham on August 9th, and the second was held in Kipnuk. Nels Andersen, Jr. and Dorothy Larson of Dillingham and Rep. Billie Akers of Chuloonawik attended the meeting. A total of 28 coastal villages, representing four Western Alaska Fish and Game advisory boards, met in Kipnuk September 3, 1977, to discuss herring, walrus, water fowl, subsistence, and D-2. The third hearings were held in Kotzebue and Nome. The people in Kotzebue were testifying at the bowhead whale hearings before our hearings, and we will use much of what was said during the bowhead whale hearings because it is what we are looking for in our testimony.

The next meetings are being held tonight in Glennallen, and from there the committee members will go to Fairbanks and Nenana. And then I have the list of the remainder of the meetings, and if you want that, I could give that to you later. And some of the concerns the people expressed were walrus head hunting. It came out in the Kipnuk meeting that the people object to being blamed for headless walrus that washed ashore. They say there is no way to prove that a village person would waste walrus just for the walrus ivory. In the October issue of the Alaska magazine there is an article titled "Ivory Hunting Alaska Style" where two men openly admit they fly around looking for walrus so they can get the ivory. These people were not village people and were collecting the ivory for commercial gain. The blame for this type of activity does not belong with the local people, who use the entire walrus for food as well as ivory.

The second concern was the herring fishery. This is a big issue in the Bristol Bay area. One question I have is, "Will subsistence needs be met before the commercial taking of herring?" Right now the Fish and Game have no regulations for the commercial taking of herring in most areas, and there seems to be little knowledge of how big that fishery is. The main take has been by subsistence users. Recently the commercial fishermen have realized the potential of commercial harvest of herring. During the Kipnuk meeting on September 3rd, the people voted unanimously to prohibit any commercial herring fishing along the western coast of Alaska until biological and socio-economic data is developed to make sound management decisions. And the Nushigak Advisory Board--their decisions were. When the people, Togiak north, wanted the herring fishery closed completely to commercial fishing, and (2) the Naknek/Dillingham areas wanted subsistence needs met first and open to commercial fishing with the exception of using gillnets only. And the Kodiak and Petersburg seiners want to continue fishing

but would like biological studies done so as not to kill the fisheries.

In the Kotzebue area one concern was that the people don't want to exchange subsistence resources for welfare or food stamps. One older lady mentioned she stopped using welfare because she saw it made her people lazy. There is strong feeling against welfare. You can imagine what would happen if all of a sudden a hunting and fishing village turned to welfare or food stamps. They would lose their sense of unity; there would be no purpose for a village. One native man in his testimony said, "Native people cannot eat money during long, cold winters. Stocks in the stores go quickly, and kids cannot eat money, either. Great dependence in Lower 48 to grow things like corn and beef. Here the land is frozen and we cannot raise things so people must depend upon subsistence foods." And this testimony was taken from the August 20th issue of Tundra Drums.

People are concerned that decisions on how they use subsistence resources are not only overseen by the State and Federal governments but are also of international concern. There was a decision made to ban bowhead whale hunting worldwide at the International Whaling Commission Conference in Australia. This was because of commercial taking of whale by countries to make perfume, etc. However, the decision affects the subsistence taking of whale by Alaska natives as well, and as far as I know, they had no voice at this conference. People are concerned that this type of thing may happen again.

Since the Committee started in July, they have found they are getting into a lot more than planned. They're involved in trying to change the Fish and Game regulations to more fit the needs of people and to recommend a new funding source for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, which now depends heavily upon the sale of fishing and hunting licenses for funding. Also, there is some talk of creating a Subsistence Division by the Department of Fish and Game, to be staffed by a game biologist and a fish biologist and support staff. This is just in the stage of a feasibility study now.

* The Committee expects to use the testimony gathered to make recommendations to the legislature, possibly present some draft legislation to the legislature in January. We are gathering data on subsistence harvest throughout the state and will analyze maps showing areas of subsistence use during the various seasons of the year. Since I have the chance tonight, I would like to invite the people of Bristol Bay and other regions to write to us at:

The Subsistence Committee
P. O. Box 234
Dillingham
Phone 842-5970

Please voice your opinions and educate the outsiders on how you use your land and what your subsistence needs are. Everything these days seems to be in the national interest. Well, I feel we are a part of the nation and we should tell people what our interests are like, and it is important that we be able to hunt and fish and this needs to be known before someone else decides that it is more important to develop whatever the State and Federal government want to do with the land.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you. Over here is the first question for the night. From your point of view, what are the problems of the present structure of Fish and Game?

The second part of that question is going to be: What do you suggest should be changed? How can local involvement be increased? And list all the actions you can think of to give more priority to subsistence.

Before you start on that, we thought it would be helpful if we described the way that Fish and Game is presently structured. Can you see over at this table? You might want to just walk around to the back just for this part of the presentation so you can see it.

