

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILES 86 / 2

78 SCOMM 7 : INTERIM COMM. ON SUBSISTENCE 1977

If you don't think foreign hunters should be cut off what about giving the situation of diminishing supply. What about ah, do you feel people from other states should be cut off before Alaskan residents?

Mr. Bud Wiese: I don't think you're allowed to do it legally. In the (inaudible) belongs to everybody. The resource belongs to everybody in the United States. Now we have in certain areas been allowed 50-50 against residents, or 60-40 in certain items. Some places I guess it's even been 90-10. 10% residents ah, I mean 10% non-residents and 90% residents on permit basis. This may change and how far we can go with it I don't know constitutionally. But the (inaudible) of the resources belong to the people of the United States. As far as commercial versus sports, I don't, as far as fish, salmon I believe the fish they are talking about. I do know that or feel,

The Sports fishing of people are the people I have not discussed this with. This particular item that's why I hate to comment upon it. But my personal feeling is that the sports fishermen are allowed a take of salmon. As to what the resource can stand. In other words, I don't believe you should shut off the sports fisherman completely for the commercial fisherman. Nor, do I believe you should cut the commercial fisherman clean off for the sports fisherman. There's got to be a balance there, I'm not much of a salmon fisherman, except at Chitna. I do believe I like to go down there and have for over 25 years now. I started in the early 50's, going to Chitna, we do every year, religiously. But outside of that I'm not much of a salmon man, I have not studied the commercial aspects of salmon I don't know anything of the management of the salmon itself. I'm talking

mainly of the game. The moose, caribou, the bear, the (inaudible) and so forth of the interior of Alaska, where I have spent the last 36 years.

Representative Joe Hayes: In other words, you don't feel that the people that are attempting to live the subsistence life style, either 100% or 50%, should have any greater right to the game than somebody from Seattle? Is that what you're saying? Or you just don't think the law

Mr. Bud Wiese: I would like to say yes. But knowing that the game belongs to everybody, than I don't believe that anybody has subsisted, as far as the production of meat, and berries, off of Alaska, than anyone in our family. We haven't bought meat for over 30 years. And we harvest a lot of berries every year. I'd like to continue that style of life, but I don't feel that I have 100% right on that over anybody in the United States. I believe we have to give a percentage to them.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Hayes.

Representative Joe Hayes: I just think that this more than - I think the difference is that in your particular case you have the option of living off game or going down to the store. And your talking about the extreme side of subsistence is, the head waters of some rivers, where there is no local store.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Don't you believe that our welfare program today is so, when I mean welfare, its always have been for our people. That there should be no people hungry today? Unless they do by their own choice. I can go

hungry for going out here in some isolated area where there is very little or no game and not take any food with me, depend on the game in the area, and not be able to get any, I'd get pretty skinny. I believe, with the transportation, that we have today, with the economics that we have today, and knowing our welfare program, what little I've know of them, I don't think there is any excuse for anybody to starve unless it's still, its just completely stupidity that they haven't contacted one of the agencies to help them.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Hayes.

Representative Joe Hayes: Bud, you've got five tough questions here. Four of them we can't deal with next session, we're not going to settle. But one of them, one of the questions we can deal with. I hope you'll talk to some of the representatives from Fairbanks and help them, through your organization. We have a (inaudible) with the administration in tightening up enforcement laws. I've had a bill in with the special Fish and Game prosecuter for three years now. And Fairbanks delegation were very good. About supporting a different approach to enforcement, one that is going to be meaningful and I hope your organization will continue to do something. Because this is the one thing we can do and do it right and we can do it soon. And I think that most of us admit that the enforcement system now is inadequate.

Mr. Bud Wiese: We have another tragic problem as you know, we have tackled in the last couple of years, the last few years. We've been organized, if you have followed some of the stuff we have forwarded to you, in the last

several years.

Representative Joe Hayes: I still would like to see your organization can do.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Yeah, we keep you pretty well posted I think. Yeah, and we are just getting into the enforcement deal that was just brought up. That it is a problem and we decided to take some action on but we haven't channeled our efforts and we're going to have to get a hold of somebody to more or less give us some guidance of which way to push on it. Because we don't have anybody in our organization that is legally available that does have the knowledge to help us you know, to channel our efforts so we got to get somebody to give us some lead as to which way to go of what we want to do to accomplish this move.

Representative Joe Hayes: A lot of tough questions that can't be dealt with on a short term basis. Fish and Game is full of very tough issues. But enforcement is one that can be dealt with now on a perhaps a more rational and more timely basis than perhaps many other issues.

Mr. Bud Wiese: We told us. We didn't feel it was so much the enforcement issues and the fines that are levied for those violations that are caught. That we feel this is more deterrant you know. A guy goes out here and gets caught snagging salmon or an over limit of gear, fine him \$50.00 and \$25.00 suspended, well what can you lose? You know, you don't lose anything. And I think it's a disgrace to the officers themselves and deterrant for them to make anymore arrests because of the hours they have to spend just

to write up the paper work. I know it's fantastic and yet the guy who does the violation gets off scott free even if he pleads guilty he figures he doesn't lose anything. I think this is the problem, I think legislature I personally feel we got to lay down that if a guy gets caught fishing without a license he gets find \$150.00 and spend a night in jail. And the judge doesn't have a thing to say on that. I think that is the kind of things were going to have to lay down to get some teeth in our laws. Is it legal to lets lay down the criteria for what the crime is and fine him and place him in jail. And the judge has no discretion as to what to change that. And then you can listen to the people and if you listen to the judge is going to say its a \$50.00 fine with \$25.00 or \$30.00 suspended. Put some teeth into it.

Representative Joe Hayes: I think you can see us approach (inaudible) probably enact next session we would be enacting a drunk driving law with a mandantory sentence.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well I think that is what your going to have to do here.

Representative Joe Hayes: I think it will be studied before it's applica-
tion before the State.

Mr. Bud Wiese: In one other area, along the same lines, now this is personal, I haven't had a chance to talk to the others yet I feel that the biologists, or anybody in the Department should be deputized to make arrests. Give them a basic training course on how to arrest people and be allowed to make the arrests. Because they are the ones in the field. We don't have enough people in the field, even those kind of people not just the

enforcement people.

Representative Joe Hayes: No more questions Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Mr. Chairman, I might observe that biologists in the field biologist very often are deputized for those very reasons you are talking about. They don't like to be called that maybe thats the reason they - Well if they have a sincere belief in what they are doing, and in their jobs, I think this would be part of their program.

Representative Steve Cowper: I guess what I just said is they would prefer not to be enforcement agents. But they are all deputized. They have to take a five day enforcement course or something like that but most of them are.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well I didn't know that.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Wiese please take a seat I have some questions for you. Other members have any further questions? Mr. Wiese I take exception at some of the comments that you made. You made reference to the walrus on the west coast of Alaska I believe. You stated that walrus have been taken only for commercial purposes.

Mr. Bud Wiese: I didn't say only. If I did I'm wrong. I said there was a lot of them taken for ivory only.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well I attended the meeting with the central

region Fish and Game advisory board on September 3rd in Kipnuk. Have you ever been to Kipnuk?

Mr. Bud Wiese: No, I've been over on the west coast fairly close to them.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well Kipnuk is miles from Anchorage, which is how far from Fairbanks, anyway it's a long ways. And now those people are a little bit tired of people blaming them for the taking of walrus for commercial purposes only. Apparently you don't know those people very well. I'm sure you don't know those people at all. But they take walrus. And they take it for the meat. I'm not done yet. And they see walrus drifting up to the beach without heads. Okay, now they are tired of being blamed for that. Now who is doing it?

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well I don't know but

Representative Nels Anderson: Who is doing it?

Mr. Bud Wiese: I believe the report of one party flew the coast over there and counted over 900 carcasses on the beach with the heads off, with the tusks cut off. Not even dug out.

Representative Nels Anderson: Who's doing it?

Mr. Bud Wiese: I don't know.

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay, If anyone has any idea who is doing this and it goes back to your question of enforcement, you know, we've got

to have more people out there to find out who is doing this because those people are getting sick and tired of being blamed for that activity. It is illegal.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Yeah, for your information I'm on the guide board. I'm not a guide. I'm a non-guide that serves on the Alaska Guide and Licensing Guide Control Board. I've been on it now for three or four years. This is where I get a lot of this information. People from Savoonga and Gambell the (something) brought in and talked to other people from that area who we are trying to help become guides so they can guide clients in that area

Representative Nels Anderson: Well I understand that. Now on your piece of paper here you have given to us, you have concerned sportsman. Now what in your opinion is a sportsman? What is that?

Mr. Bud Wiese: This is a man that goes out and gives fair chase to game. And he buys a hunting license, he pays his share for the management of game. This is a sportman.

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay what does he do with the meat?

Mr. Bud Wiese: I would say he would utilize it. And I would, and I just wrote a note to the fellow that is with me, Walter Henderson, Charles Graves, (Ulmer Smithney?) We wrote to Alberta to find out what they have and their law reads "It is prohibited to leave edible meat in the field or to allow it to be lost or spoiled." This prohibited by law. And I am getting tired of people coming in go up in the hills, kill a sheep, 25 miles back in and they come out with the horns and the (inaudible).

They say the bear got them, the rest of them. As I said I've killed game up here for 35 years now. And bear have yet to get a piece of my meat. They may some day and I know it does happen. I don't leave meat. You go into these walk-in areas. We went in there a few years ago, there was a ram, shot right through the chest, he couldn't have gone 30 yards. But he was (inaudible) on one side. It was a walk-in area. No one even took the time to dress him out. The next year Harley went in there, on the day of (inaudible) it was a walk in. He went in with a tractor, he and his buddy, they loaded up enough meat they couldn't even eat it all, while they were in there. Meat picked up right along the trail. I don't believe those guys are sportsmen.

Representative Nels Anderson: I'm very much aware of the wanton waste around as I was the author of that legislation. That put more teeth into that particular weak enforcement area and the one thing I wanted to get at was the moose season in the peninsula in units 17 and 9. September 10 through September 20. You know what happens to moose around September. They go into the rutt.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Right.

Representative Nels Anderson: What happens to the meat?

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well, I've killed, we have the same here, I've killed moose up to the last day of September, that have been with many cows, and I've been very careful. I've skinned them, remove the hide, taken them home and hung them for two or three weeks and its been very good.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well most of the reports that I get, that season that we got in those units are designed for sports hunters. Not the subsistence hunters, the meat eaters. Because when the moose goes into the rut that meat stinks.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well you've killed different moose than I have. I've killed

Representative Nels Anderson: I'm telling you what the people tell me back there in my district.

Mr. Bud Wiese: The hide stinks. You've got to use care in removing the hide. The caribou is a different animal.

Representative Nels Anderson: That may be the case. I'm telling you that it's your word against theirs, and those people live out there and they aren't going to touch that meat. Now what we've got to try to do is to accomodate not only the meat hunter but the sport hunter too. And I think the sport hunter has a pretty good, a lot of (inaudible) influence in the legislature.

Mr Bud Wiese: In other words your going to try to regulate the use of the product rather than the taking of it.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well to regulate the season so the meat hunter is satisfied with that meat, when he catches it.

Mr. Bud Wiese: What is the season out there?

Representative Nels Anderson: It's September 10th to September 20th.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well most of them right up in this area are just slightly entering into the rutt before the 20th of September.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well the end of August is when the moose go into the rutt in the Bay.

Mr. Bud Wiese: They start, yeah, But they aren't actually

Representative Nels Anderson: By September 10 that meat stinks and I am aware of that.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well you have different moose down there than we have up here.

Representative Nels Anderson: We might have. Their a little bit more aggressive.

Mr. Bud Wiese: I can varify what I have said right here. Many people have killed moose. There are probably people sitting here in the audience who can varify what I say.

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay, I want to go to another section of your presentation where you stated it would be waste of time for us to try to define subsistence. And I would like to state that the committee agrees with your assessment. I think that is correct because in September I prepared a full session legislative report for my constitutants. This was done in

September and I would like to read it to you. "We hope to define subsistence as it relates to Alaskans throughout the State. Arguments against defining subsistence are that subsistence values and uses vary greatly across the state and that any attempt to define subsistence in the same way throughout the State will greatly undermine subsistence hunting and fishing in every region of the State." And my belief, I haven't sold it to the committee yet, but that is my personal assessment. I think that - I think that we are on the same track. Going to the subsistence, you say, was a life style. I think to a degree you are correct. I think that there are people in rural Alaska that still heavily dependent on the resources of the land and the waters. They are greatly dependent on those resources. And you may not agree. But there is one thing you don't understand. When a person comes from Kipnuk or some other village, they don't have access to all the services you are referring to. They don't have telephones, they can't get on an airplane and just hop on a plane. They don't have scheduled air service. They have to charter they have to get to those agencies that exist in Bethel and other places of the State. And they don't get that kind of service that you think is available. Their not getting it. And those people need that meat, to survive. Now you may not agree, but I'm telling you just exactly what I feel about this. That's the way it is.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well maybe you can answer my question on this. Like the caribou now. That western caribou herd continues to decline, and that meat is not available to those people, what is going to happen? What happened to the people in Anaktuvik last year when a lot of caribou was in that area? And the people there never got a caribou?

