

287

HRES

HB 17

-

HB 57

HB

17

1/20/75

COMMITTEE REPORT

FINANCE

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 3-25-75

The Committee on Resources has had House Bill 17

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

- ( ) recommends it DO PASS
- ( ) recommends it DO NOT PASS
- ( ) recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)
- (X) recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR HB 17 AND THAT  
       CS FOR HB 17 DO PASS ~~with the following amendments~~
- ( ) "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_  
       COMMITTEE
- ( ) reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION
- ( ) "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>Wesley Anderson</u>	<u>Steve Hershberger</u>	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

Wesley Anderson Chairman

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF LANDS

323 E. 4TH AVENUE—ANCHORAGE 99501

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

February 14, 1975

The Honorable Leslie E. Swanson  
Representative  
House of Representatives  
Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Representative Swanson:

The Alaska Division of Lands does have an existing authority that will provide assistance to the fur trappers. Within the Director's authority as provided in AS 38.05.330 and as interpreted in 11 AAC 58.210, permits for temporary use of State land may be negotiated permitting temporary occupancy of State lands with limitations as proposed in your house bill.

Permits can be offered to trappers that exhibit evidence of a legitimate trap line that has been used for a period of at least two years and is presently being used. The permit would include special stipulations as follows:

1. Duration not to exceed five years.
2. Use of a site described may be used for the erection of a cabin not to exceed dimensions exceeding 12' x 12'.
3. Permit is not transferrable or assignable.
4. No preference right to lease or purchase the subject lands inures with the permit.
5. The annual rent is \$100.00.
6. The permit may be terminated upon 30-days written notice for failure to comply with the terms of the permit.

This type of permitting is used for all legitimate applications for land use where the State does not wish to provide any permanent tenure. Actually, the idea of the special land use permit is to legitimize a person's occupancy of State lands, providing him with a document to show other persons that he does have authorization for the described use, and allows the State to keep a handle on use of State lands.

The Honorable Leslie E. Swanson

Page 2

February 14, 1975

Please feel free to contact me if further discussion and clarification is needed.

Sincerely,



Michael C. T. Smith  
Director

cc Northcentral District Office  
Southcentral District Office  
Southeast District Office  
Lands Section

HB

29

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

POUCH S—IUNEAU 99801

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

February 27, 1975

The Honorable Nels Anderson, Chairman  
House Resources Committee  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol Building  
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Mr. Anderson:

re House Bill No. 29

House Bill No. 29, an Act to provide a school tax on oil according to the House Journal of February 26, 1975 was referred to the House Resources Committee after which it will be referred to the House Finance Committee.

The bill provides in general that there is levied upon the producer of oil a tax of one cent on each barrel of oil which is transported intrastate by pipeline and removed or sold from any lease or property in the State, less any part the ownership or right to which is exempt from taxation. Line 18 on page 2 of the bill provides for repeal of the present \$10 per head School Tax.

In order to evaluate the effect on the Treasury as to revenue to be gained by school tax on oil and as to revenue to be lost by the repeal of the present School Tax of \$10 per head, requests were made to Mr. O. K. Gilbreth, Director, Division of Oil and Gas as to the school tax on oil and to the Audit Division of the Department of Revenue for School Tax.

Attached for your consideration are copies of memorandums and schedules from Mr. O. K. Gilbreth indicating new revenues to be gained by imposition of the school tax on oil for the fiscal years 1975 through 1980 and a schedule prepared by Darrell D. Knox, Audit Supervisor II of the Audit Division of the Department of Revenue incorporating new revenue from school tax on oil and loss of revenues under proposed repeal of the present \$10 per head school tax and net gain or loss to Treasury for the fiscal years 1975 to 1980.

If you have questions on the enclosed material call the writer at 465-2397

AGO 547296 +

Honorable Nels Anderson

-2-

February 27, 1975

and arrangements can be made to have Darrell D. Knox of the Department of Revenue available for committee hearings. Mr. Gilbreth is stationed in Anchorage, Alaska.