(male):

I'm not quite sure how I got talked into presenting the organization of Fish and Game, but I did, somehow. I'd like to quickly just run through what the basic structure of the Department is, and, when I am finished, possibly the Governor would comment on some proposals that both the administration and the department itself have been considering in terms of options to what exists presently. Generally the Department is broken into two main functions: the management side is the side where the Commissioner sits, and the regulatory side is the side where the Board of Fish and the Board of Game are located. From what I've been able to gather from the organizational structure of Fish and Game, people in Alaska seem to rub shoulders with Fish and Game people at three different locations: (1) on the management side, where field representatives and research people are working in local communities and regions, where local communities exist. On the regulatory side there are 53 to 55 advisory committees statewide, and there are a number of individual members spread throughout the state who represent local communities and regions. And I know there are numbers here locally

both on the advisory committee that represents the area and on the Board of Fish and Game. And then, also, on the regulatory side, the enforcement side, the Department of Public Safety has a responsibility in the area of fish and game for protection of the resource. And that's one other area where the people seem to come in contact with Fish and Game, not necessarily the best area to come in contact but certainly one where contact is made.

Just quickly running down, then, the various responsibilities. Below the Commissioner are his divisions within the Department, the Division of Sport Fishery, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Division of Game, and the Division of Fisheries Rehabilitation.

Below the divisions are the regional supervisors, and below the supervisors are the field representatives in each of the regions.

On the regulatory side you have the Board of Fish, as I have mentioned, and the Board of Game, and directly responsible to these boards are the 53 advisory committees represented statewide. And then, of course, on the enforcement side you have the Commissioner of Public Safety and the Division of Fish and Game Protection. So that is, very generally, what the management structure is, so are there any questions?

Gov. Hammond:

Thank you, (indistinguishable). I had requested that subsistence be an issue brought before the public forum because it's one, as Nancy said, they bring up at every public forum meeting. And it poses some very difficult problems, first, because the State of Alaska constitution says that the game resources and fish resources of the state belong to the people of the state--equally. It doesn't say that any group, class, color, race creed, or what have you, is more equal than any other. Because of that, it's difficult to simply structure something that by law accommodates the subsistence user. That difficulty is compounded by the fact that nobody has ever been able to come up with a definition of the word "subsistence." It's kinda like, in my view, the word "pornography." Nobody can define it, and we all know it when we see it. The difficulty of determining whether or not one is a subsistence user, though--let me cite some examples. Is a subsistence user an individual who necessarily requires that particular animal or fish to feed himself, or--for example, we found in Barrow (I was in Barrow here a few weeks ago) it was equally important for the people of Barrow to hunt whale because of the cultural aspects as it was to sustain themselves insofar as the food substance was concerned. Very, very important--far more important to get the whale even, in the view of some, than it was necessarily to consume the whale. Similarly, is an individual who may be working for one of the native corporations and earning a substantial salary but still desiring to go out and

obtain a great deal of subsistence off the land, truly a subsistence user compared perhaps to a destitute non-resident who might come up here and need a food substance to simply sustain himself? These are the questions that pose very great problems in coming up with a definition of subsistence, and something that has not yet been resolved. The best definition I've been able to come up with for subsistence is that which sustains one, both body and soul. That bowhead whale hunter in Barrow's existence is diminished substantially, even though he may survive with welfare and food stamps and so forth, -if he can't go whale hunting, it removes a major portion of significance from his life. So what have we tried to do over the years to assure that subsistence is the priority use? We have structured into state policies that subsistence shall be, when there is a matter of deficient fish and game resources, that subsistence be the No. 1 priority. Also, I've tried some years ago to provide more meaningful input from the local levels, who are best able to determine what they think is appropriately a subsistence use than perhaps some fish and game board that meets once or twice a year in some far off spot. I was responsible for the establishment of the advisory committees. Quite frankly, that has not satisfied the local residents adequately. The advisory committees have performed a function, but too often they feel that their recommendations are ignored or overlooked. In an effort to upgrade that assurance that the local people have substantially more say in the promulgation of fish and game regulations, I drew up some years ago a so-called satellite, or regional fish and game board system, which would have divided the state into some twelve regions and provided each of them with their own fish and game board that would promulgate regulations that could only be overridden if they were deemed by a member of each of these twelve boards to be (1) either at odds with some conservation or (2) broad public interest. Frankly, I think, in the light of developing circumstances, the demand for improved subsistence utilization and prioritization, it obligates us to pull down off the shelf all sorts of proposals and take another look at them. I've done that with the satellite board proposal. We have discussed it with some of the various interest groups, villagers throughout the state of Alaska, and frankly, that's one of the main things that I would like to have the public forum consider: whether or not they believe that some sort of regionalization of a board system that perhaps would say, for example, that maybe you divide the state into five major regions and have within each of those regions five or six sub-regions from which some individual who lives in that region would have to come