Representative Nels Anderson: That's an interesting proposition because last year the Department of Fish and Game said there was 34,000 caribou. Now they up'ed that to 75,000. For some reason the herd increased dramatically. Twofold, but what happened there? I don't know what happened. I don't think the Department of Fish and Game knows what went on up there.

Mr. Bud Wiese: I don't know. I think we have too many people behind the desk and not enough people out in the field.

Representative Nels Anderson: I agree with you basically. Okay going back to the other thing, the enforcement aspect of this. I agree with you that enforcement efforts are weak. But, there is one thing I would like to share with you and the public is that I am getting pretty tired of people using the Department of Fish and Game as whipping boys. We're not supporting those people, as much as we should be. You know where their money comes from don't you. They sell our fish and our game. They sell our moose and caribou and our bears. And the money they get from licenses they sell is matched with Federal funds. Okay, so if they don't go out and sell enough caribou, moose and bear their not going to get enough money to get their payroll. Okay, then we have to start dipping into the general funds to start supporting these people. So to kick them around, it's not going to help to kick them around.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Well, enforcement is not being supported now by the game licenses.

Representative Nels Anderson: I don't know where the money supposed to be coming from but I

Mr. Bud Wiese: That comes out from the general funds. Because it's under the Department of Public Safety now.

Representative Nels Anderson: But a good portion of the money from management and other purposes comes from the sale of licenses.

Mr. Bud Wiese: All of it does.

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay.

Mr. Bud Wiese: And this is why I think you should get money from the general fund for the Department of Fish and Game because they are allowing people other than the sportsman and the subsistence uses, but the people that buy the license, to help manage this game and their not convicting, ah, putting one penny towards the management of it. Even the trapping license money doesn't go toward the management of game but yet our Department of Fish and Game are paying for it.

Representative Nels Anderson: I agree with you. That's a good point.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Your paying for it. I'm paying for it. If the trapping license go into the general fund they use it for something else.

Representative Nels Anderson: Any other questions or comments, gentlemen? Thank you very much Mr. Wiese. Anybody else at this time?

Sam Demientieff: Chairman Anderson and committee members. My name is Sam

Demientieff. I was born at Holy Cross, Alaska and raised in Fairbanks. I am presently employed with the Tanana Chiefs Conference Corporation. I am a former member of the Alaska State Board of Fisheries. And I only say this because I fully realize and don't envy you in your job in hoping to define subsistence for all those concerned. When I first heard the word subsistence, which was many years ago, it was used along with the phrase "Living off the land". During those years, which was during the 1940's, there was not as many people as there are now. During those years, your job of defining subsistence, would have been a lot easier because the pioneers, we're the remnants, of the miners and explorers of Alaska that stated in Alaska. These early newcomers to Alaska found natives, in the most part, friendly and subsisting off the land. Many pioneers today, living all over the State, would have to testify to the fact that the native people were than sole subsistence users of land when they got here. Native people are a passive type people to a certain extent. Having trust in one's word. But the native people are now realizing that all words, bills, or just about any dealings with almost anyone has to be carefully scrutinized. Native people in Alaska's bush areas are not at this moment being are now at the moment being told of people, agencies, projects seeking Federal groups, associations, boards and committees. That are trying to help them one way or another. The subsistence life style is a constant time consuming and continuing process. But the native people are finding out in order to live within each populations and regulated life styles that they have to listen and try to cooperate with all agencies, boards etc. I think I safely say that the native people are more than willing to live with cooperative management of fish and game, wildlife, renewable resources. But are now confused by so many different agencies that take care of these different

projects. If subsistence could be under one agency this would help a great deal. In defining subsistence itself I know that anyone here that has lived for some years in Alaska knows its the native that lives the true meaning of subsistence. Hunting, trapping, snaring, devising any means to get food to live and using 100% of what he got. Subsistence is a way of life. It is as much alive today as working for wages or going into business is a way of life for others. You cannot come out to say "we're going to phase out business" because it is a thing that was born so many years ago. The same pertains to subsistence. It must be protected. It is as natural as self preservation. Or an animals own instinct. Subsistence is a natural heritage of traditional life style used by any native of a region or country. Traditional life styles encompasses the use of fish, game, plants, just about anything that could be captured or harvest for personal need or for in Alaska survival. I'm leaving you copies of testimonies given to other agencies or boards by Al Ketsler, president of Tanana Chiefs. And others. Thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you Mr. Demientieff. Mr. Cowper do you have any questions?

Representative Steve Cowper: No, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Hayes.

Representative Joe Hayes: No, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much

George Matz: I'm Executive Director for the Fairbanks Environmental Center. I just heard about this hearing and I just wrote down a few notes in an outline I'd like to speak from. I'd like to begin by first giving some Center policies related to subsistence. And I might say, the Center, ever since its formation in 1971 has been very concerned about the protection of subsistence rights and has played a very active role from that point to the day the bullhead whale issue has been taken up. A lead I think in terms of environmental groups to try and protect the bullhead whale. The subsistence rights of the bullhead whale. But our general policies are as follows: First of all we believe the subsistence harvest should not exceed the carrying capacity of a region. And I think there is probably a general agreement on that. Furthermore, we think that subsistence users should be given preference over other consumptive users. In other words subsistence should be a preference over sports hunting or trophy hunting. Non-consumptive users rights, to a resource, should be co-equal to the consumptive users. We don't think that the non-consumptive and consumptive subsistence rights can co-exist. Subsistence regulations should involve subsistence users, such as regional boards. Now in the HR 39 the Udall D2 bill you were supporting the idea of regional subsistence boards. And more recently we have seen that Governor Hammond has come up with satellite fish and game boards. And I'm not really sure of the details on this but we generally support the idea of grass roots approach and the getting the subsistence people directly involved in the regulations that effect them. In terms of preference we feel the State rather than the Federal agencies should have principal responsible for subsistence regulations. And we feel that subsistence rights should be available to non-natives as well as natives. And in fact if you go into some villages you see kind of a cross culturization. You see some non-native who are, habits and I've even seen an accent that is

is almost indistinguishable from natives. And maybe facial characteristics.

But Mayor Gillam earlier mentioned that there shouldn't be a racial definition for subsistence. And I tend to agree with that but I also have sat in with arguments with lawyers about just how you define this. The distinction between racial and on-racial. Especially with Federal legislation. And I have also tend to agree with Congressman Siberling when he says maybe racial distinction is the best thing to do to avoid a court challenge. A legal challenge because of the Federal trust responsibility. So, though a lot of us don't like to think of racial distinction between these things I think we also have to realize that it is in the United States Constitution that there is a Federal Trust responsibility to natives and its on that basis that I think it derives its comments. So its, you know, his concern is standing the court challenge. Our Center policies also feel because of the carrying capacity is limited and because of the number of people who want to live with subsistence life style keeps increasing, in fact, I guess, the carrying capacity is decreasing its inevitable that were going to have some kind of qualifications of who can have the right to subsistence and who can't. I know, particularly in the villages, people don't like to think of the thought of qualifications but I think reality is such that this may happen. I think, lets see it was mentioned that the ah the, your committee is interested in thoughts regarding the definition of subsistence. Now implicitly, if you have followed occasions you are defining subsistence. Also, I, these qualifications should be dynamic because subsistence, like any life style, changes and adapts to the circumstances to the world around it. So, it shouldn't be locked into something rigid because I think it would really work against

the protection of subsistence rights. But I think if you had these, if you had qualifications with tours set up, ah, to tie up to what ever the carrying capacity is in circumstances in a regional area. People in a region in a strong voice would say just how these were established. That (inaudible) you are defining subsistence. I'd like to make a few recommendations. One, we felt that State legislation is needed to clearly give preference to subsistence users over other consumptive users. And as Jim Kowalsky was indicating, I think that this perhaps the biggest problem on the State level. We see in the Department of Fish and Game that there is some kind of interest in terms of giving preference to the subsistence user. But I think that the administrative discretion not that cut by state statutes. And I think it's created problems on the national level because we ah in the D2 hearings, in Fairbanks, we essentially heard the Siberling committee say "well if the State can't give preference to subsistence it will be imposed on the Federal basis". I think the State legislature also needs to recognize that subsistence is closely tied into the protection of habitat. And, in this regards the, I think that there needs to be stronger legislation to protect critical habitat. Especially species that are important to subsistence use.

Another recommendation I would like to make is that in regards to qualifications that the Department of Fish and Game conduct a census holding village meetings throughout the State. Finding out just what would be acceptable to these people. What different criteria would be workable. In that line, the Center replied to the Fish and Game (wildlife management) plans we had a lengthy letter which was sent to Commissioner Skoog. And in there we recommended a few criteria which might be considered for qualifications. Here again I'd like to emphasise that this is only for

consideration because we don't really feel that we know enough about this or really qualify to say that these should be qualifications. Their really pointed out as suggestions. But one of them would be the subsistence user must demonstrate a commitment to a life style rather than merely speaking from experience. One of the fears we have is say someone from Southern California comes up here and has romantic ideas of what subsistence is and like to go out to the bush and live a subsistence life style, Spend a year out there. Builds a log cabin, shoot a lot of game, find its pretty monotonious and finds it doesn't have the same excitement as California did. And that's not the thing for him and leaves. Were, in fact at the Environmental Center we get a lot of people, especially through the summer, coming through saying that I just come here from California and I would like to go out and live in the bush and live a frontier life style. I'm very apprehensive about that because to many have romantical ideals about what that is. And I think that if they did go out there they would degrade the carrying capacity and find that it it not what they really want and go back to the urban or suburban area or something like that. So I think the people who are allowed the subsistence right have to demonstrate a committment to this life style and not to be just an experience or a trip. I think the people also, the subsistence user must also demonstrate need. The amount of fish and game allowed a subsistence user should be based on the size and family to be supported. The amount of cash income. The cost of living for the area. A subsistence user must be at least a five year resident of the respective subsistence region or be an Alaskan native. A subsistence user must use an efficient means of take. Captial or energy intensive means of take such as for instance airplanes are not consistent to the committment with subsistence. Now, (inaudible) definition of subsistence.

One thing that has been mentioned quite a bit has been the, is the income. And subsistence is a substitute for cash. I think one thing to which has not been really recognized is that subsistence as a life style is a low (inaudible) life style. Now if your familiar with physics, you know that the conversion of energy to work you have certain amount ways that is (inaudible) And our realization of shortages of resources, in this world, we become more and more aware of concerned with (inaudible) or waste or inefficient uses of energy. Whether that be the (inaudible) or someother type of resource. I think in terms of the justification why subsistence should exist and also just where it fits into National interest. It should be realized that the low (inaudible) life style. And by that definition it means that it be counter to the practice to have energy intensive means of take or (inaudible) too. In terms of recommendation. It was earlier mentioned that the funding for the Department of Fish and Game should be broader than just the licenses or the (inaudible). We fully support that. In fact what we would like to recommend is that the permanent fund be used to support fish and wildlife and habitat studies. To improve the base line data so we know what the carrying capacity is so that we make decisions based on knowledge rather than guesses. Avoid situations like last summer with the caribou, western arctic herd. Or this past summer with the bowhead whale.

Now in the permanent fund it has two conditions. It's that the money be spent on renewable resources and also there's a return on investment. And I think that money spent on base line data. Environmental studies on fish and wildlife habitat can meet those criteria. A lot of it is based on just how you determine what is a return. I think if you use a broad definition and consider a return in the sense that the State would be saving money by not being in a situation of not having to provide welfare

services and things like that. The state can be returned. So if you look at the social cost you can define it as such. At the permanent fund hearing that was held here, I guess, about a month ago, I brought this up. And it was said that well you know this base line environmental studies or base line data really weren't consistent with permanent fund ideals. But afterwards I looked at where the origin of the permanent fund came from and its to protect the Alaskan lifestyle. So it seems to me that this kind of studies are more consistent with the use of the permanent fund than to develop say petrochemical industries. Petrochemical industries are not consistent with Alaskan life style and never has been a petrochemical industry here until recently.

As a final recommendation I'd like to suggest that the State get more directly involved in the bowhead whale situation. I was at the hearing in Barrow and Governor Hammond expressed great concern for this and but he also seemed to imply that this was a Federal problem or international problem. Which is mostly true. But I think the State must also do its part. There's a lot of work, a lot of studies needed to determine just what are the - what could be justified quota for bowhead whale. I think if the state would help out the Inupiat in doing some of these studies. They are very concerned. They realize the importance of the bowhead whale, and the continuation of their culture. And proposed studies which I think are quite sophisticated but the cost would exceed the amount of money they have available. So they are looking for funding they are looking to the Federal government. But I think it would be appropriate if the State would really, if they are interested in protecting subsistence, to see what they could do in supporting the kind of work needed here. I think the bowhead whale situation is especially critical because I can't think of any

more ideal case of just what is subsistence? I mean if one animal, as a species, is probably the highest priority, the highest importance of any species. And the eskimos on the coastal areas so much of a great percentage of their culture, and the effort and the protein is based on the bowhead whale. It's different than other areas such as the interior where protein could be moose or possible caribou or salmon or things like that. And so it's also the villages on the arctic ocean coast there are less, happen with the culture lines also. So I think there is no better case for protecting subsistence than protecting the bowhead whale. Making sure that both the whale and the eskimo culture continues. In that regards I present a testimony in Barrow and I brought a copy which I would like to give to the committee and it gives some of the policies, some of the Center policies and the reason why we felt it was the position of the United States here should object to the International Whaling Commission ban on the subsistence hunting of the bowhead whale. It might give you some insight to the thinking of the environmental center. Well that's about all that I've got. If you have any questions I'd be glad to answer them.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Cowper?