Very truly yours,



R. D. Stevenson  
Special Assistant

RDS:sp

attachments

cc The Honorable Leslie Swanson  
Sponsor, House Bill No. 29

The Honorable Hugh Malone  
Chairman, House Finance Committee

Darrel D. Knox  
Department of Revenue

AGO 547297

FEB 10 1975

# MEMORANDUM

# State of Alaska

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS

TO: Gary L. Jenkins  
Director  
Audit Division

DATE: February 7, 1975

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: O. K. Gilbreth *OKG*  
Director

SUBJECT: Fiscal Note Information,  
House Bill #29

We have examined the proposed bill and submit the information you have requested as follows:

1. Impact on treasury

This bill would result in the following income to the State of Alaska during the fiscal year 1975 through the fiscal year 1980:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>					
<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
\$624,000	\$568,00	\$520,000	\$3,224,000	\$5,544,000	\$5,984,000

2. Impact on budgetary accounts

Since this proposed tax is applied essentially the same as the oil and gas conservation tax, the additional burden to administer the program should be almost negligible.

3. This tax is only on oil transported by a pipeline and which has been removed or sold from a lease. This exempts oil carried by trucks. At present there is a very minor amount carried by trucks but it should be pointed out that as remote wells are completed it is possible that we will have more production carried by trucks to central gathering facilities.

In Section 43.58.010 (a) the tax is levied on oil transported intrastate by pipeline.....it should be pointed out that about 75 percent of the present production is moved by interstate lines to a terminal for shipment to the South 48. It should be determined that from a legal point of view this production is transported intrastate for purposes of this tax. We have assumed that it would be covered in our estimates however if by some legal quirk it is not, then our estimates should be reduced approximately 75 percent.

cc: W. C. Fackler, Acting Commissioner

TO: Frederick P. Boetsch  
Deputy Commissioner, Taxation  
Department of Revenue

February 18, 1975

FROM: Darrell D. Knox *DK*  
Audit Supervisor II  
Audit Division

House Bill 29

Per your request I have reviewed House Bill 29 and submit the following data for your information.

<u>Source of Data</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>						<u>Total</u>
	<u>'75</u>	<u>'76</u>	<u>'77</u> (000)	<u>'78</u>	<u>'79</u>	<u>'80</u>	
O.K. Gilbreath's Oil School Tax memo dated 2/07/75	\$ 624.0	\$ 568.0	\$ 520.0	\$3,224.0	\$5,544.0	\$5,984.0	\$16,464.0
Less: Present School Tax estimate Per revenue sources - Alaska FY 74-80	1,820.9	1,939.7	1,981.3	1,960.8	2,038.2	2,103.7	11,844.6
Net gain (loss) to Treasury	<u>(\$1,196.9)</u>	<u>(\$1,371.7)</u>	<u>(\$1,461.3)</u>	<u>\$1,263.2</u>	<u>\$3,505.8</u>	<u>\$3,880.3</u>	<u>\$ 4,619.4</u>

If I can be of further assistance, please call.

DDK/bjm

HB

41

"An Act requiring entrance fees for the use of state park lands, and providing for an effective date."

1/22/75

COMMITTEE REPORT

FINANCE

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 1-28-75

The Committee on Resources has had HB 41

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

( ) recommends it DO PASS

( ) recommends it DO NOT PASS

( ) recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

(X) recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR HB 41 AND THAT

CS FOR HB 41 DO PASS

( ) "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTEE

( ) reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

( ) "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

[Handwritten Signature] \_\_\_\_\_  
[Handwritten Signature] \_\_\_\_\_  
[Handwritten Signature] \_\_\_\_\_


Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

[Handwritten Signature] recommends: do not pass  
\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:  
\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:  
\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:  
\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