to sit on a regional board, and they would then deal with the herring or determine the methods and means of bag limits, the seasons, and so forth; and only if those were deemed to be at odds with strong conservation or again broad public interest--because the constitution, mind you, says that those resources belong to everybody, and we can't, through some regulatory device, say that nobody except the people in Bristol Bay can use them, but you can through seasons and bag limits and methods and means better accommodate the people who live here perhaps than someone who lives someplace else--now my question would be whether or not a regional board system of that nature or an expansion of the existing advisory system or maybe an entire new system that we haven't even thought of would more appropriately deal with that whole issue of now only subsistence but the utilization of all those resources. I can tell you that we are taking another look at the satellite system, and we're requesting input and will have some proposals that we will float out to the public; and I want to emphasize that these are only proposals, that we're exploring this as a means of better addressing this question. And, unfortunately, the word "explore" all too often translates in people's minds as "endorsement," and as soon as you put something out on paper you realize what this idiot is proposing to do to us, and all that sort of thing. So I would ask you to bear in mind that these are proposals that we're exploring and that we want to do it in company with the people. Let me tell you that already some of my sportsman friends and guides in Anchorage are very distressed with this proposal of mine which would permit the locals a substantially say. But I think it's the only way we can assure that subsistence is sustained and that the people are satisfied that they're having a more meaningful say in this whole issue of management of your fish and game resources. So I don't know what the questions on the public forum will address and whether or not they'll deal that specifically with regional or satellite boards, but I would like you to consider that approach to the problem.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you, Governor. Certainly, when you get into discussing solutions to the problems, that's a very appropriate time to discuss the regional board concept that he just very briefly outlined. As you discuss, I want to let you know that there are several people here tonight that can help answer questions. There are some advisory committee members, whose names these are--there's three people: David Nanalook, Frank Woods and Andy Golia -- is that correct?-- those three names who I understand are members of the advisory committee.

- (male):
Frank Woods -----(indistinguishable)---organization that was formed last November in Bethel, and we was talking about the resources we have and we decided to call ourselves the Subsistence Resource Council. We're statewide, we represent each region, we've got probably 28 members statewide, and we've been fighting this issue for the last two years. We finally decided that instead of calling us a committee or (?) liaison or RuralCap, that we wanted to form into something that people would recognize as a resource council. That's what we're talking about. We're not just talking about animals; we're talking about people. And I really wanted to say something, but that's all right. I could clear up a lot of things that maybe Adelaide was saying, and also Hammond, but I don't know if we have the time for it. I don't know.
- Nancy Brunck: What we could do is let that be a part of the small group report after people have had a chance to discuss. Would you be willing to do that?
- (male):
Frank Woods It don't really matter. A lot of things would have to be cleared up when we talk about subsistence, and you've got to get both sides of the coin before you start talking about the subject.
- Nancy Brunck: My main concern---I don't mind letting you have some time right now--my main concern is that each of the small groups also have time. Would you be able to say what you wanted to say in a couple of minutes?
- (male): Sure.
- Nancy Brunck: Come on up.
- (male):
Frank Woods What Hammond was talking about, I agree with it. And I think what he was talking about was cooperative management. If I'm wrong, he can correct me. A year and a half ago we talked about the state divided into so many what you call regions. Our problem is--the big question is how to define subsistence. Then you talk about a big state. We've got twelve regional corporations. Now we know that it's not functional to have twelve what you'd call either a state board or to have twelve individuals like you should have twelve---all your different areas will have one representation to sit on the state board. What we're talking about is what you call cooperative management between the local people, between the State, between the Federal government, to make the decision as to what happens within this area. The people that come from this area--

what we would like to decide is if they sit on our board when a decision is made on either D-2 or rules and regulations that affects that area, I surely, in the fact, wouldn't want to be sitting here in Dillingham and decide what happens up in Nana. Same with the Federal government--rules and regulations that are set with the State and Federal government--have made rules and regulations for the whole state and they have made it for a whole. They have never set down and made rules and regulations based to fit this area. Part of our state rules and regulations are like that.

I agree with Hammond. We've got knocked down for two years trying to talk about this thing. What you call the urban people has been opposing us. We're talking about rural people. If you talk about our Subsistence Resource Council, which will be the local people here--okay, let's say that we've got five--five that will sit on the board. This group that represents Nana might have eleven guys on that committee. That committee here will decide who they're gonna pick to represent that area on the state board. That's why I say in order to make something function, that control has to come from locals, which is the villages up. It shouldn't come from the State down to the villages. And I think that's what we are deciding here: what is subsistence? Who gets to use it? I can't go up there and tell Lyle Smith he's not a subsistence user. We've got to be able to sit down and decide what are we going to do with it. And the only thing is we came up after two years--at least we hope it will work--with what you call cooperative management. And it's a really touchy situation. You get knocked on from all different areas--the State, the Federal government, the Sierra Club, you name it. So it's a very tough situation. After two years we came down to what you call cooperative management. That's all I've got.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you, Frank. Why don't you just go ahead and start in your discussions in your small groups, and when you do get to the point of discussing what are some of the solutions you'd suggest, we'd like to add that you discuss the regional board concept in your small groups and make any comments about that. And we've got an excellent resource here tonight if you've got any questions on it. Does anyone have any questions right now? There are also some Fish and Game people here if you've got specific questions for them. Have at it.