Representative Steve Cowper: George, you know none of this is a problem until there's ah, and I'm speaking of things like subsistence, subsistence use vs other uses, fish and game, none of it becomes a problem until there's a shortage. Because everybody's got plenty until then. Okay, when there's a shortage you've got to figure what to do with it. Alright, you've got to have to say your going to take only a certain number of animals or fish or whatever it is. Who gets to take them? Is it more fair to say well first 600 caribou

no matter who takes them. Is that fair? Does that give unfair advantage to a person say with an airplane or a person who happens to live in the area? Or is it more fair to give a preference to people who actually live in a game management area? Or adjacent to it. Is that more fair? And if there is anything left over people from other parts of the state can come in. I don't know. That's the sort of thing the D-2 council is wrestling with and we're going to take that stuff to Washington next month. And so, you know, there real hard answers we're looking for. How do you solve this business of fish and game preference? And you know we're going to take something with us to Washington we're not going to go there with an empty sack. And we're going to come up with some kind of solution. I'm not prepared to say what it is right now because this in one of the purposes of Mr. Anderson's committee here. But...

Mr. George Matz: This is the type of question the Center has been debating apparently for years. And in fact are now coming up with their reply to the wildlife management plans that thought about this carefully. And we felt that in terms of preferences what has priorities, subsistence should be first. And there were a lot of philosophical reasons behind that. Just as a type of life style, decentralized self sufficient life style. Becomes a tremendous amount of value to this country because a philosophical basis I think one of the problems we're in urban areas and everything is too much centralization. Too much people depending on somebody else doing something for them. I think the importance of this protecting people who want to be self sufficient are more important than people who like to hunt for sport.

Representative Steve Cowper: Is a guy who works here in Fairbanks and makes

\$20,000 grand a year on construction, goes out and shoots a moose every year and has done that for 20 years, is he a subsistence user? What's the difference between him and a person who lives in the rural area and makes \$20,000 a year and goes out and gets a moose every year?

Mr. George Matz: A number of options available. Where you live and type of life style. A person that lives here has more options than a person who lives in the Yukon Flats or something like that. I think, now its been mentioned that you can't define subsistence. But I don't -- In one sense it's hard to do it. But you can't avoid not doing it because you end up with qualifications. And like I mentioned when you have qualifications implicitly you have to have to find it. The trick is to have it flexible so that is can adapt to change in circumstances.

Representative Steve Cowper: You say, now I'm -- I don't mean to you look like I have some pre-conceived notions about this because I don't. The question is more than academic I tell you. You say the person in urban area has more options. Well what are the options? What can a guy do? Why can he do more than the person in the rural area and has a job making \$20,000 a year? He may even drive a cab or something?

Mr. George Matz: Well the options are more than what's listed in the want ads. The options are in terms of skills and ability to adapt to urban areas. And things like that and that all enters into it. So you know you have to look at it from the qualitative values as much as quantitative. Quantitative being things such as number of jobs being available or cash income.

Representative Steve Cowper: My observation is more friction has occurred when hunters or fishermen from outside the area, now it might be, outside of a particular geographical location in Alaska or it might be people from Pennsylvania or Texas or people coming up here shooting the animals. Or it might be these foreign hunters people are talking about. But my observation is there is more friction along those lines based on geographical or people coming in from other areas than there is any other. Now, I don't know if that means we can give preferences or recommend preferences for people living in an given geographical area or not. But it's certainly one option that we have.

Mr. Sam Demientieff: In fact that has been done. I understand that around the Grayling area, Yukon River, that the Advisory Game Board has asked for restricted access. To avoid the competition, I guess, essentially between the subsistence and the sport hunter. So there's no (inaudible) allowed. I'm not sure that is true. Maybe somebody else will try to understand it. That area of the Yukon River has restricted access. Which in essence gives favoritism to the people that live there.

Representative Steve Cowper: Okay, thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Hayes? Yes sir?

Dave Kelleyhouse: I'm with the Department of Fish and Game. And I would like to clarify George's last statement. Indeed there were regulations imposed this last year. We made two special management areas. Kalskag (and Paradise) on the Yukon River. To control harvest by out of the area hunters. But, and this was in favor of the Athabascans living along that

stretch, I'd like to point out that it was the sports hunters primarily that were being kept out of the area. Indeed it was more native hunters out of Bethel, chartering out of Bethel, hunting Athabascan country. So now we have a situation, you know, both of them are essentially subsistence type people. It's just there are very few moose down river. And these, and this was the main bulk of people coming in. And this was why the special management areas were established. I just wanted to clarify it wasn't sport hunting per se.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you.

Male Participant in Audience: That's an interesting piece of information. And I think it all the more points out that you really end up with qualifications. Now you got two subsistence users. Apparently one of them, one group, has problems with their carrying capacity necessary getting their necessary food. So which subsistence user is more justified than the other.

Representative Steve Cowper: Who does the game belong to? The guy who lives in the area or the people of the United States?

_____ : People who live in the area I'd say.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Hayes do you have any comments or questions?

Representative Joe Hayes: Yes, you mentioned in reference to subsistence the incompatibility of consumptive and non-consumptive.

Mr. George Matz: Not incompatibility. If I did I was mistaken. And I think I was really making reference to the fish and wildlife management plans where they said we're going to have non-consumptive uses in special areas. You know, national parks and a few isolated places in Alaska. And when a fraction feels that non-consumptive uses of game occurs, essentially where recreation occurs, when your canoeing and you see a moose or something that's an enjoyable scene so you've got to recognize that non-consumptive uses occur throughout Alaska and although there can be conflict with consumptive uses for the most part there aren't.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Hayes?

Representative Joe Hayes: Mr. Chairman. George, you indirectly gave us a very comprehensive definition of subsistence. And did a good job at it. You talk of the need for flexibility. On one hand we realize it's necessary to have the opinion and expertise of local people living right in the area and know the area, on the other hand it is necessary to have the biological expertise to the people within the department that are trained and knowledgeable in that they have done a good job. But these two things conflict a great deal, because it is not always easy to arrive at how we're going to determine the flexibility of the course of the subsistence area. How would you recommend that the state handle local input versus the need for biological information determined wasn't proficient, how can you work together, this is one of the biggest harms that I see.

Mr. George Matz: That's a good question, I think there may be conflicts but we can properly manage that should be compatible. I think the professional fish and game manager as a difference type of expertise than some who live

in the villages and who are subsistence users. Subsistence users are also the experts, but with a different background who tends to more (inaudible) For instance the Western Arctic Herd, someone who lives in the village doesn't really have an understanding of the total population of Western Arctic Herd of the migration routes of what past they go through or anything else. It's very familiar with certain aspects in terms of especially his region and the person who works for fish and game tends to have a more broader overview, he knows what the total populations are. I think that both types of perspectives are needed and what we have to do is find a way where subsistence users will generally tend to be pretty keen in making observations and know what the habits of these animals are, can be combined with the professional knowledge from fish and game or from fish and wildlife service. And so that these are compatible and (inaudible), rather than working against each other. Though that is required that both sides restrict the knowledge of the other side and talking to biologists and a lot of subsistence users, I think its missing. I think this computer has distressed the biologists and biologists has a lack of faith or credibility to confuse her.

Hardy M. Smith: Members of the committee and ladies and gentlemen. I'm Hardy Smith. I flew in the Ladd Airforce Base in 1952 and been here most of the time since. I've been a big game guy guide most of that time. Most of you know the supreme court ruled last year in 1976 that the big game animals of American and Federal territory belonged to the American people, not to the guide license or the control board or Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And people at Barter Island were islanded many years, many of them subsistence entirely owned fishing and hunting and many of the children came to school hungry. That one meal a day from Department of Agriculture

prepared by Issac Icoochick's wife was the only meal they had so there was no absenteeism. The Supulu's and Wilson's many of these people depend quite heavily on subsistence hunting and there in the prime spot. They could go up with there sno-go on the Hola-Hola River and in no river you can get twenty dall sheep, the game is plentyful. They tell me that with a hundred people, hunting these animals if there ever is a depletion and they'll have to kind of cut this back, but at the present time I wouldn't care if there wasn't any. They have transportation, they've got sno-go's and they can get there in an hour, if they want to go way back in the mountains its ten hours. Transporation Fel-Air Point Barrow, Joe Felder brings people into the Changler river and I don't know what he gets, but the going rate for a moose up there is \$2,500.00. How many eskimos in Point Barrow can pay this, many can't. Sure they got 2 million dollars each from the Federal Government in land and money, but most of it hasn't filtered down in the village, a good bit of it hasn't. Many of those people are just as poor as they have ever been. And there isn't as many moose or caribou around or a bear are in that area. They got to get down to the Colville River.

Linda Spain told me some time ago on Dr. Gold's V-line program would I do away with all these tags, permits, lotteries, drawings, and just have a season's length. If there isn't any moose close the season. If you get thousands of them, you can lengthen the season. Even last year you can go up on unit 26c, Barter Island, and one guy could shoot 5,000 caribou legally, and when I protested to shoot out on a Colville river to Governor Hammond's T.V. program last year right away we'll get to the enforcement people. They're not doing their job. My opinion, enforcements are doing their job 110%, they'll get you when you didn't do anything. This guide

licensing control board I've opposed that from the beginning. I ask few of the gentlemen, there's one guide in two million acres for his exclusive guiding area in the middle of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Since the Supreme Court ruled these animals belong to the American People, that means me and Steve, (inaudible) Lyle Carlson, and Chuck Grey. Chuck Grey is one of the greatest conservationist there ever was, he use to come to Barter Island for every year to take one Polar Bear and go home. Right now a guide can go from Colville river and shoot 5,000 moose if he can find them, there is no limit. If you got that many hunters or permits. The season is open for three more months. Perhaps we could limit these guides to a thousand moose or hundred or five or one. In other words if the native's of Barrow can't get enough moose to haul back to Point Barrow, this game is being decimated. It's being shot out on the Colville river and I object to this as an American, as an Alaskan. I think we should limit the season and limit each guide's to say five moose, if he can't make a commercial enterprise to hold the five moose plan, that's 5 x 2,500 dollars, then he should go out of business. Lynn Castle has bough out Bill Woggleman years ago when the Woodriver over here and has a very good going business. I admire the man - he's going out and going after the walrus. The mortorium shut him down, he went to Washington, they got it going again and I understand from talking to him, he gets a little money out of this. He doesn't make a great amount. The natives get some out of that from helping quide these people and they get the majority of the meat. So I think that this guiding can work for everybody if it's handled like that and that's the way it should be. In November I went down to Anchorage and watched the guide licensing and control board cutting up the primary's of Alaska and assigning it to guide's and I stood up and objected to this as being illegal and unethical the Federal Constitution says you can set up a monopoly. We do

this with lights and heat and with power and we also control the rate.
Gentlemen, that's it, if you any questions here?

Representative Steve Cowper: Hardy, how long is that guide system been set up has it been since statehood, or is it something we entered.

Mr. Hardy Smith: Began to guide in 1954 and not guiding continuously since then, 1968 I had to get registered if somebody went down to Juneau and then everybody's got to get registered so I had a bad time. I got my registered license.

Representative Steve Cowper: When did they start parcelling out the areas in 1968? Well most people don't even know, I don't. I saw very little in the papers. My brother called me when he came down from the Colville River area and said, "look there having a meeting in Anchorage go out and find out what's going on. I went out and read the law and they don't have to notify the guy's there parcelling this out and I received no notification. The period areas they say is this would control the game population, I don't see it because there is no limit on what the guy can do. I know Chuck Grey is a game conservationist he'll take one sheep and one moose, but he can go in a take 25 moose out of the Colville river if he's registered in that area, or 5,000. The game conservation has to come from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game as Linda Spain says from controlling the season, one day to ten days. If we don't the bids are going to take over like they did with the seal mammals. They want to do that already. One more point, I talked to the Governor's assistant and he said Governor Hammond does not have the power to fire anybody in here except his commissioners, he can fire them. Jim Brooks quit and we lost a good man in my unit,

But that man didn't have the power to go down and fire any of his people, now when the Feds ran this state as far as Fish and Game are concerned, they did a good job of it. They weren't many people that is as what we see it, population explosion to had a game population (inaudible) is wiped out.

Why? There is many reasons if we could transfer the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to ethopia to where they have open season on game wardens. We would have a better control on the system here, well we can't do that the Feds can.