[Handwritten Signature] Chairman

COMMITTEE REPORT

The House Resource Committee in recommending Committee Substitute for House Bill No. #41 do pass, strongly urges the monies collected for state park entrance fees be used for maintenance and upgrading of state park facilities.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nels A. Anderson, Jr." with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Nels A. Anderson, Jr.  
Chairman-House Resource  
Committee

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

POUCH M — JUNEAU 99801

January 28, 1975


Honorable Nels A. Anderson, Jr.  
Chairman, House Resource Committee  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Mr. Anderson:

Reference is made to your letter dated January 27, 1975 regarding regulations 11 AAC 12.310(b) which imposes an entrance fee on users of state recreation facilities.

Following an emergency regulation in May 1974, which canceled 11 AAC 12.310(b) for a period of 120 days, a decision was made to revise this regulation to make it permissive rather than mandatory. It is our intent to continue free use of recreation facilities during the 1975 camping season and allow time to structure a workable program beginning in calendar year 1976. We will hold public hearings on this proposed change and also solicit a reaction from the public regarding a new approach to a fee system.

Yours truly,



William C. Fackler  
Acting Commissioner

The Legislature of the State of Alaska  
FISCAL NOTE

First Session - Ninth Legislature

I. REQUEST

Bill No. HB 41  
 Title: An Act requiring entrance fees for the use of state park lands  
 Requested by: Ted Smith Date: 1-22-75  
 Return Date Requested: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Agency: Division of Parks Program: Parks & Recreation

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Budget Request Unit(s) Affected: Parks & Recreation

A. EXPENDITURES: (Thousands of dollars)

OBJECT	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80
100 PERSONAL SERVICES		24.3*	25.5*	26.3*	28.1*	29.6*
200 TRAVEL		0	--	--	--	--
300 CONTRACTUAL		0	--	--	--	--
400 COMMODITIES		2.0	2.1	2.2	2.3	2/4
500 EQUIPMENT		--	--	--	--	--
600 LAND & STRUCTURES		--	--	--	--	--
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.		--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL		26.3	27.6	29.0	30.4	32.0

B. FUNDING: (Thousands of dollars)

GENERAL FUND		26.3*	27.6*	29.0*	30.4*	32.0*
FEDERAL FUNDS		--	--	--	--	--
OTHER		--	--	--	--	--

C. POSITIONS:

PERMANENT/TEMPORARY	/	/4	/4	/4	/4	/4
MAN MONTHS (P./T.)	/	/16	/16	/16	/16	/16

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

Work would be absorbed by existing staff and additional positions would parallel present positions in accomplishing broad work of staff.

If bill is made affective July 1, 1975 conversion of existing stock of suspended permits would be necessary to make possible meeting the early requirement.

\* Personal Services and positions are noted above as indication of time requirements for existing personnel.

IV. ATTACHMENTS

V. DATE: 2-3-75 PREPARED BY: George A. Hall

Original: Legislative Finance  
 cc: Budget and Management  
 Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

STATE OF ALASKA  
Inter-Department Route Slip

TO:  
MAIL STATION NUMBER 3100

DEPARTMENT Alaska State Legislature

ATTENTION Honorable Ted Smith

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approval      | <input type="checkbox"/> Note & Return       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Signature     | <input type="checkbox"/> Initial & Return    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comment       | <input type="checkbox"/> Return As Requested |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contact Me    | <input type="checkbox"/> Return For Approval |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare Reply | <input type="checkbox"/> Necessary Action    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> For Your File | <input type="checkbox"/> Your Information    |

Remarks:

*Replacement for previous  
fiscal note*

FROM:  
MAIL STATION NUMBER 1000

DEPARTMENT Dept. of Natural Resources

BY Harry Aase DATE 2/5/75

The Legislature of the State of Alaska  
FISCAL NOTE

First Session - Ninth Legislature

I. REQUEST

Bill No. HB 41

Title: An act requiring entrance fees for the use of state park lands

Requested by: Ted Smith

Date: 1-22-75

Return Date Requested:

Agency: Division of Parks

Program:

Parks & Recreation

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Budget Request Unit(s) Affected: Parks & Recreation

A. EXPENDITURES: (Thousands of dollars)

OBJECT	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80
100 PERSONAL SERVICES		0	0	0	0	0
200 TRAVEL		0	-	-	-	-
300 CONTRACTUAL		0	-	-	-	-
400 COMMODITIES		2.0	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4
500 EQUIPMENT		-	-	-	-	-
600 LAND & STRUCTURES		-	-	-	-	-
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.		-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL		2.0	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4

B. FUNDING: (Thousands of dollars)

	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80
GENERAL FUND		2.0	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						

C. POSITIONS:

	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80
PERMANENT/TEMPORARY	/	/ 0	/ 0	/ 0	/ 0	/ 0
MAN MONTHS (P./T.)	/	/ 0	/ 0	/ 0	/ 0	/ 0

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

Work would be absorbed by existing staff.

If bill is made effective July 1, 1975 conversion of existing stock of suspended permits would be necessary to make possible meeting the early requirement.

Revenue is estimated at \$200,000 for each full year of program operation. Emphasis on tourist attractions, gas costs or shortages, and other factors can affect the forecast. Split of revenue should be approximately 70 % resident/30% non-resident visitor.

IV. ATTACHMENTS

V. DATE: 2-13-75

PREPARED BY: George A. Hall

Original: Legislative Finance  
cc: Budget and Management  
Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

HB

57

HOUSE RESOURCE HEARING - Aleknagik, Alaska, January 19, 1976

Re: Wood Tikchik State Park

Present were: 44 adults, 10 children, in addition to the traveling team.

Opening remarks by Representative Anderson and Representative Smith included explanation of the changes in SS HB 57 from the original bill. Clearer definition of the management of the proposed park is included.

Russ Cahill, Director of the Alaska Division of Parks presented testimony in favor of the proposal. Copies attached.

Representative Jimmy Huntington presented testimony against the proposal, stressing how much land has been taken from the native people already. "Once you make it a park, it's gone". "More than half of Alaska is gone because they take it for parks." "They tell you you've got something to say about it, but you don't. It's gone." Wait for awhile--find out what the best use for that land is before you make it a park. Maybe in ten years you'll know what you want to do with the land. You know how many times they promised you something, and you know how many times they lied to you. I'm against it because they've got too much now. One man is the boss, and that's the Ranger. Don't let them tell you any different. (Mr. Huntington used as an example the situation in Katmai Park, where the federal government said they would allow use of the land the same as before, but didn't.

A question was asked of Russ Cahill regarding his stand on mineral extraction in the proposed park. Mr. Cahill answered that he would prefer that there be none, but would live with the proposal as it stands.

Representative Smith spelled out the changes in the bill since the original was drafted.

1. Elimination of "bi-centennial" from purpose of the park.
2. Changes in the declaration of purpose - "...to protect the area's recreational and scenic resources, and to protect important salmon spawning and river resources.
3. Change in the plan of management
4. Allowing subsistence uses
5. Allowing a hy-dro electric plant, not considered an incompatible use.

Representative Smith concluded that it had been made plain at the last hearing that the people wanted the area to remain in the hands of the people. He asked at that time for someone to come up with an alternate management scheme for the area. In a letter to the Commissioner of Natural Resources, he asked for a projection of possible use of the land if it were not designated as a park. The conclusion was that if no park system were in effect, the open-to-entry program would eventually provide private ownership of the lands, and the natives would lose it anyway.

The mayor stated that he goes along with what Representative Huntington said.

Mr. Wasley Luchek stated that "you say it won't affect the life-style of the people, but with many people coming in it will affect the life-style--with pop bottles and pollution. There is trash throughout the place where people go now.