Okay, on Question No. 1, which is "From your point of view, what are the problems with the present structure of Fish and Game?" --and we thought that funding was a primary problem with Fish and Game. No. 1, we need an area game biologist for Bristol Bay. We don't have any game biologist in this area. We had one apparently promised,

you might say, for the area, and it disappeared somewhere. And we need funding to continue the char program. They went up there and impounded 5,000 dolly varden, Arctic char, whichever you want to call them, and by that think they possibly should have saved a million more salmon to go out to the sea. And we should realize a couple hundred thousand out of that returning. We need more money for counting towers because many fish spawn on the Nushagak, the Mulchatna and the Nuyakuk Rivers, and they are not counted. At this time the towers have been dropped and they're not counted. And I believe there's also a tower been cut out on the Branch River.

And we need more money for stock separation program. They're starting to examine the scales off salmon and hopefully they can tell where the individual salmon are spawning. And by that, the management people can go out here in the bay and take scale samples off the salmon, and if they have enough salmon, say in the Wood River Lake system and the salmon in the bay are those which are going to the Nushagak, they can shut down the bay and let those salmon through. Or if they are salmon that are coming up to the Wood River Lake system, why they can open up the fisheries some more, even though the Nushagak does not have its escapement, or the Kvichak, or the Naknek, or whichever system it is.

And on the herring fishery, we know virtually nothing about the herring in this area--where they come from, whether the same ones come to this area to spawn, what percentage of the stock, their parent stock, we can harvest and still maintain a fishery. We need the beluga program reinstated to keep the belugas out of our migrating smolt and returning salmon after they get inside the bay area here. And that's what we think about Fish and Game.

And on the second question, what do we suggest should be changed?--we think that the local advisory committee should be less advisory and more regulatory. They should have more say in what goes on in this area than they do now. They don't have any. They can just advise. And by having more regulatory power, that would give more priority to subsistence. We could realize greater control on the subsistence, and we also need, in addition to the local committees, we need board representation from each management unit on both fish and game boards. Thank you.

Nancy Brunck:

I just want to note the other thing it says up there in question No. 2--What do you suggest should be changed? The funding source changed--less dependence on the sale of licenses and fees and more money--the suggestion is from the permanent fund. I think the idea

is trying to find alternate sources of funding for Fish and Game. Is that correct? Okay, thank you for that report. Whose report is this one right here? Would someone from this group come up and give this report? Is this the table right here? What about this one?

(male):

I came late this evening, so I didn't really get into the swing of things, and we had a small group. What we're saying here basically is that the thrust of the Fish and Game management historically has been sportsman-oriented. It's been developed by people who want to control the fishery for the sake of the big game hunters and the sports fishermen, and this is a valuable industry in Alaska. And yet, for the people who live out in the boonies like we do, it seems like there should be more emphasis on the subsistence part of it, so what we're saying is that Fish and Game is sportsman-oriented and regulations are politically developed, and some examples would be when you go to take fish for subsistence, if you're hungry, however you can take that fish would be fair game. If it's a net, or a triple-barbed hook, or a string of them--whatever it takes to get that fish to supply food for you and your family should be fair game. And if a person is going out for sport, then you can start talking about fishing with a single-barbed hook or a hook with no barb on it, or maybe a plug with no eyes, or something, you know, to make it a little more difficult so that it is more fun and more sportsmanlike, and all this. But when it comes to subsistence, when a man needs to eat something, or he needs food for his family, he should be able to take it. So we're saying that would be kind of an answer to No. 1.

For saying an answer to No. 2, solutions--the priorities should be switched around. The priority should go for game and resource--if we could make it a little broader than just game--game and resource management utilization should be prioritized first for subsistence, or local need, it might be termed, second for commercial, and third for sports. And to define subsistence more narrowly--to define it as a personal, immediate family use. This gets away from the broad idea of somebody under the guise of subsistence taking a lot more than he and his family need and using it for other purposes. Then for the taking of that immediate and personal family use subsistence, relax the restrictions on that kind of hunting and fishing.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you very much. Is this report from your table? This one right here, the second one. Go ahead and bring it on up and tape it up on the wall. I'm just reading some of the things on this,

and I'd like to find the group that did it. There's some really good ideas up there. Whose is this right here?

(male):

The first one that we addressed was the problem with the current structure, and the first one under that was that decisions are made by urban outsiders, not enough local input. For instance the marine mammal protection act, and the moratorium and the waiver of the walrus issues to the State of Alaska from the Federal government, or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The hearings for that issue were taken up at Barrow and at Bethel, and I feel, and I think that there was no representation from the Bristol Bay region. After the moratorium and the waiver issue took place, the State of Alaska immediately made a blanket decision closure for Unit 17 on down for the closure of walrus taking.