Dan Rodey: First of all I would like to make a few comments, I am a guide, and I do guide on the Colville river, and in regards to comments Mr. Smith made that didn't pertain in anyway whatsoever to this topic here, all guides were issued to registered a letter and did have the opportunity to attend and take part in this very equitable sharing and no way did it in any form be tracked to many type of quote subsistence takes forcement hunting or anything else. So thats a personal problem that Mr. Smith has. I would like to make a few comments and it deals with this whole undefined thing subsistence hunting, since only one person has made an attempt to define it. I would like to offer some caution in the future. I'm afraid were going to be forced into a definition and whether it's flexible or inflexible it is merely rhetaric, but I'm sure that one will have to come up with the pending Legislature, I can see no way out of it. With that in mind I can only look to the people of Alaska, and look at the changing life style, look at the income, look at the source's of revenue, and the services in goods that all people receive native or non-native alike if we are forced into some type of definition to define subsistence, then I think we are in a very-very tragic position, because I'm sure if you take

any person in Alaska, and even today look at the services he receives and put a monitoring value on that, you would play a very difficult time trying to say that he is subsistence and quotes lives off the land. We don't, but I would like to say we do. And it's a fact we don't. I'd like to use perhaps Anaktuvik Pass, the village of Anaktuvik, as a good example, last year there was almost no caribou take from the village, yet people subsisted very well. I've been in and around Anaktuvik for quite a number of years. I believe every person in the village and I'm acquainted with the hunting and fishing of the area. Daily flights from Bettles, from Fairbanks food is brought in, this year I can't estimate the how many charters that Frontier Airlines and other flight services have made to take the natives out to Chandle Lake and other places to take them hunting and fishing. I would find this really difficult to say this is a subsistence life style. You have seen the disappearing the sled dog, replaced by the iron dog sno-machine all these things are pointing to the case economy and I don't believe that we can even, there may be a few isolated pockets of subsistence related individuals, but it won't last. It can't last more then a few years at best so I'll just throw this caution that anything that is done in regards to subsistence definition in the long run, will be tracked from all the people of Alaska. And particularly the bush residents. So I was hoping to make this the shortest comments.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Cowper, any questions?

Representative Steve Cowper: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Samuelson: Of Fairbanks. I have questions concerning our subsistence fishing in Fairbanks. Am I coming to right board? Close enough. I'd

I like to know why can't subsistence fish up here. You want to know why what? Why we can't subsistent fish, we were cut off from (inaudible) we couldn't subsistent fish at all. Then we went to someplace and then they told us that we have to go below the Woodriver and we have children in school and we can't afford to go down out of town for fishing. We fished for three days commercial fishing and they told us to go below Woodriver to do our subsistence fishing.

Representative Nels Anderson: I'm going to answer you with a question. Did you ask the Department of Fish and Game them why you couldn't fish?

Mrs. Samuelson: They said that it was cut off from Juneau or somewhere and that we can't go below the Woodriver.

Representative Nels Anderson: It came from Juneau?

Mrs. Samuelson: That is what they told us out at fish and game.

Representative Nels Anderson: This office in Fairbanks?

Mrs. Samuelson: Yes.

Representative Nels Anderson: I really can't answer the question, why, you were not allowed and I'm quite sure.

Mrs. Samuelson: And no one was allowed to subsistence fish up here. And we fish commercially for three and a half days of the year and we like to put up our fall fish for our subsistence fishing, can it and smoke it,

we pickle it and we freeze it and we pay as much money as the other fisherman do.

Representative Nels Anderson: Was it only this year or was it last year, too?

Mrs. Samuelsen: No last year we got to subsistent fish, but we also had to have a wheel built and it cost us \$500.00 and it was through the end of the year. Or it was at the end of the fishing season.

Representative Nels Anderson: The only thing I can see try to find out for you, I don't have the answer no. I don't know if there is any people here that are from the Fish and Game know that might be able to answer the question, but I don't have the answer.

David G. Kelleyhouse: I'm with the Game Division. Earlier, Fred Anderson from Commercial Fisheries was in the back of the room. I don't see him now. But you could call the office tomorrow and ask for Mr. Fred Anderson for an explanation.

Mrs. Samuelsen: Well we've been over there and we were told we could not fish. We fished three days and at 6 o'clock they told us our wheel goes off at noon. We've been over there hoping we could have a meeting where we could subsistence fish but they said we cannot just go down below Woodriver. Were eligible below Woodriver. And we cannot go down there.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well I'd like to find out why you were not

allowed to do this. How can I get in touch with you. Do you have a phone number where we can reach you?

David Kellyhouse: Yes we do.

Representative Nels Anderson: Can you give it to us please.

David Kellyhouse: 456-6195

Representative Nels Anderson: Well I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll call this Mr. Anderson tomorrow and try to find out, you know, you weren't allowed to do this.

Mr. David Kellyhouse: Well they say we are in sub-district, I don't know, from Nenana, Manley to Fairbanks. But they say the quota has been caught. And it takes a week for our fish to come up from Nenana and we're just automatically cut off. And like way down on the Yukon they caught their quota a long time ago and even for commercial fishing it is cut off way before you know, we get it. And we spend as much money as they do. I can't see why we aren't allowed to fish just like the other people. We live on our fish.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, Mrs. Samuelson, like I said I will call the Department and try to find out why they are doing this, you know, and I will call you back and try to give you some kind of an answer.

Mrs. Samuelson: There are not only us there are several families in Fairbanks. Not only the natives but there are whites that depend on it also.

Because they ask us if we have fish. And also we are only allowed 75 fish for the year. And you cannot do all that we like to do with our 75 fish you know. We dry them, we smoke them, we freeze them, we can them, we kipper them. We make salt bellies. And my family is a native family who likes fish and who likes to buy it. Salmon strips and dry fish at \$10.00 per pound. We can't afford it. We bought some from Tanana but to get it up here on the airplane it cost us \$10.50 more. And we can't afford that. My husband is retired. He works on the pipeline but he has to come back to keep our commercial license, what do you call it, free working? And that is for when there is no pipeline and he is too old to go working on the pipeline. And also he has fished all his life. For as long as I know him and that for 16 years. One year he didn't fish that was in 1974. And we went to Doyon, and they finally gave us our permit. Or we each wrote down to Juneau and we were fined \$25.00 or something for late entry or something like that. And I can't see that.

Representative Nels Anderson: Neither can I. Do you have any other comments you would like to make Bob? Steve you have any other questions? Mr. Hayes?

Gene Carlson: I would like to, I can probably answer that question in part. Member of the fishery advisory committee. So we've taken up this issue with the Department locally. And the problem comes in that a year ago they attached the subsistence fishing to the closing of the commercial fishery. And this was only for sub-unit 6. Now what happens is when they get their quota of 15,000 fish and if it happens in one day. The subsistence fishing is cut off. The logic behind this was potential use of the sale of subsistence use caught salmon roe. Their trying to regulate on the

basis its a non traditional fishery. And the population the way it is potential devistation of the resource, I guess. So that was the answer I got from the Department and we did try to get it reopened. As Mayor Gillam stated earlier we did try to get it reopened and they didn't see it fit to do this. But we have offered to work with the Department in coming up with a better system in doing this for next year.

Representative Steve Cowper: Gene, excuse me, Gene do you think is that problem going to go away say if subsistence sale of salmon roe no longer allowed. You know it keeps going along a year at a time.

Gene Carlson: Well, all I can give you is an personal opinion of the problem that I think is a tragedy we ever passed the law that allowed the sale of the subsistence slamon roe.

Representative Steve Cowper: Okay

Gene Carlson: I feel bad that we have to waste one resource to save another one, of potential uses.

Representative Steve Cowper: Okay, leave aside that if that law lapses, which it threatens to do, about every year. If that law lapses do you think the problem that led to this sudden cut of subsistence fishing in this area would that problem be solved?

Gene Carlson: No, I personally think it was a quise of which it was done. I think someone doesn't like this fishery because its a non-traditional fishery and I don't believe that was the real reason behind it at all.

Representative Steve Cowper: Okay, that's kind of what I was getting at.

Representative Nels Anderson: You've got the floor sir.

Mr. Tom Scarborough: I'm president of the Tanana Sportsman Association. You're familiar with a year ago the Arctic caribou. TSA took the initiative to protect the caribou resource. And the second thing there was to prevent the Department of Fish and Game going in there to and become a welfare agency. Our basic reason for this is we read the Alaska constitution and say where the Department of Fish and Game belongs to all Alaskans and we didn't feel they should be allowed to run certain groups on some basis and needs. That litigation is still pending and is now before the Alaskan Supreme Court. One interesting aspect of this is that some native organizations are being represented by Alaska Legal Services. I would like to question if this is entirely legal or not. It appears to me that the North Slope Borough for one can afford to hire their own attorney rather than the tax payer pay for it. And if you have any interest in that you can look into it and see why we tax payers are paying for this service. But that is apparently the case. That's all I have to say. People who wrote up the draft, I think it's HR 39 I think it's Senate Bill 1500 are aware of the provisions and lack of constitution on restrictions for subsistence. Here's a copy of it. These are applying to all the people of Alaska. They had intended to circumvent this lack of constitution with HR 39 which I think is totally incorrect. The resource cannot be allotted to one ethnic group or on an economic basis. Discouraging to some other group. The resource belongs to all of us and got to be allowed to the best interest of all the people. The only definition I have found on subsistence hunting, and that's my main expertise I guess,

is section 1605-257 which your probably familiar with. There it says, "subsistence hunting means taking of big game animals by a state resident for food or clothing for family or personal use." Now, maybe you can probably come up with a better definition and fishing will probably be added in there. If you go much further you're going to find all kinds of restraints from the Alaska constitution. Now, you have two types of subsistence. Mainly, what everybody has been talking about has referred to subsistence as a (inaudible). That's a very short term use. Maybe it's already passed. There's very few subsistence users in Alaska. There might be some in Southeast, living on the coast. But I don't think there is any place else. The types of subsistence you really have to deal with is also psychological. The psychological need for subsistence. That's the type we're going to have to deal with in the future and the urban resident probably has a bigger need for this than the rural resident that lives with it every day. I'm not sure how you're going to cope with this but this is the type of subsistence that the (inaudible) play. Mental need to get back to what your ancestors did possibly. Their cultural way of life. That doesn't necessarily mean you have to take and eat the big game. I do think you're going to have to deal with some type of definition of subsistence. I don't see how this is going to get anyplace unless you have some concept to work within. And with that you're going to have to define what is modern day subsistence or are you going to define it on a level 10 years or 20 years ago? If you're going to discuss it at that level, HR 39 discuss it as of 1971., December of 1971.

The reason for this, is the modern day hunter and fisherman is very different today than he was 10 years ago. Particularly 20 years ago. And now with the modern snow machine we've got modern air access, modern car

fleet, modern fish net. And this can go on. I think of all of this the first consideration is going to have to be the resource itself. That's number one priority, the protection of the resource. Alaska Constitutional restraints will have to be observed when you start making priorities on what your going to have to do with that resource. The best interest of the wildlife owners are also going to have to be taken into account. And you know that the urban residents as well as the rural residents own that wildlife. Both their interests are going to have to be protected. None of your efforts on this subsistence issue will be any benefit unless you protect that resource. Part of that protection is going to have to be enforcement. Now, I'm not so sure that our enforcement division is doing all that bad a job right now. I think the biggest failure is probably in penalties put out by the court system. The second problem is the non-enforcement by the Feds. Particularly on waterfowl and marine mammals. They have a long history in this and particularly rural people of the State have learned that in all likely hood they won't be bothered. So I would like to recommend that you consider an educational program statewide starting at the elementary level to start education our young people on the proper use of the resources. Than maybe in a few years they will start to understand why we use management techniques. Sportsmen have asked for this for some time and no action has been taken. Unless an educational program is started particularly in some areas in the bush, we're not going to get anywhere. You can pass all the laws you want. And no way are they going to enforce them. Because there is no way you're going to convict somebody say in the bush area where his peers have to be selected as is jury. The legal (inaudible) is all ready aware of this.

I noticed in the paper when, where you're talking about hunting, the

department enforcement are well aware of where they are hunting and where they hunt from and are able to manage this. The Department of Fish and Game except commercial fish that's down the tunnel. Enforcement would greatly appreciate having somebody help them with this task funding the Department. However, I think you'll find the Sportsmen have a pretty good track record. You won't find any place the resource has been depleted by sportsmen. There may be other reasons. Not only fishing resource but I think if you look back on the record, nation wide, you will find this to be true. Nels also said the game is for sale. I don't think that this is quite true. Maybe some people have looked at it that way. But a lot of these funds are used for non-fish and game. They manage falcons, song birds and a few other things like this. Obviously, the Department is probably against the people who pay the salary and need them the most. And maybe this is why they want to get their salary some other way. Also, we have a little argument with the State about 25¢ license. People who buy those license don't pay their fair share either. Somebody else has to pay their way. And I suspect that the majority, I suspect that, they put out 5,000 of these last year and I don't know how they distribute that. They probably equally from Fairbanks, Anchorage and the bush. I think you'll find that the sportsman know - they pretty good - (inaudible) We were putting up red flags in the Western Arctic Caribou herd - 1973, we were ignored. We did the same thing on moose, in (inaudible) and we were ignored, but we were telling the Department and the Board of Game that problems were occurring. Nothing happened until there was a crises. We've got a lot of crisis in management right now, maybe that can be corrected. A good example of animal (inaudible) for sale would be Dall sheep, and that's the only animal we have got the same number as we had 10 years ago. We have an equal chance to get Dall sheep as we did 10

years ago. I can't think of any other animal in the State right off.