Mr. Cahill replied that if he were to prepare a plan now, he would have no roads in park areas, and he would get his staff on the site prior to drafting such a bill, so as to include in it what was necessary for that particular area. He would keep the area "rough", which in itself limits the number of people entering the area.

Elmer Smith, a resident for 46 years, stated that he favored the park system. The land is now available to all comers. Under the park plan, there would be some control. He mentioned the decline of the moose herd in the Sunshine Valley area from in excess of 50 to 9. If a person wants his money controlled, he gives it to a bank to supervise. If we want control of our land, we'd better turn it over to professionals. Restrictions must be used to control what people do with resources. Pollution is coming from our own local people--an example being the road from Dillingham to Aleknagik.

Annie Luchek asked which was worse--public land status or park status? Rep. Smith answered that it would be better as a park because it would not stay traditional under private ownership, but it depends on your viewpoint. The bill states that the land "shall" be available for traditional subsistence uses.

Rep. Anderson said that the problem with that is that subsistence has not been satisfactorily defined in Alaska.

The best answer to subsistence was written by the natives themselves--a traditional lifestyle where they can live as they always lived, and live hard if they want to.

Andrew Groyolia of the Bristol Bay Native Association pointed out more concerns for the subsistence way of life. A document is needed stating that the government would not interfere with subsistence.

Rep. Smith answered that under this plan the law would say that the government would not interfere.

Annie stated that the state must realize that life is still primitive in many of the villages and the only way to exist is to use subsistence resources; hunting, trapping and fishing.

Jimmy Huntington: It is hard for a white man to understand the native way of life and thinking. If they would just try it wouldn't be so hard. We need the protection of the Troopers, but there aren't enough of them to even begin to help.

Additional comments Subsistence is a way of life with a monetary value to the people from hunting, fishing and trapping. It will change. (The response was that it will not change).

Rep. Smith stated that the area was selected because if the state didn't get it, the federal government would. Then the land might become open-to-entry. Park status is the only way to protect the area.

Rep. Hershberger stated that he didn't think there would be an influx of people, especially if there was no development program.

Rolland Moody stated that it is essential that the area be left as it is until there is a plan drawn up. He does not want the land open-to-entry. A park would protect the area. Anderson, as a Representative of this area, must see that the park system protects the area from the concerns of the people. The life-style is changing, but the area must be protected.

Russ Cahill, in answer to some questions: Study was conducted in 1963 regarding mineral development, and the result indicated that there was no real future for mineral development in the area. In 1970, the area was being considered for an open-to-entry program. A 1970 study investigated the possibility of 5-acre tracts. Cahill is advocating the park status to avoid the small tract status. Park status will save the area for all of the people, not parcel it out to a few people.

Additional general comments included: Q. What will be the adverse effects on the people in any situation? A. Anything that changes the lifestyle of the people to something they don't want--that is an adverse effect. As an example of what can be done in the way of regulation, Cahill turned down 4 lodge sites in the area last summer, in order to try to preserve the character of the area as it now exists.

Much of the above testimony was translated into the native language.

There will be corrections in the spelling of names and some additional testimony which was inaudible on the tapes.

HOUSE RESOURCE HEARING - Dillingham, Alaska, January 19, 1976

Re: Wood Tikchik State Park

25 persons were present.

After the presentation by Russ Cahill, comments were made regarding the mineral use and potential of the area. He requested a change in the section on mining to exclude mining, since studies show that mining is not profitable in the area and incompatible with the major uses of the area. Mr. Cahill stated that the existing master plan for the state does not represent the policy for the state at this time. Before any work be done in this park Cahill would demand that a change be worked out for the people of the Bristol Bay Region. It is time for us to make our decisions on the resource values of the land.

Harvey Samuelson asked why the land will be closed to mineral extraction. Cahill replied that his group has ascertained that mineral exploitation and the current uses of the land are incompatible.

Carl-----asked who was pushing the bill, and who would pay for it.