And then, secondly, the Fish and Game licensing structure is selling the renewable resources to outsiders. The license fee should not go to Fish and Game and Fish and Wildlife does not enforce sports, and then the hunting regulations are not in compliance with our rural ways of life. For instance, you can take--when I look at my father's old records when he was a licensing officer, I look at the regulation book back in 1965. Unit 17 used to be open for a whole month for moose hunting, and now it's only ten days. And those ten days are centered within the rutting season. And another one which is going to affect in the future our renewable resources and the fisheries resources, the beaver hunting season has been closed for the past two years. And I just went out just a couple weeks ago up to our region in the (indistinguishable). There are a lot of beaver dams and a lot of beavers, and still no word from the Board of Game on the opening. This is another portion of the subsistence life style and another economic benefit to the rural villages in Alaska.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you, David. Which group does this one belong to? Would someone come up from there?

(male):

The first question we had, I think, was what do you suggest change should be made? Normally, just a figure of speech, it should be the structure. What David was talking about is exactly what's happening in our area. He talked about the beaver situation. Since 1974 it is closed. They said within two years we'll have it back open again. Last spring we approached Fish and Game and talked about this situation. We showed them where all the beaver dam is. They're all over the place. They're up the sloughs; they're up the creeks--you name it. They say that we have to make a comparison that has to relate to 1968. Okay, this week or next week they're

going to find out, say, that they're going to make a study on it whether the beaver will be open or closed. So about a half hour later they come back and say that the decision has already been made. For 1978 and part of 1979 it's gonna be closed in the lower Nushagak. I'm wondering, when I talk about changing the management, if we had a local input--and the study itself proved that the beaver season should be open--that's what I say about management. If we had some kind of input--we know that the game is out there, but they don't believe us. And that's what I talk about local controls--the State and the Federal government working together to get the problem done and start planning what's going on in the state.

We have Fish and Game local supervisors should work together closely with the policy board. We're talking about with local control State and Federal government. The local supervisors within your geographical area will work closely with the policy board. Naturally, they'll have to, because they're within their geographical area.

Access to information--we'll get a lot of information, like the advisory board we have now, there's a lot of information that's not really there. They're still seeking for information. The only people that have information is the State or Federal government.

And it says the policy board which will be combined of all the three different agencies should work closely with the local supervisors. That also ties in with what you call management.

We have a lot of problems. We have problems between--conflicts between fishing/hunting, and we find out certain species are being depleted. We wonder why. We live here. You look at the State record, you'll find out that we are the minority of the people. When rules and regulations are made, it is the urban people, or the people that are in Anchorage, Fairbanks, you name it. On the same token, by being the minority people, we are the majority land users of the State, but we have no input.

When we talked about zoning, we're talking about either subsistence zones, D-2 zones, it looked pretty funny if we had a park here that said we can subsist within that park or area. If there's some old lady taking a picture of a ptarmigan in the springtime when they come down from the mountains and you come by with your snowmachine, or even skis, or whatever you've got to get there, and you shoot it in front of her, you could see the conflict. When you talk about zoning, we're talking about the game that we

have. They migrate; they move. We know that. The State knows that. So what I'm trying to say is that when you manage the resource is that you follow the game. Like one area will be open for subsistence. Maybe the next year it won't be, or the fall time it won't be, because the game is gonna be gone. Then it's an ideal situation for visitors.

We talked about orientation. We have orientation on the pipeline. They have programs to orient you how the environment is, the people, the conditions, and you name it. But we don't have anything for sports fishers that's coming from Anchorage outside and orient them how our lifestyle is, or anything like that. We don't have a program like that. So they just come in whether we like it or not.

And the last issue, I think, was how should you put as a priority on subsistence. I mentioned before that we are the majority land users of this state, and I think and honestly feel that it is a very high priority, and the subsistence should dominate over commercial and also sport. Thank you.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you, Frank. Would someone from this group come up and give their report?

(female):

I don't know how we did about answering the questions like they are, but this is what we talked about.

One problem with Fish and Game is that people don't know how they operate, why the regulations are like they are. Maybe it's because they come down from the Feds, I don't know. But there's not very good p.r. between people and Fish and Game.

We talked about native culture and life style--things like hunting in the spring and harvesting fish and drying fish. And we thought Fish and Game regulations should be clearly stated. They're hard to understand.

We need local representation, and the problem is the advisory board is only advisory, and that's not good enough. There's not enough control--that the structure of Fish and Game discourages immediate action. We talked about the conflict between commercial and subsistence fishing, the problem with Fish and Game funding source coming from--well, we weren't sure--probably permits, tags and fines. We wondered what the difference was between the revenues Fish and Game gets and their expenditures. We had a discussion about what people want. Do they want subsistence, or do

they want conveniences--whether you can have both--subsistence life style and development, or do you have to make compromises. We didn't come to any conclusions; we just talked about that.

But we do think--some people were thinking that people who don't live a subsistence life style should be the ones to buy the licenses, and the people who live subsistence shouldn't have to.

We talked about the beaver and things like that, as far as the difference between what Fish and Game and the local people feel is enough game, you know, as far as being able to go out and get some. And that there wasn't equal enforcement of the law--that for local involvement, maybe the people in the villages could be trained to do studies of animals in their area--like with the beaver, since they're already there and they know what's happening.