Rosita Worl: My name is Rosita Worl, I've been up on the North Slope for the past 2 years doing scientific investigation on the political development of the North Slope Inupiat. Part of my work led me to an investigation of the traditional political elite of the area which involve the whaling complex. From there, I developed a further study into subsistence. I want to set your mind at ease right now, I'm not going to try to define subsistence however, I will try to bring to you some of the variables that I think are important in the consideration of subsistence. I'd like to say first of all, that I agree with Mr. Wiese of the Interior Wildlife Association, that subsistence is not a welfare system, and that subsistence should be based on a natural, increment level. The occupation of Alaska by Alaska Natives has been based on the harvest of it's natural resources and therefore it's within their interests to insure the continued use, the continued availability of it's resources and I think that this is present in the minds of people on a very conscious level, so I see no conflict within that idea, however I do disagree that subsistence is at an end. And in fact my work within the last two years has shown that subsistence is a viable activity within the rural Alaska. I do want to say that I think that many of us are of the popular misconceptions that have stemmed from a social scientific thought and that was that there is a movement from a subsistence base to a cash resource economy. My work has shown that there is a interrelationship not a unilineal progression at all. But there is an interrelationship between the old and the new and that subsistence activity is as viable today as it was in the past. And I think my definition or my understanding of subsistence is well founded in the policy that our Congress adopted within

the National Environmental Act, whereby they recognized, whereby Congress recognized that economic activities, that industrial expansion occurs within the social and cultural context and so the United States adopted a mandate to protect its cultural and social environment. Just as comparably, subsistence occurs within a social and cultural context.

I just want to briefly define the aspects of subsistence. I said there's social, cultural and there's economics. Most of the focus has been on economics. Economic insofar as legislative regulations of land access or regulation on the resources. Today, we have a third element within the economic aspect and that is a relationship with a cash economy. It's true that there is no subsistence that exist without a use of some cash. In my work I found that this is where we enter into the social aspect of subsistence. I have found that there are three basic functions within the social elements. You have your subsistence harvester, your person who is actually going out, very active and obtaining the subsistence. You have your subsistence user, those who are recipients of subsistence products and those can include the subsistence harvester, and also people who are not able to go out and get the subsistence products themselves. Very forcefully, that includes your elderly and your aging. Then the third aspect, it could be a person or just a function, is your financial cash or your financial support. Sometimes it is the man that earns who earns \$20,000 who is supporting subsistence activities and this is where the difference you know that I see that between the person that is making \$20,000 in Fairbanks and the person who is earning \$20,000 in the bush. The bush, I have found the person who is earning \$20,000 by most standards, he should be a middle income person, but when you look at the kind of way of life that he has he seems like he is very poor. When you begin to

look at it you find out that this man who is earning \$20,000 is supporting other kinds of subsistence activities. The subsistence products that are obtained are distributed throughout the community so that's his social, that is your social welfare system. The man is providing the cash either for his hunting partner or maybe part for his own activities. The subsistence products are then in turn redistributed around the community and often it goes beyond the community. I think within the North Slope we can demonstrate very concretely, that subsistence products are shipped from Barrow to Point Hope, Point Hope down to the Kobuk area. For the last two years, if it hadn't been for the interrelationship between the communities, I think you would have had some villages that were starving within the Interior and I'm specifically talking about Anaktuvuk Pass. The North Slope people gathered together and they did ship some of the marine mammals and resources that they had obtained into Anaktuvuk. So there's this kind of distribution and the sharing that is very real, that is part of the cultural system. I would also submit and probably it's not a criticism against the State but your welfare system is not working in the bush. It is not available in the bush. It is not the stupidity of the client that he is not able to obtain welfare or welfare products. It's because it's just not available in the bush. And I think that was really demonstrated in our caribou crises in the North Slope. The North Slope would have liked to have declared it a disaster, it was a disaster, and because of the efforts from the North Slope they were able to get a minor food stamp program up there, which I understand is not going to be available any longer. I'm not too clear on the administrative set up and how they are doing it but I know that the bush area is not being served by your social services, and believe me it is not the stupidity of the recipients.

The cultural aspects of subsistence is really difficult to define but it is I think people living in the Fairbanks area are probably the most close to what is the cultural relationship. Somebody talked about it as a psychological relationship. There is a very special relationship between the subsistence person, be it the user, the harvester or the supporter. There is a very special relationship between those persons and their environment and their resources. To some of you, it may be manifested in the arts, the symbolic relationship, but nevertheless, it's as real as some of the symbolic, religious objects that many western religions have. So, it is very difficult to define, but there is a very special relationship. I would like to recommend that the State recognize that subsistence is a cultural heritage, just as our resources are a natural heritage, and I think that we could do that by adopting the format of the National Environmental Policy Act. And, also I think the State has adopted the State Fish and Game has adopted a very liberal definition of subsistence. The policy statement is not in effect, but I think it is a useful beginning for you. I think that the State has already enacted legislation that favors special interests. I'm not going to go into the details, but my understanding of your limited entry concept where persons get points and they are able to go out and get their permit. I think if we can adopt a priority system and the final thing that I wanted to say about the State is that the attention should not only be the carrying capacity of the study of animals itself, I think there are other things happening out there in the environment out there in the bush where you're finding the resources and there are some changes that are occurring right now to the habitat which may be detrimental to the resources itself.

I think the game management report is negligent in glossing over those

kinds of impact. They talk about probable or future impacts of certain kinds of development. I have a feeling and I can't document it scientifically but I've been up around there to know there have been changes there to the environment and I think some of the focus of the state should be to find out what's happening to our environment that's affecting the natural resource.

Representative Steve Cowper: Well, I'd like to commend you for a very helpful and articulate statement. I would like to just speaking personally, I have an awful hard time with a notion that people who traditionally been subsistence users ought to go on welfare, I have a hard time with that one. I think there's more life in clipping one of those stamps or whatever that is. There's more to the subsistence lifestyle than meat on the table too. One of the congressmen who came up with the Congressional Subcommittee on the D-2 Legislation suggested in his opinion subsistence hunting and fishing was no longer necessary because of the food stamp program. I thought that was an interesting comment, I disagree with it very heartily.

Senator Pat Rodey: Rosita, in determining how we're going to manage subsistence as been proposed with income be used as a guideline. Do you favor a one to one relationship between income and some subsistence right whatever that might be and if not what relationship should there be between income and subsistence rights.

Rosita Worl: I think if you regulate based on income, then you're going to regulate subsistence out of existence because just my research on the

North Slope and within Southeast, my own personal experience in southeast and my knowledge of other areas is that it is your Umialik, your rich man who is an important person in providing access to subsistence harvests so if you should say that a man is earning \$20,000, it was really demonstrated last year what happened with the caribou when permits were granted on need. As it turned out, permits were granted to people who often didn't have the means to go out and get the caribou so they in turn had to conscript someone who had the money to go out and get the caribou for him and then that in turn was distributed to the families. So your unit can't be to individuals. That's my personal opinion - that if you legislate subsistence on individual basis then you're going to legislate it out of existence. It's a social activity.

Senator Pat Rodey: Do you favor any use whatsoever on income as a criteria for subsistence rights. Does it have a role.

Rosita Worl: Well, I think that would have to be qualified, you know, I certainly couldn't say that a man who is living in Fairbanks or a Native person who is living in Fairbanks making \$50,000 - that he should be able to go like a sportsman, I think it needs to be qualified. I think at this point, I go along with the concept, local determination, they know who are the subsistence contributors.

Mr. Bud Wiese: Mr. Chairman, I think her paper was excellent and I'd like to have her make a letter, in the form of a letter or something that I could get a copy of it for the board and for myself.

Representative Nels Anderson: This will be transcribed and we could make a

copy of this available to you.

Mr. Bud Wiese: What would I have to do to get this.

Representative Nels Anderson: Just get your name and address and we'll ship it to you.

Mr. Gene Carlson: My name is Gene Carlson, I live in Fairbanks, and I came here with no prepared testimony (inaudible) So if I confuse you think nothing of it cause I'm already confused. First, I would like to say that I definitely believe in subsistence not perhaps as the people in the bush do because I really think things are changing so that the same need is not there. At least at the magnitude that it was before. But I believe in subsistence not on a traditional or cultural basis. I think we're all Alaskans and many of us came here for the same reasons that the Natives like living here. We came here perhaps to live off the land. The need isn't as great for one as the other. I have a tremendous need. I go to Chitina every year to get my subsistence fish. I have as much need for that for my family as anybody else. I wouldn't starve without it, that's true, but neither would anybody else I don't believe.

I'd like to first go back to a question somebody posed about prioritizing the management of the resource. I don't think you can just speak to the Fish and Game both because they're totally different. In the fishing industry, I would prioritize management in that the commercial industry should be the first to be managed down. And I say that because it has by far the greatest potential of devastating the resource. For another reason, that the resource of the State are according to the constitution, they're I

forget what the exact words are, for the common people. I think in the fishing industry you would have to start with the commercial industry. To say that the commercial industry should be allowed 95% and the rest of the people 5% - to me is absurd, I can't even believe that.

Definition of subsistence, I could live with the word subsistence. The only time I've run into a problem with that is when I talk to the Board of Fisheries and they are the ones who seem to have a problem with the word. For the simple reason they want to use the definition. They want to use the word for traditional or cultural purposes. They're doing here in Fairbanks, this isn't a traditional fishery therefore the people in Fairbanks aren't entitled to it. And I think that's totally out of line. Which brings to mind a thing that legislatively can be done perhaps. I don't know, maybe it'll have to be done by initiative or something. I don't believe in the new concepts of regional boards than at any time of the history of Fish and Game management in the State of Alaska. On the other hand, the way it is right now with the Governor appointing all of the members of the board we ended up with a commercial Fish Board. We didn't have a fisheries board, we had a commercial Fish Board. Therefore, the subsistence user has not a chance, the sport fisherman, who also eats his fish, so that to a degree is subsistence he hasn't a chance. You couldn't go talk to those people, it is like talking to a wall, unless you had a commercial interest. What could be done about that? There could be legislation passed that would perhaps mandate that the Governor could not appoint a majority of commercially interested people to a State Board or commission. This would seem to me to take care of the problem. Then you would not have this lopsided monopoly on any board that is supposed to serve the entire public of Alaska. So, to me, that is one of the most important

things that needs to be done. And I'm not quite sure how it's going to get done but I do believe that's the first priority. Now, and I don't say this with malice, it's simply that my belief in what the Native Land Claims settlement Act was all about - the intent was to make all things equal, to make Native Alaskans equal with non-Native Americans and everybody equal as Americans, not black Americans, not white Americans, not Native Americans, but Americans. Therefore, they, in the claims, for what they got for this equality, the right, the cultural and traditional right were given up - not that they can't continue some of their traditional lifestyles because they can, but the traditional and cultural rights to the game and the resources of the State were given up for this equality and I believe fully that their desire was to be an equal part in the American society. So, and it states in there that these were given up. So I believe that was the intent and I don't understand why we continue with this ethnic lines of distinction, I think that that is a wrong thing to do. I came here of my own free will to the State of Alaska, that doesn't make me any better than somebody that lives here by accident of birth because he was born here but certainly, I think, I feel, that it entitles me to more than a one-quarter Alaskan Native that has never seen the State of Alaska. They live in New York City or Pennsylvania or someplace and have never seen the State of Alaska. But that isn't the way it is. We're supposed to all be equal. The first priority, I think I would have to go back to what you manage game for? You first manage it for the resource itself, I believe. The lady said that's not true, but if you don't everybody ends up with nothing. If you don't give first consideration for the game population.