A. The federal government first proposed this area as a state park in 1962 or 3. Then the state selected the land with the intent of keeping the federal government from having it. Legislators and the Division of Parks have come up with proposals for the land. The federal government would still like to have the Wood-Tikchik area as a national park. In answer to the financing question, Cahill replied that it was you and I, just like other tax issues.

Joe McGill: I definitely want to say that I am against the proposal. ( Tape unintelligible here--notes from Van Doren) Once it becomes a park the laws can be changed any session. It will hurt the area and hold it back to make it a park. It needs to be set up in the state plan with a multiple use concept. Otherwise it would stagnate the area.

Cahill: The area has always been classified as a recreational area by the state. The question is whether to have 5-acre lots or total public recreation.

Mike Nelson: What would be the criteria if it was classified as a wilderness park? A. The state does not really have a set up for a wilderness park at this time. Regulations would have to be set up.

Concern was expressed about the original master-plan. No expansion can be tolerated, especially along the spawning area. The party urged that all consideration be given to the salmon stocks. Roads and campgrounds could be detrimental to salmon stocks.

Jeff\_\_\_\_\_ stated that people are fooling themselves if they feel there will be no development. Already there are squatters and lodges. "Development scares me."

Herman Schroeder, representing Choggiung Limited, presented testimony, copy of which is attached.

Concern was expressed about the state master plan; stress was made that the plan does no longer exist.

Rep. Huntington reiterated his comments made in Aleknagik--that he did not want to see any form of withdrawal of the land at this time. The state of Alaska has not been able to manage the resources that it has. Leave the land as it is for at least 10 years. If it goes into the hands of the state it will still be managed the same way, no matter what you call it. Make the state put down exactly what you want, in writing. Document it so that it can't be changed.

Testimony by Robert C. Bacon was presented. (Attached).

In answer to a question about Environmental Impact Statements for the area involved, Cahill stated that extensive work has been done, and the surveys are available to the public.

Samualson enumerated the many parks already in the area. He suggested that maybe all 5,500 people in the area should be hired as park rangers!!

Rep. Anderson: We have 1.4 million acres in this system in the state. In the past the state has not shown that it has the expertise to manage the land. Where is the expertise now? A. Currently the state has an amount about equal to the proposed park--1.4 million acres--under its control. When asked about the manpower situation proposed for the park, Cahill said "...1 full-time, 1 4 or 5-month seasonal employee and 1 4 or 5-month mechanical employee. (This is based on keeping the park in the condition it now is.

Tom \_\_\_\_\_ of the Bristol Bay Native Association made a statement opposing the bill. His definition of subsistence is simply "a way of life". Other comments echoed previous testimony. He requested tabling of the motion indefinitely.

Cahill said that he could do a masterplan for the area in six months, and would work with the people. Rep. Smith responded that it would make more sense to apply the expertise to solving the legislative problem at hand. Let the Div. of Parks respond to legislative direction.

Gulea, of the B.B.N.A., (an economic analyst) presented a statement opposed to the park. He advised postponing indefinitely the action on the bill, until the state can prove that the native lifestyle will not be adversely affected. There is too much insecurity on the part of the natives, especially around Aleknagik, to proceed with the park.

Stanis Hopula asked why parks and recreation are considered equal to fisheries in the bill. Fisheries should be the highest priority. He also would like to see an advisory board from the area to have some weight in the management of the park

Wm. H. Nicholson, Director Community Advocates, B.B.N.A., presented a statement, a copy of which is attached.

Mr. Cahill proposed a one-time study group to develop a master-plan, for the park, if the bill is passed. Huntington said that he would not go for the idea unless it was in the bill or in operation before the bill was passed.

Richard Armstrong: The creation of the park would affect his lifestyle too. He is a pilot, guide, commercial fisherman, and in opposition to the park. We don't need the state to be all parks.