Kind of over all, we kinda thought Fish and Game was a mystery to us.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you. Which table had this report? Would someone come up and give a report. I think that's the last table. Have you given yours back there?

(male):

The first thing I guess we started off with was our point of view on the present management structure, and we sort of got into a number of the other questions as we went down, too, but I think we sort of stuck to the structure initially. For the first part, I guess our main problem, as we saw it, was that the Fish and Game Department seems to hire a lot of outsiders who don't seem to understand the environment and the cultural aspects. That causes a lot of clashes right there. I don't need to reiterate that. I think we have said it many times over, and we see it in the papers, and it's all over.

The other thing is that the management seems to be run out of Anchorage and Juneau, and various agencies like that, and we need local control similar to the regional education attendance areas. Getting it down to where the people are at, decentralizing programs and having local authority making decision powers right at the local level, because we're the ones that have to live with that and have to abide by our own decisions. If we mess things up, I mean that's it forever, and I think we know the consequences of that and have ways of dealing with our own. We feel like we

should hire local people to work with Fish and Game and provide career ladders so that they can provide management and enforcement as necessary by the local boards--so that this management and enforcement again is down at the local level. We know that many of our people aren't educated--quote, unquote--with the degrees to qualify themselves for the jobs that we have right now, and, as a result, very few native people are applying for any of the Fish and Game positions--at least the higher-up positions where they really count. We felt that there should be something to allow local management to set management areas or boundaries depending upon the plentifulness of game and fish and changes in migratory patterns--have that again--that local decision-making power right down at the local level. If Region 17, one area is good and another area is bad, close down one area, open another area--these types of things. We didn't feel there was enough flexibility as it is right now. We're not too well aware of all these sort of things, but at least from our own perceptions.

We feel that the management structure should get out of the Department of Public Safety. We don't want cops and all those things all over out there. Everyone we see one--if somebody died, or somebody shot someone, or something's happened--and it's got a bad taint to it. We want Fish and Game separated. There's no place for the Department of Public Safety with the Department of Fish and Game. And that there, I guess a guy could go on a half hour worth of examples and problems that we've been having there, but we feel very, very strongly about that as a structural change.

The management now seems to cater to sports fishermen and head hunters. As an example, one of the consultants I was working with, I told him what I would like him to do is find me a very, very good likeness of a white man's head down below somewhere, and I wanted it put on a frame and I didn't care what it would cost, but I wanted to donate that type of thing to each of the different spots where head hunters come in--like King Salmon, Dillingham, Iliamna--and say, "This is the last head hunter who left all the meat behind and came out with a head. He lost his own." Something of that sort. But it's really a problem, regardless of the laws, and wanton waste things and stuff like that, it still happens.

Fish and Game officers--and we heard a number of things and we couldn't quite agree, so we put "allegedly" search fishing boats without warrants for fish and game and illegal equipment. And

this also goes into rumors about searching homes and stuff like that, and it causes a lot of problems. You hear about people going hundreds of miles away, getting game, and they're only a couple of miles away from home, a plane lands, takes away their snow-go, all their equipment and everything, and he's out for subsistence. But you have other head hunters out who only bring back maybe a hindquarter and a head and they say, "Gee, thanks, we got a couple thousand dollars out of you," which is really nothing.

More problems--we feel that more time should be spent on education about fish and game rather than enforcement. If we're going to get people involved in that area--and we feel more of our people should be--we need education in the schools at the primary and at the secondary level by law enforcement officers and others who are around here, because they know more about it than anybody.

By removing from Public Safety, the stigma of the Fish and Game will be minimized and will hopefully allow more local involvement. Again, that came up as we were going into, I believe, the second question about what do you suggest should be changed, how can local involvement be increased, and list all the actions you think would help prioritize subsistence. Again, establish local boards. It's the very, very key, we feel. Give more priority to subsistence. Raise the license fee for outsiders to a very high level. I understand they're getting something like five grand for a lion now. We could probably up our moose to about ten grand, and stuff like that, and maybe we'll have enough game around for subsistence and enough for our grandchildren. If you have problems with something, and you want to still allow them to come, even if you raise it to fifty grand, you'll still have those rich buggars comin' up here when they fly Lear jets up here--

---most local input. All along we kept hittin' up local input. We were intrigued with the idea of cooperative management; we feel that's very, very necessary. We understand laws are necessary, but regulations interpret laws, and regulations should be made by those people that are most affected, and not by somebody again away who thinks they know the law.

Permitting subsistence in areas that are at times close to sports fishing or hunting so that a way of life may be preserved. Again I think it pretty well explains itself, but again, allowing subsistence hunting to prevail over regular hunting and fishing, especially when game gets down to below maximum sustained yield areas. And using clearer language in Fish and Game regulations, so that all people can understand regulations, not just those who

speaking legalese. That's a problem I always brought out. Things are too sophisticated, and even if you did understand, we still may not necessarily follow the law. That's always a problem. Like they say you can't hunt in the spring. Well, the game's plentiful in the spring, so you go out and hunt. They're not necessarily plentiful at other times, so that's something I don't think you'll ever stop. And you hear about the people in Barrow are going to go out whale hunting regardless of what the law says. They've always done it; they always will do it. So rather than making something illegal you should adapt it to the situation at hand, knowing that they're going to do it anyway, and trying to make things less severe and more applicable to the area, and making it more difficult to the people outside, like seasons when people should be back to work, not during the summers and stuff like that, when kids are going back to school. A lot of those sorts of things can be, and are, I think, already being implemented to a lesser degree.