One other thing the legislature could do and here again we're back to

protection. I put in a proposal to the Board of Game and Board of Fish a couple of years ago that went no where, and rightfully so, because it is a legislative thing and that is to make, first, redefine what is wanton waste, not that I intend to waste that animal when I shot him or something else but and make wanton waste a felony charge. Not a misdemeanor that's punishable by a slap on the hand if we're; and this applies to everybody, this applies to subsistence users, sport users, commercial users. So in the event that you have a year, I can't recall the year when the commercial fishing industry goes out and rapes the resource. Why millions and millions of fish more than the canneries can take and they rot and they go dump them back in the ocean. That's wanton waste as far as I'm concerned. They had no business to start with, if the canneries couldn't accept them. And this is their responsibility to know. Not just go out and rape the resource and then waste them. So I think this should be made a felony charge and this will have to be legislatively done. Then we have to have the protection to back it up. I've been told it would be a waste of time to make it a felony charge cause you can't prosecute anyway, so true. But we don't stop trying to prosecute just because some people get off the hook. Otherwise we'll just open the jail cells and turn everybody lose. One feller earlier said that you should have to be an Alaskan resident for five years or be an Alaskan Native. I just think that, that is the most ridiculous statement I have ever heard. For the simple reason like these to think that a one-quarter Alaska Native that's never seen the State of Alaska, back to that again, should have the right to come back here and because he's Alaska Native go out here to subsistence life style is beyond me. I can't cope with that. To me that makes no sense whatsoever. We're all Alaskans and I think subsistence can be regulated, not defined, but regulated so it doesn't have to go out of

existence. I've heard tell of some areas where they have no limits. I disagree with the no limit life style, I can't even say how much. We go to Chitina and the criteria down there is for the head of the household you're allowed, it changes each year, but we'll say 20 salmon, a family person is allowed 40 salmon. This is for anybody, any Alaskan, a resident Alaskan, who is down there dipping. For the other people that have the need, an honest welfare, I'll throw that term out because we've heard it hashed over enough tonight, an honest need for more salmon than that. They have established a higher limit to them. I disagree with the limit they've established because I don't think that anybody could eat 500 salmon in one year. When I think of subsistence I think of what you're going to eat, I don't agree with feeding it to dogs. So but the limit could be based on a reasonable edibility situation. Can this family of 10 people eat 250 salmon in a year, 300 salmon in a year, there could be some criteria such as this established that would set limits and take away this nonsense of being allowed to go take, I heard a figure of 40,000 salmon, by one individual that was selling salmon roe, now I tell you it takes a lot for me to cope with anybody catching 40,000 salmon. Maybe they did, I really can't say, but if you're catching more than you can eat then you're either selling them or your're taking the roe and selling the roe and in that case you're throwing the salmon back in so I don't understand how anybody could know if they caught 40,000 salmon, we do know that it's happening. If you had a good limit, that wouldn't happen and here again I believe that the board should make these determinations. I don't like legislative intervention in the fish and game matters anymore than absolutely necessary and that's only when the board is not being responsive to public needs. One more thing, I don't believe in geographical qualifications either. I don't believe that you can say that, if I believe

that I would have to say that people of Chitina or Cordova could say that I can't go down there and catch my fish. I don't believe that at all. If you ever established that, you would say that any village at the mouth of the river could set their own regulations, they have first crack at all the fish. They could take them all which happens to a degree right now but I think we'll get around that eventually so there will be a fair distribution of all the fish. So I really don't think that geographical qualifications will be meaningful at all. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Dave Snarski: My name is Dave Snarski and I'm here representing Alaska Conservation Society. With the Chairman's permission I have several copies of testimony said at other hearings that I would like to submit. And also a statement from a person that couldn't be here tonight. In the interest of making things move along a little faster, I have a policy paper on lifestyle, subsistence hunting and the D-2 lands. I just would like to read the summary (inaudible). The broad spectrum of lifestyles practiced by Alaskans contributes to it's uniqueness among the 50 states and adds diversity to American society at large. Within this spectrum there is an array of Alaskan and subsistence lifestyles that consists of a complex mixture of traditionally and traditionally non-native elements. There is therefore no rational or fair basis for defining an Alaskan nor a subsistence lifestyle. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering of natural foods are pursuits that figure prominently in virtually the whole spectrum of Alaska lifestyle, however, there are (inaudible) with respect to these pursuits, a single individual which often exploits living resources for different reasons at different times. Consequently, attempts distinguish among commercial, subsistence, and recreational hunting and fishing, trapping or gathering as practiced by many Alaskans have been unsuccessful. Different

lifestyles have different impacts on land use and resources. Alaska lifestyles and subsistence uses, in particular are less disruptive and less destructive than any other lifestyle and uses. Subsistence uses are a natural part of Alaska's wild country and should be provided for on national interest lands except set aside as national Parks or National Monuments. Other line management such as park reserves or refuges are more compatible to subsistence uses and natural resources. Land in Alaska is being divided into smaller and smaller parcels under variety of ownerships resulting in (inaudible) of management goals and policies. This trend is generally incompatible with the conditions (inaudible) for many lifestyles in Alaska, could lead to the destruction of these lifestyles and the integrity existing ecosystems. An on precedent of the level of coordination and cooperation among federal, State and private use will be needed to overcome this trend. The wildlife population and the habitats they depend upon do not have boundaries that coincide with the existing Federal, State and private lands nor those lands proposed for inclusions in the four systems, Section 17 (d)(2) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. For this reason, as well as the fact that legally and historically the State of Alaska has had the responsibility for wildlife management, The Alaska Conservation Society believes that the basic existing regulatory regime of hunting, trapping, and fishing is most appropriate properly conserved and protected issue in Alaska. However, since Federal agencies have legal responsibilities under existing national laws and international treaties and have now and will have in the future management habitat responsibilities continuing federal and State coordination and cooperation. ACS appreciates the opportunity.

Representative Nels Anderson: I have a question. You made reference to a

recommendation, national parks and so forth, and I'm not really quite sure what you were; what was your intent.

Mr. Dave Snarski: The society feels that National Parks, as National Parks, should be closed to hunting.

Marion Hao: My name is Marion Hao, I've been a resident of Fairbanks on and off for the past eight years, working and going to school. I came here mainly tonight as an interested citizen and learn what Fairbanks residents would have to say about the topic of discussion. And I decided I wanted to come forth and say what I have to say. I'll attempt to be organized about what I'm going to share with you, however I did not come with any prepared statement. And maybe wanted to come forth and add a personal good (inaudible) To show that when you talk about subsistence, you talk about those rural areas that you are really dealing with human beings and this will attempt to show that you just cannot categorize any one people into one area and I felt there were some statements tonight that tend to be blanket statements and also what I have to say hopefully will perhaps add a little bit of understanding. People that make blanket statements tend to show lack of understanding and experience and any time a blanket statements are made it is unfair at all. This is going to be personal so that have an appreciation for what it's like to say for subsistence wise.

I was born and raised in St. Lawrence Island, Savoonga. I came away from the Island to go to school and I have decided to live in the mainland for my own interests. Anyway, subsistence living has been really a personal way of life with me. I don't think I would be - well, St. Lawrence Island has always been traditionally a very ocean harvested area but also

people depend very heavily on the walrus, that was the main staple, back there when you were talking about staples, you usually talking about potatoes or rice, but to me when I think about staple, I think about walrus. I grew up on the walrus, not until I started going to school did I realize that there were foods that were foreign to the area. We were served lunches that were, at that time, were very unfamiliar like vegetables, meats that were different. When you talk about subsistence, I've heard people say that it's just undefinable, that it's all psychological, I thought perhaps that's what I've heard tonight. Okay, when you talk about subsistence, you're talking about seasons, you're talking about the knowledge acquired in going about this subsistence living, you're talking about land, you're talking about knowledge of the land. The way I grew up was very traditional in that, when men did the hunting, the women stayed at home. They were the ones that did the gathering and the utilizing. We seemed to make these subsistence statements about subsistence hunters that seem to have negative thoughts about the rural area. I would have more respect for what they say if they would realize what really takes place out there. The language, the whole process of it all. When the men go out hunting, they have, they know the weather, they have to know the ocean, the movements. You go out, not on any day, if you just happen to feel like going out hunting the walrus in just one day, it just doesn't happen that way, you have to read the skies, try to read how the weather is going to be like for the day. By the way sometimes you come across so that I could be understood but when I get nervous and try to come in such a way that I perspire, I get all jumbled up so you have to be patient with me.

Anyway, and the movements of the water, the ice, it's all interrelated with what subsistence hunting is, you know, when you go out and you're getting

into lead that is bad for that day, you could get stranded out there for days. Okay, I'm trying to bring that there is an appreciate, there can be an appreciation of all the world of subsistence hunting is. I'm trying to explain this not with acquired knowledge myself, although I've lived around it, it was not available to me. So when you talk about subsistence hunting you talk about acquired knowledge over years, acquired language, acquired understanding and close appreciation of nature. Okay, when you're talking about hunting the walrus, you're talking about the movements of the walrus, you're talking about appreciation of nature because it is something that is not predictable. To talk about the complexity of it all, with the different language say in the area that I cam from where the language if it were defined into the English language would very easily be termed technical, very technical. So I think those are important to realize.

When you talk about subsistence hunting you're talking about seasons, okay, you talk about walrus which is the main food of the Island but you supplement the main staple seasonally with like during the fall it's bird hunting time, all kinds of birds, adn some seal hunting, and during the winter, there is also hunting at the ice. Okay, you have to know areas of the ice, I understand by looking at the ice you know which areas are eaiser to cut through, in other words the thickness of the ice. You acquire that knowledge by going out, okay, during the winter there is seal hunting also through the ice, and during the spring is walrus hunting again, and whale hunting, by the way up there north country, St. Lawerence Island including, the ice does not go away until June. Okay, the snow and the ice does not go away until June. During the spring, the later part of the spring we do egg gathering, where you have to climb and comb the cliffs around the Island, certain parts of the island, so when you're talking about subsistence hunting

you're talking about the seasons also. Away from the ocean, the land you talk about greens, all kind of greens, that are picked and preserved for the winter and then the berries, I grew up with my grandparents so I'll never forget going out every spring from morning until about 5 o'clock going with my grandmother every day during the spring to gather greens and berries preserved for the winter.

Incidentally, we did have a store where the ship came once a year with supplies from the outside. Incidentally, these were the kinds of food mainly canned or dried hardly any fresh stuff. The store still now is a Co-op store, where the men, whoever does use the tusks of the walrus, the ivory, they carve it to a saleable item in exchange for goods in the store. It is mainly fuel or shells or whatever for their guns. Those go mainly for help in the hunt. The can goods are kind of side dishes that are like dessert or special that add to the traditional food. Like I say the way that I grew up was very traditional and where the food even today, the main food, is the walrus and the meats and all the others that I mentioned.

The very first time I was going to go off the island, I realized how different it was from that little world because my parents started training me how to eat these other kinds of food that I was not aware of. For the first time I realized that they really cared for me, because they were taking the time to train me how to eat these other kinds of foods. They started buying these can goods, that we normally do not eat from the store, like beets and green beans and so on, all of a sudden I realized that things were not always how it was it back home, you know. They said because I would have to go away for awhile to the mainland, to the hospital, that I would have to live off of their food for awhile, and I would have to learn

to like it. That would be the food that would be the food that would be available at that place that I was going to. It was kind of frightening because it was all so different and when I came to the mainland at the hospital, that little bit of training that I received at home was not enough because for the first time I ate foods I never liked. To show how much difference I had to resort to, you know common foods like bananas, like eating a banana for the first time it always stays with me the memory. You know, such strange food you know, as a child, it is kind of dramatic so I tried very hard, and because of these foods that we were eating during that time, at the mainland were different, we tried very hard to like them, to learn to like them and we were not aware at this time that a lot of Americans did not eat all that they were given. We would feel so guilty, and that they would look down on us, so we would struggle through a tray full of food, hospital food, you should remember. We were always taught to eat all that we were given, we would struggle through all of this tray full of hospital food. Whenever we didn't like anything, like trying to say the banana for the first time, because it was so new and because that we thought the rest of America ate all that they were given, not liking the food that you have tasted for the first time, you just could not see struggling through finishing it. Like the banana, we would wrap up what food that was left, wrap in paper towels and throw in a can and you talk about conservation and that one gentleman said well, conservation should be taught in the schools and I wonder whether he realized that maybe it should be, if he supposing teaching conservation in the schools, then it should start from waste of food that America does.

Anyway, what I'm attempting to do is; okay, it is a personal side to political issues, we tend to forget that there is really, that you're really

dealing with human issues. There is a human side to every issue. I also realize a lot of times especially when all of Alaska is becoming very political and that with every issue the groups of the people that are heard that are the ones that are more vocal, more articulate, they have the power to be heard and I wanted to try to add some different viewpoints that would remind us of that we really dealing with people and I'm not sure if I'm coming across all that real. but.

And during the years that I've lived in Fairbanks I've tried to observe the actions, where the people have to say, I have noticed how it's such a big issue for people to be Alaskans come election time, especially in Fairbanks. I noticed how it so very important that the person is an Alaskan. I've lived here for how many years, and I'm an Alaskan. Therefore it is something special, it gets almost to the point where being an Alaskan means you're a special somebody, who is especially understanding, and especially kind in all matters. It gets almost down to that tone. But I've also noticed where those people that say this will turn around and try to make a difference between themselves and the rest of Alaska including the rural areas and those groups of people that are termed Alaska Natives. They say everything is equal, we're all Alaskans but there's a lot of those that are quick to make a difference between Alaskans and Alaskan Natives. Sometimes it gets to the point where it doesn't seem fair because there's always that difference and sometimes there are perhaps, there are remarks made that are a little bit different than the viewpoints that are used to being heard. Then perhaps, there could be a better understanding of that even with all of the parents' differences that what really comes down to it, you know. You're all feeling with (inaudible) This is what I think I'm trying to say, I'm not sure what kind of (inaudible) arriving at but I

realize that in a very awkward way, I'm trying to come across and try to show that dealing with issues people that (inaudible) try to make generalizations in the long run, you're not really being fair about it. If people are going to make statements, I believe there has to be firsthand experience and understanding before statements are made which are directed at a group or an area or say Ethnic groups, that there is never ever one definition that can be directed at these groups or areas. I guess that's how I...

Representative Joe Hayes: I just like to say that I appreciate your sharing your experiences with us, I certainly gained some insight into subsistence living based on what you told us about your experience and I think you came across very well. I got your message.

Marion Hao: Like Mr. Wiese tonight, I think mentioned his name, was very proud that he had not bought any meat the years that he has lived in Alaska. And this shows the intelligence and adaptability of people. Okay, when people talk of how subsistence, there's some people that mentioned, subsistence living is no longer here, if that is the case then maybe somebody should go around try to educate these people who are living a subsistence lifestyle which goes into the area of eating certain kinds of foods being used to eating certain kinds of foods and if there is no longer subsistence lifestyle then somebody should go around teaching these different people how to start eating foods that are what the general Americans eat and that would be a little touchy area because I've heard stories from long ago, say like the language used to be discouraged. It seems like that kind of touches into that area. Maybe somebody should be appointed to go around to the villages and how to acquire tastes for big macs, say. When you are talking

about these things like you're talking about - you know people.

Mr. Chris Anderson: My comments are also unprepared and short due to the lateness of the hour, I have to go to work tomorrow for subsistence. These comments, I just jotted down here during the last couple of hours and some of the major comments that I have to make is that on subsistence itself, I really don't think that it should be defined at this time, or probably not defined at all. For the simple reasons of everybody has got their own definition, every association or whatever has their own definition of subsistence and it is also an impossible task. I'm pretty sure a lot of the people that take different issues and different sides of the big issue of subsistence you know, (inaudible) at this point in time, because of the subsistence term with that definition is being used, or whatever guidelines or bills or legislation that comes about. I also think that the Federal government and also the State government should get together somehow in a meeting, (inaudible) if necessary, to find out, to set some guidelines that will be the same on some of the D-2 land some of the private lands, you know the state is going to (inaudible) Enforcement is very important, it is also necessary to help data collection. I do think that enforcement is a priority (inaudible). If enforcement does its job, I think you'll find out just exactly what's happening. For those of you who have any comments.

Mr. David Hawthorne: I'm working on this subsistence study in the National Petroleum Reserve on the North Slope that is mandated by Section 105 (c) of the National Petroleum Reserve Act and I just wanted to share some

of my perceptions of the definition of subsistence. In a completely, unofficial way, because that's something that I'm kinda pounding my head against the wall on too. I kind of got a feeling that if people from Alaska don't have some sort of at least, vague definition that somebody from D.C. is going to have a definition one of these days, that may not be as good as what (inaudible) One of my feelings is that in consideration of defining subsistence in terms of Natives is a viable alternative, not Native in a racial sense, not saying you know, let me see your genealogy. But, Native in terms of people who are involved in a culture that is a hunting culture, whatever their genetic background. The reason I say this is because in my work in Nuiqsuk this summer and previous work in other places in the Arctic. The guy from the village who's, (inaudible) from a particular point who goes across the tundra looking for something. There's a lot of stuff up there. When I first went to the Arctic and looked, it was kind of white, and there were rocks sticking out, there just didn't seem to be a whole lot, but there are stories, there's graves, sodhouses, and there's a whole bunch of things that a lot of people don't appreciate. I think that's a type of land use that is much more intensive than outsiders and I think that some analysis or some thought about that. You know, the fact that they use it more intensively because there's a lot of stuff there that the people from the outside don't see. Also, for cultural reasons, you know, the history is not something that's remote from the villages, because there are all those things out there. The history is out there, it's not in a book. You know you can go out and look at the history because you can go across the river from Nuiqsuk and see or (inaudible) various villages and you know get a million stories.

There's a couple of things that I think will have to, that everybody's

going to have to be very careful of defining subsistence. That's defining in economic terms and in technological terms. The thing about the Native people, in the Arctic, that I see, is that they have become very admired by people all over the world for their ability to adapt. They continued to adapt over the last 100 years, coming in contact with people from Europe and America, as any smart person would. I think that if we have a definition based on income, on technology that would eventually favor hunting activities by non-Native people who are dropouts from their own society or who are rejecting their own society, who are going out to live for romantic reasons. The thing that I have been struck by, or have always been struck by is that subsistence is not a steady thing today to people. It's not a recreation, it's not a game, you know, as it is a game for some person who comes from Los Angeles buys the dog feed and (inaudible) across the tundra. You know, even if he does it for 30 years I think there's a different perception of what's going on and I think that we have to think about that and we have to realize that subsistence system and subsistence conflicts in the villages are so perceptive and are very adaptive, people. They use snow-mobles almost exclusively it doesn't make sense and if I think people are penalized for doing something that makes sense people that use the land to play games well for aesthetic reasons, are eventually going to have the upper hand for land use. Just a couple of my perceptions on the history of the North Slope might be relevant of what I am talking about. There's this notion that there's a subsistence economy, and there's a cash economy and the good old days, people you know were real subsistors and now they've been corrupted because they have snow-mobles and they have access to cash. I think if we look at least on the Arctic Slope over the last hundred years, we see that there's been definite dual economy, there has been cash components, there has been subsistence components in the economy.

In 1860, the whalers came, there was thousands of people from Boston in whaling ships that wintered over on Barter Island, Hershel Island. Native people were involved with this. They traded, they got money, they ordered from Sears Catalogs, for goods that they wanted and also they got guns, at first it was (inaudible) Muskets. This was an adaptation that made good sense, so people did it. So the subsistence complex changed as it had 1200 A.D. when the Tuna Culture invented whaling. Okay, then whaling decreased, (inaudible) people got a hold of high powered rifles which worked better than muskets, they made sense, so they used them, because they're smart people. Also, because they had high powered rifles, they could start using bigger dog teams, which is not a precontact generalization. Pre-contact, much more than post-contact. There's this whole notion that the trapping era on the North Slope was the "Good old Days". Well, it wasn't. It was the result (inaudible) how many people were out to make money by getting (inaudible) they had to have a lot of dogs, they had to shoot a lot of game to feed their dogs. In fact they were using a lot more resources than (inaudible) When wage labor was introduced people could have more outboard motors, they could have snow-mobiles, they continued to get the things that they've always needed but it was more effecient and a lot of people could spend less time on the land. The need didn't decrease but the time on the land decreased because the harvest was made effecient and here again people are smart. Why should a guy down in Washington, where I'm from, sell his combine and go back to his horses. I think, it's real analagous, I don't think, in setting up a definition of a people who are adapted, to be analyzed because they aren't living in a way that is aesthetically pleasing to the people who like to buy postcards in Alaska.

Mary Binkley: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman and members. I'm Mary

Binkley, I'm here, I'm not a fisherman. I'm here to speak for friends of ours on the Tanana River and this very local area who are friends and many are Athabascans. But it's a non-ethnic problem here and it has been mentioned earlier in the evening by I think by Mayor Gillam earlier, and also my Mr. Samuelson, and it just concerns this local discrimination possibly against the fisherman in this area. There are regulations in the booklet put out by the Board of Fish and Game that says that very definite limits and very small numbers of salmon that are allowed to be caught in this area. And then in the subsistence fishing there was a new regulation that was just added last year and I think that what Mrs. Samuelson was referring to, it's on page 17 of the book. The restrictions, and it's number 15, which says, in section 6 (c) of Sub-district 6, which is north of the Wood River, between here and Nenana on the Tanana, salmon may not be taken following the closure of the commercial salmon fishing season and so that means as soon as the commercial fishing season is over, there is no subsistence fishing. The people in this district just got to fish a very few days and further down the river, maybe 40 miles from here. They were allowed to catch unlimited amounts of subsistence fish. So the fishermen in this area feel that it's very unfair to have put that in and most of them were not even aware of it, when it was added last year and I think it was added at the suggestion of the local Fish and Game Division here. So I just wanted to get it in the records, and I have nothing to do myself with fishing other than we operate a tour boat that goes down river and we have known many of these people for years, one party for 28 years and he has always fished, depended on it for a lot of income for himself plus his own personal use.

Mr. Jonathan Soloman: My name is Jonathan Solomon I'm from the Yukon Flats.

The Committee - looking at a definition of subsistence and prioritizing regional game hunting areas and this sort of thing are inclined to forget that our fore father in the State of Alaska has divided the State of Alaska in game management, a long time ago. Longer than (inaudible) exists between the (inaudible) of billages and the regions of the natives in Alaska. The boundary lines of the Eskimo people, the Interior Indians, the Tlingits, the Aleuts, has been defined by the Native people before the whiteman ever came. In looking toward regions of subsistence areas, the committee should look toward the Native people, the older people that are still alive, that tell us these things that people are there. And this is where when you want to define game management boundary lines, the committee should look toward the rural people and their elders. Because in the Yukon Flats, and other areas, they seem to know about these things because I've heard it from my grandfathers, my father, my father heard from hi grandfather, and his fathers. Even the boundary lines between the villages in the Yukon Flat, where there was 11 villages, the boundary line, the subsistence resource where each village was defined in the Yukon Flats, defined by mountain, defined by a river, and still today we respect those those boundary lines. We don't hunt moose in the Beaver area, we don't hunt moose in the Circle area, we don't hunt moose on the boundaries of the Arctic Venetie Reservation. In Fort Yukon, something about our own boundary lines? We got (inaudible) respect for the boundary lines today because we were told it was by our fathers and their fathers. To prioritize game management in the State of Alaska is no problem. In defining subsistence and saying that you'll define it on resource available to the people living in a cash economy. I worked as the Mayor of Fort Yukon, I worked as a President of Gwitchyan Zhee Corporation, which is under the Land Claims and I worked for (inaudible) which is the Three G's, which

is the non-profit arm of the Yukon villages. I worked for three different outfits and I made \$19,000 a year. In saying, if you look at it on paper, and I could call it kids, I've got 8 kids altogether but right now only 5 at home, the rest are on their own. In saying, if the income of mine, saying that is sufficient, that I do not need subsistence to survive.

It was brought up tonight on that, Mr. Cowper touched, and a fellow from North Slope also touched on it, which is right. My activities and the money I make to support my wife's subsistence activities and my father-in-laws' subsistence activities of Arctic Village and my grandfathers' subsistence activities up at Central Mountain? From Venetie these are the people support. Because they have no cash economy to support their activities. But (inaudible) they would not be eligible because of subsistence papers if you try to define subsistence on a resource or a cash economy of the person individually.

Mr. Moses Samuelson: My name is Moses Samuelson, I would like one of you fellows to take this put this proposal, when they asked us to put them in so. Like Mrs. Binkleysaid in this section - regulation 15 - put that down so they could take it off. Justification is here we should be allowed to fish subsistence after commercial fishing is closed, in fairness, same rules as in Subsection 6 and 6(b) should apply to subsection 6 (c) which is Manley and Nenana. And this other one I put on, subsistence wording applied (inaudible) subsection quotas for each subsection of subsection 6 rather than single subdistrict quota. Justification: This would allow each subsection to harvest a fair portion of the salmon. Like to have one of you maybe take this.

Representative Nels Anderson: I don't know what we can do with these, I

believe there is some kind of a deadline. Have you already sent this in?

Moses Samuelson: This is just a copy I have made. I thought I better bring it down here and leave it here with you.

Mr. David Kelleyhouse: I have not notes. I just would urge the legislature to try to resolve the whole subsistence thing in as fair a method as possible to avoid any further polarization for the people in this State along racial lines. I think the whole thing started when everything was fine as long as nobody had a claim on any of the resources, it was just kind of a low population, productive situation until people pressures and economic systems grew to the point where people started grabbing what they could and staking claims around it and this last ditch effort to utilize, and get your fair of resources, seems to have polarized just about everybody in the room and I think one thing that the legislature should try to keep in mind, I realize that there are many sociological, cultural, these kinds of problems here and a lot at stake but as a biologist, I hope, all my integrity intact, I would urge everyone to try and keep the resource itself, utmost. Because everybody in here would, took the time to comment, and the committee itself realized that the importance of the resource is to try to accommodate every special use (inaudible) as a biologist, I can guarantee you, if you lose the resource base, and your popularity and your seats, my job, (inaudible) because the resource fell on it's nose and really it's in your hands right now. You have the power. Perhaps to reach a solution, to accommodate social pressures. Biologists hold the data on the population level, or the activity of the population. and to a large of an extent as possible. I would like to see the regulatory, the fine regulatory mechanism, left up to the State. So that under guidelines, of course, because of the social pressures, but

have the State set those harvest quotas and have all the groups involved, the Alaska Federation of Natives, and everybody involved in this whole question, realize that the integrity of the resource itself is what's at stake and try to get along as Alaskans instead of trying to break up in small warm groups for instance, don't like to see conventionalism.