Weigh each violation individually so that human factors are considered. It's very difficult when you set up a law that's set up for the whole state or for the whole nation. It does not consider a lot of times the individual circumstances that often warrant one to break a law because they need that game just to survive. They need that food. And I think many of our game officers, at least in the past, at times, have been very good with kind of looking the other way; but lately we have more of a crop of people--these cops, I guess they are, playing Fish and Game guys that are out there that are playing right strictly by the letter, and that causes a lot of problems. And some unfortunate circumstances could arise because of that, because they're not being flexible enough.

Need native subsistence user on all levels of boards. We feel that if people were native subsistence users on the different levels of boards, whether they be Fish and Game, local boards, or wherever, that they can keep hammering home that point and let people not forget that there are subsistence users, and it's needed, and even though it isn't defined, they know because they are subsistence users, and they could tell these other people they don't know what they're talking about. And as we proceed to try to explain how one exists, or subsists, or whatever you want to call it, that is the paramount thing, I think, out in all of Alaska--rural Alaska.

And I guess that's all we had.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you. Have you given your report over here at this table? I think that's the last report we have.

(male):

Okay. The No. 1 question, what was it--from our point of view what problems exist? To make it short and sweet, it looks like education is one problem and enforcement is the other. We run into problems where enforcement officers are in a village attempting to enforce the law and trying to explain to violators why they can't do this or why they can't do that. And either through ignorance, or the fact they just don't care, people don't seem to understand that they can't go up the river and net all the fish out of the holes and still have fish three or four years later.

The problem of p.r. was brought up, and the problem of the policeman picture of the game enforcement officer was brought up. And, as an air taxi pilot, I personally have seen a lot of Fish and Game people go out in the field, attempting to enforce the law, and running into a stone wall where the local villagers have made absolutely no attempt to assist them--made no attempt to understand or to care simply because the man was a policeman out to arrest one of their own for what they feel wasn't a law that applied to them. So I think the idea of education beginning in the schools and right out to the village of the fact that we are all citizens of the same country and that the laws apply to us all, not just to the few that pay the taxes and are educated or who care. The education process has got to be completed right from the ground up so that everybody understands. I've seen people that say, "Well, the fish have gone up the river every year for generations and generations, and we've gone out here and taken these fish this way ever since time began and they're still here today, and we just can't understand why there are fewer and fewer fish." And the law enforcement officer says, "Well, you can't go up there, and if you do, we're going to fine you, or we're going to punish you," or whatever is necessary. And then the conflict arises, so education is really important.

And then the other thing that's important, as we saw it, was enforcement. During our peak fishing seasons it's not at all uncommon to have several fishing boats outside the line, especially when weather conditions make it tough for the enforcement people to watch everybody, or after dark up the river. It would pay, I think--or we thought it would pay--if there were enough enforcement people to cover. If there was a man put up the river and left there--if there was people covering the line all the time--not just out there once in a while making a spot check, but there all the time. If we're going to draw line and say nobody can fish beyond

that line, we can't say, "well, nobody can fish beyond that line," when the man's looking, and nobody can fish beyond that line anytime. It has to be for everybody. That is the way we addressed question No. 1.

And No. 2--the same problem. How do you suggest change? Well, we suggest stronger enforcement of what we've got. If you don't like what we've got, then change it. But we have to live with what we've got right now, and we have to enforce it if we're going to try to make it work.

Consistent and tough penalties--we find a lot of inconsistencies in different places. If a man violates a particular law in Naknek and the same law in Dillingham, one man will get a slap on the hand and the other guy goes to the pokey. The thing has got to be put together so that if a guy goes over the line, he knows what he's going to get, and then he gets it if he gets caught.

On the second part, we believe that the advisory system as we have now is a good thing and is working but that it has got to be expanded. I believe that here in Dillingham all of the villages within this district were invited to participate in the local advisory. Some of them did; some of them didn't. It's possible that some didn't because they really didn't understand what they were being invited to. It's back to the education process again.

As far as the actions that could be taken to give more priority to subsistence, we are back to the problem of definition again. If you can't define "subsistence," how can you give priority to it? If you can say, "This man is a subsistence hunter because he's got to have this fish or this game in order to subsist or to live through the winter," then you can say, "Okay, this man can be identified either through the possibility of some kind of a simple state licensing system that says this man has got a subsistence license which allows him to go out and take his fish or this game any time of the year, any manner necessary, as long as it's strictly for his use and is necessary. If it isn't necessary--if the man is out here making \$35,000 a year fishing, then he isn't a subsistence hunter, whether he thinks so or not.