A. M. Swarner: I'm A. M. Swarner, I've lived here for last February 27th. I was here 40 years. It won't take me long, there's several things I want to say. Repeat that subsistence to death. Everybody has their own definition and it means something different to everyone else and I think (inaudible) I wish Mr. Smith were here, if he thinks for a minute that those Feds can manage our game, if they do like they did our musk ox. Boy, get rid of those Feds leave it up to the State. Those Feds are too far away, we've got to stay with our own. Our State's got to manage our own game, (inaudible) it might be crammed down our necks but we should never accept it. Last year at the caribou hearings, I talked to a man from up North and I said to him, "I was told that there was stacks of caribou that went to waste, I think if it had not been for the snow machine we would still have plenty of caribou. I sad to him, "is this true that there were stacks of caribou that went to waste. He put his eyes to the ground and he said I'm sorry to say and I'm ashamed and he said yes. I think we as people have got to stop and figure how much we can eat and not take more than we can eat. I think this thing that has happened in the past, that people didn't figure how much they could eat, if they were there, they didn't count, they wronged a bunch and I'm sure that this has happened in the past, but that day is gone. We have got to start, can I eat 50 fish? Can I eat 70 fish, or whatever. I say if you use it, it's not wasted buy maybe the time has come when we can't even take what we need to use. But one thing that I want to say to everyone

in here - we're divided enough, let's whatever we do don't divide. "lets unite". Everyone, color, white, everybody we're all human. And lets unite that's my main thing.

Stell Nauman: Mr. Chariman, I waited until last because I'm not from Fairbanks. I happen to be up here for meetings and saw your notice and attended. I'm from Eagle River. But I thought that it might be worth giving you a few comments that have both been already mentioned trying to bring into some sort of order and also to bring in a few things that have not been mentioned yet. One of the primary things that I think that needs to be brought out in this whole discussion of subsistence what you're really talking about, I think, is providing something more than the existing sport, hunting, fishing regulations with (inaudible). I think if you look at why are these not adequately providing for the needs, particularly in the bush you'll see that there are broader dimensions at work. One is your user population is increasing, this is one area that could be worked on to help provide additional resources for those who are more dependent upon them. Your game tends to be decreasing, in many of the species, and in some of the areas across the State so that additional funding from the State Legislature for Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the research program to this sort of thing, particularly in the fish, where we know they can influence good populations increases in new runs, would be beneficial. The other thing is habitat loss, and this is effecting your game, and the availability of resources to the increasing user population and this is happening for a number of reasons. I'm not just talking simply of the loss of habitat due to the industrialization taking the land out of use but to other things such as putting it into different classifications where it cannot be used. Tapping it with road systems, which would create additional pressure from more

urban groups. All of these things taken together are causing today, I think, great concern, in many parts of the State, for doing something to provide for subsistence.

It was interesting sitting and listening tonight, because although nobody really wanted to define subsistence, everybody was able to talk about it in one way or another. It's being phased out, it's tradition, it's cultural, it's not phasing out, I think as it has been stated. Everybody tends to have a definition in their own minds and one of the reasons you get so many definitions is that if you break it down into some of the components elements you'll see that, I think, most of them are continuums. You have a basic continuum where a person over here, on this end somebody who would be theoretically 100% dependent upon subsistence resource, he would be (inaudible) a subsistence user. At the other end of the continuum you would have the visitor from Germany, who comes in wanting to take his antlers back and he'll gladly give the meat to the guide. Okay, he is obviously not a subsistence user. Now it's the in-between area where you're having difficulties in drawing a line and saying from here to here is subsistence and from here to here it's not. And this same continuum idea goes on where do you draw the line on income, low income, high income. Options, where do you draw it on the continuum of few options to many options. Traditions, is it a deep tradition, long set cultural based or is it a fairly recent, a guy that's been hunting for 4 years and wants to keep on hunting for years. Dependence, is it a tremendous deep dependence or is it. I'd rather kill a moose than go or is it on a racial basis. You have the 100% pure Native who lives in Alaska all the way up to various degrees of inter mixing to a pure white who lives outside perhaps. These are all the contingents, as to legislators, you're going to have to deal with and ap-

approaching a definition.

Another thing that I think that is a generalization that subsistence resource use, the use of those subsistence resources carries across the State regardless of what you call subsistence, those resources are used in differing degrees and differing ways in the various areas of the State. The Seward Peninsula use is very different from the use Admiralty Island so any definition or policy you develop has to take into account the very diverse regional difference. You also have to take into account the legal constraints obviously the State Constitution, the existing State and Law regulations, I can't remember which, on subsistence, which simply states that the subsistence is the taking and use of wildlife for personal or family use. ANCSA, Federal Law is involved, the Constitution, Federal ability to for Native groups. Also you have the State and Federal agency mandates which have to be considered. The fish and Wildlife Service can do certain things in areas and it cannot do certain things in these areas. Precedence of the court, it's something that hasn't been mentioned and I think it's critical and in that report which is very excellent, by Kelso he goes into this in very detail, pointing out that the existing precedent on the word subsistence is normally related not to Wildlife and (inaudible) Okay, if this goes to litigation and you do not have a definition then the courts are likely to fall back on (inaudible) this inappropriate definition and not do what you would have them do as legislators. Another point that needs to be brought out more clearly I think is that some game is resident, is in the resident area. Your ground Squirrels or something, tend to stay in one place, on the other hand you have certain categories. Intensity, to simply use some sort of special permit issued to individuals and not go the full council, board route.

I would prefer personally, to see that the overall state's management of game and fish being left with the State as a cohesive manager. But the state would have to have the responsibility of coordinating their management with these other agencies, Federal and State to insure that their policies don't violate the agency mandates. And, also to adequately provide for these special subsistence needs. Apparently, there's some accord that has been achieved between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor on this. Because the new Andrus proposal appears to do this. The definition has to be flexible. Because as it has been pointed out, that subsistence is changed, it's just the way of adapting to the land and that adaptation will alter both the techniques, species used as game cycles change, areas used as the cycles change. So it has to be flexible enough so that it can change over time, which means in general, definition. And I think as biologists has emphasized and I think, everybody else would, the most important thing is that you have to protect the resource base. Because without the resource base, you have neither the resource nor subsistence.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much. I really appreciate your comments. Obviously, you have given this a lot of thought and we can use your comments.

Unidentified Male: I wanted to say to our biologist that I think, that possibly we can, our streams can, produce more fish but they may have to have more money for the spawning at the head of the streams. I think we can produce more fish than that, I think the streams will feed more fish than what are there.

Undertified Male: I would like to make one extra comment on that. There was a comment made tonight (inaudible) about the ability exists to produce more fish, I guess the insinuation was that game biologists could not produce more game and that's a fallacy. I would like to take this opportunity to (inaudible) the possibility does exist to produce more game in the State, particularly if we could convince the Federal Government to go back to the natural fire regime in this State. (inaudible) high moose productivity produced in the 1940's to the middle 1960's. And it's only been since these fires have been knocked down to an average of close to 2 million acres a year down to less than an average of less than a million acres closer to a half million acres a year that our moose herds have been in the state of decline. Don't overlook the possibility of putting a little money into habitat improvement, or a little influence on the Federal Government. To allow the (inaudible) to do what it does best up here in the summer time, that's burn. So, think about that, and also increase the resource base, and decrease the amount of conflict over the allocation.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you. Are there any more comments? Or is there anyone else who would like to testify at this time? If not, thank you very, very much for coming to the meeting tonight. We appreciate it and this meeting is adjourned.

ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY

National Interest Lands

Position Paper

Life Styles, Subsistence, Hunting and 17(d)(2) Lands

December 1976

SUMMARY

The broad spectrum of life styles practiced by Alaskans contributes to its' uniqueness among the fifty states and adds diversity to American society at large. Within this spectrum, there is an array of "Alaskan" and "Subsistence" life styles that consist of a complex mixture of traditionally native, traditionally non-native elements. THERE IS, THEREFORE, NO RATIONAL NOR FAIR BASIS FOR DEFINING AN ALASKAN NOR A SUBSISTENCE LIFE STYLE.

Hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering of natural foods are pursuits that figure prominently in virtually the whole spectrum of Alaskan life styles. However, there are continua with respect to these pursuits,; a single individual often exploits living resources for different reasons at different times. CONSEQUENTLY, ATTEMPTS TO DISTINGUISH AMONG COMMERCIAL, SUBSISTENCE, AND RECREATIONAL HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING OR GATHERING AS PRACTICED BY MANY ALASKANS, HAVE BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL.

Different life styles have different impacts on land use and its resources. Many Alaskan life styles, and subsistence uses in particular, are less disruptive and less destructive than many other types of life styles and uses. Subsistence uses are a natural part of Alaskan wild country and should be provided for on National Interest Lands except those set aside as National Parks or National Monuments. Other land management categories, such as preserves or refuges, are more compatible with subsistence uses of natural resources.

Land in Alaska is being divided into smaller and smaller parcels under a variety of ownerships resulting in a proliferation of management goals and policies. This trend is generally incompatible with the conditions required for many life styles in Alaska and could lead to the destruction of these lifestyles and the integrity of existing ecosystems. An unprecedented level of coordination and cooperation among federal, state and private groups will be needed to overcome this trend. Fish and Wildlife populations and the habitats they depend upon do not have boundaries that coincide with existing federal, state and private lands nor those lands proposed for inclusion in the four systems under ANCSA 17 (d)(2). For this reason as well as the fact that legally (Statehood Act) and historically the State of Alaska has had the responsibility for wildlife management, the ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY BELIEVES THAT THE BASIC EXISTING REGULATORY REGIME FOR HUNTING, TRAPPING AND FISHING IS MOST APPROPRIATE TO PROPERLY CONSERVE AND PROTECT FISH AND WILDLIFE IN ALASKA, AND TO PROVIDE THE MECHANISMS FOR ALLOCATION OF RESOURCE USES.

However, since federal agencies have legal responsibilities under existing national laws and international treaties and have now and will have in the future management habitat responsibilities, continuing federal and state coordination and cooperation will be needed.

LIFE STYLES, SUBSISTENCE, AND HUNTING

In Alaska there is a broad spectrum of life styles that have developed from many different cultural roots. This spectrum ranges from life styles derived from hunter-gatherer economies, whose social organization and cultural patterns were shaped largely by the biological and physical environment in which they evolved, to those derived primarily from western-industrial economies, whose social organization and cultural patterns have evolved in directions that lead to the separation of the individual from direct ties and experience with the land and its resources. Indeed, it is this very mix of life styles found in this spectrum that contributes to Alaska's uniqueness among the fifty states. ~~THE~~ ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY CONSIDERS THAT THIS DIVERSITY OF LIFE STYLES IS AN ASSET TO ALASKA AND AMERICAN SOCIETY AT LARGE.

There are three important qualities to this spectrum of life styles that are relevant to decisions regarding the disposition of d-2 lands and the agencies that will manage them. Each of these qualities can be visualized as a continuum. They are 1) a dependency continuum with direct use of local resources at one end and dependence upon distant resources or their products at the other; 2) an energy consumption continuum characterized by labor intensive acquisition of resources at one end and at the other end, highly mechanized acquisition, processing and transportation of resources and; 3) a psychological continuum ranging from a feeling of self-sufficiency and independence at one end to a feeling of less self-sufficiency and greater dependence on others for basic needs at the other end.

A full discussion of the ramifications of these qualities of life styles with regard to land use and resource management in Alaska is beyond the scope of this position paper. The most important feature to recognize is that DIFFERENT LIFE STYLES HAVE VERY DIFFERENT IMPACTS ON LAND AND ITS RESOURCES.

Subsistence:

Within the existing, broad spectrum of life styles there is an array of "Alaskan" life styles including many so-called "subsistence" life styles. Subsistence life styles are a complex mixture of traditionally native, traditionally non-native, and completely new elements that vary tremendously from place to place, from one individual to another and from year to year. For these and other reasons, WE BELIEVE IT IS

IMPOSSIBLE TO DEVELOP A SIMPLE, RIGOROUS DEFINITION OF SUBSISTENCE. However, there are still many people who depend greatly upon natural resources in order to make a living; there are also many for whom subsistence living is culturally the way of life. Of necessity or by choice, they live off the land. To a great degree - they subsist. Activities in support of these life styles include hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering traditional wild foods and other organic materials. Of necessity, practitioners of subsistence life styles live in areas of low human population density. Historically and throughout Alaska, hunting and gathering societies were distributed at low densities as mandated by the productivity and characteristics of the ecosystems of which they were a part. Furthermore, to be successful at subsistence living, they must have the dedication, knowledge and skills, which in essence make them "professionals" at hunting, fishing and trapping.

The Alaska Conservation Society supports the concept of subsistence use of natural resources by Alaskans for the following reasons.

1. There are strong cultural affinities for subsistence living among natives and non-natives, even though the basis for these affinities differs.
2. The existence of viable subsistence life styles provides our society at large with an added and positive element of diversity, which enriches both subsistence users and others.
3. Subsistence life styles, properly pursued, are environmentally less disruptive and less destructive than life styles associated with modern agrarian or industrial societies. Regulated and controlled, subsistence activities can be an ecologically sound means of supporting people in rural Alaska.
4. Subsistence use remains an economic necessity for many rural Alaskans.
5. Subsistence use has always been a natural part of true wilderness, contrary to today's popular notion of wilderness as "...a place where animals live, but people only visit."

Hunting:

Hunting, fishing and trapping are pursuits that figure prominently in virtually the whole spectrum of Alaskan life styles. However, given the current "mobility" of individuals with respect to life styles, some people are often involved in the exploitation of living resources for different reasons at different times. Similarly, the use of a given species can, at different times, be for different purposes by the same person. This is true with respect to hunting, trapping and fishing. For these and other reasons, attempts to distinguish among