That's all we have.

Nancy Brunck: Okay, thank you.

(male): I'd like to respond

(male):

Talking about what these gentlemen have already been saying, as a 45-year resident of the Dillingham area, when our Governor was here some years ago, as compared to the game, say, the moose down the coast area, there's only about 10% of the moose down in that area now that there was when you were here. And it goes back to--well, having hunted down there for some 35 years, in 35 years we've had to leave one moose. Now there's a law that says that we should not leave--we cannot leave the meat there. In 35 years we've had to leave one moose there because a three-week fog and rain came in and it was soured when we got back there. And you go over to Naknek and you see hundreds of horns come through every fall, and you don't see any meat coming with it. And yet they want us to abide the rules, and it just doesn't make sense.

We're talking about subsistence again. Subsistence means different things to different people in different areas. Now I go up in villages and work. You go into a village, I dare say that there isn't a Fish and Game man that eats moose three times a day. And I've been in many of the homes where you moose and rice for breakfast, moose and rice for dinner, moose and rice for supper, and you have that day after day until that moose is gone. I like this. Subsistence should be No. 1 priority.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you for all the time that you've spent tonight. There isn't another table left, is there? Oh, no--there is.

(male):

One of the problems with structure of Fish and Game, we talked about it before. Our table thought funding was a major problem and that what was needed, was a long term base.

Second, we supported the regional board that people talked about here, although some words were local boards.

Third, we need more followup from local input. If the regional board thing is implemented, the local input will automatically happen.

Priority--subsistence over commercial and recreational or sports fishing. And one thing that no one wants to talk about which I thought was important because it has been expressed to me on numerous occasions by many native people, and it has to do with snow machines, and we recognize that the snow machine is necessary in subsistence hunting. However, we don't know what effect it has on the game, and we kinda thought that maybe a statewide

impact study should be done on it to see what the impact is and make the information available.

Under 2, a lot of the things that we have here under 1 are interrelated with 2. What we suggest should be changed: the advisory boards need more power, perhaps regional or local board system is the way to do it.

Nancy Brunck:

Thank you very much. It's really late, and I just want to tell you thanks for staying this late and sharing your ideas with us. I hope that they have been helpful for you to listen to tonight, Governor, and part of what our job is now that you've spent the time writing all your ideas on the paper is, it is our job now to go translate it and put it into the report that goes directly to the Governor. And I'll just turn the meeting over to the Governor to say a few words in closing.

Gov. Hammond:

All I'm going to do is close it, believe me. I realize the hour is late. I want to express my appreciation for your patience and attendance and input. I think there's been a lot of significant comment made. I recall Frank's mentioning the cooperative--necessity for cooperative regulatory fish and game management. I had this called directly to my attention in Barrow here just recently where it is very evident, as somebody else has said, that they're going to continue to hunt whales in Barrow regardless what any International Whaling Convention comes up with in all probability. Now what do you do, Federal government? Send in the troops to preclude this from happening. I can just see that. But I think by sitting down--we sat down with something like a hundred Barrow whaling captains--not Barrow, but northern village whaling captains--and they recognized the need to improve the method by which they took whales. Some of the villages lost a number of whales because of certain methods that most of the whaling captains agreed were inappropriate. But by eliminating those types of methods without taking additional whales than they actually use now, they can continue that whaling culture from here on in. And I think through that cooperation between the Federal, State and local people, we can work out a system that meets everybody's concern, but without it we will fall flat on our faces--no question about it.

One of the concerns I have is in regard to if you go into a regional board system. In my view, my proposal of some years ago, the so-called satellite board, had a system whereby the State was divided into regions, and then they would be entitled--each region--to so many advisory committees. And then instead of the Governor

selecting somebody who's going to tell you what the fish and game regulations are going to be, permitting the most democratic process imaginable to occur, in which the advisory boards would select somebody to serve in their regional board, and they in turn would select, by election at the local level, or what have you, somebody to represent them on the master board level. Frankly, I much prefer that. I think you people should select who is your best representative in the realm of fish and game management. I'd like you to consider that as an alternative to the present system, which simply has somebody selected for you to represent your interest. Sure, we ask you who you may prefer, but I think it far preferable that you in essence determine who you want to have represent you. Then you've only got yourselves to blame if you don't attend the meetings, if you don't select the people you want, rather than blaming me. And I much prefer that.

But I came here primarily to listen. I've probably talked too much already, and I should mention to you something that I've told other public forums. And that is that I recognize now that one can get in a lot of trouble by talking when he should be listening. I had this brought home dramatically to me when I put the call in to then Governor Carter before he was inaugurated. I had my secretary place that call, and she announced on the intercom that the Governor was on the telephone. So I picked it up and I said, "Governor, or is it Mr. President Elect, or just what does protocol dictate I call you?" The answer came back, "You can call me the operator. I'll go get the Governor for you."

So, as I say, I'd better sit down and shut up, and I want again to express my thanks for your input and look forward to seeing you again.