#### Hearing in Anchorage - re: Wood-Tikchik park

In addition to statements by Rep. Anderson, Rep. Smith, and reading of a letter from Commissioner Guy Martin, Department of Natural Resources, a statement was presented by Claudia Martin, of the Alaska Conservation Society, Upper Cook Inlet Chapter, in favor of the park. Recommendations she added included putting in a sport fishing biologist within the area, and closing the area to mining.

Clark Engle, speaking for himself, opposed the bill, stating reasons previously mentioned by others--too much land in the parks, and lack of protection for the spawning areas.

D.S. Bruden, speaking for himself, was in favor of the bill, stating that the area had unique value to the people of the state, and should be controlled by the same system. It has a value to all the people of the U.S.

Wm. Tennyson, of Choggiung Limited, presented a statement opposed to the park. (attached).

Duncan MacLeod, for himself, stated opposition., as did Willie Goodwin. Again the question of defining subsistence arose.

Jack Morris, B.B.N.C., stated opposition, and the problems of preservation of spawning versus recreation uses. He favored allowing mineral entry.

Russ Cahill, after delivering his prepared statement, departed from it to state that the previous administration's Dept. of Highways had pushed for roads in the area. Cahill assured that no roads would be put in the park and a communication will be delivered stating this. There will be also a letter to the committee stating that the management plan existing would be thrown out.

HOUSE RESOURCE HEARING - Anchorage

Phil Smith, Executive Director of RuralCap, talked about the priority of subsistence with rural people. Any encroachment would be going against the goals of the people. A concern that one man can control the fate of the land at the present time was expressed.

Other comments included request for current surveys of the area (obtainable from Cahill), and a request for a new master plan before any more comments be made on the bill. A case study of Afognak, where there are supposed to be no roads near the water or streams was presented. The Fish and Game Department has written no citations for these offenses. The same thing could happen in Tikchik.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT(S) MAY NOT FILM  
LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY OF THE  
ORIGINAL.

File

Hwy System  
+  
Wood River Tick chicks



DILLINGHAM EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

AFFILIATED WITH THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

BOX 202 • DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576 • PHONE 842-3181

April 5, 1974

RESOLUTION NO. 74-4

RE: State Hiway into Bristol Bay

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

WHEREAS, the state of Alaska has indicated through the media that they are making plans for the expansion of the integrated State Hiway system into the Bristol Bay Area, and

WHEREAS, the people of the Bristol Bay Area have indicated that they are strongly opposed to the spending of funds to promote such a Hiway into the area, and

WHEREAS, the local service roads and trails are inadequate to handle even local traffic

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Dillingham Education Association go on record as opposing any extension of the integrated Hiway System into the Bristol Bay Area, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any money appropriated for such a project be used instead to upgrade the local service roads and trails in the area, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Governor of the State of Alaska, and the Legislature be urged to authorize the commencement of upgrading the local Service Roads and trails during the fiscal year 1974-75, for which the planning phases have been completed.

The DEA Executive Board

*Arden S. Ruby*  
Arden S. Ruby, President

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) MAY NOT FILM  
LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY OF THE  
ORIGINAL.

ALEKNAGIK CITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION 75-

WHEREAS, the State of Alaska is proposing that the Tikchik Lake system become a State park, and

WHEREAS, the residents of Aleknagik are dependent on subsistant ways of life and utilize all of the area, and

WHEREAS, a State park would prevent the Aleknagik residents to hunt and fish to provide their daily sustenance.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Aleknagik City Council that we are opposed to any park system that would deprive our subsistance way of life and living.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that another type of recreation area be considered that would allow the residents to continue to utilize the area on a subsistance basis.

*Patric Kohler Sr. Mayor*  
ALEKNAGIK CITY COUNCIL

*Dora Gaudhier 12-5-75*  
Attest: Secretary

Aleknagik City Council  
Aleknagik, Alaska 99555  
December 5, 1975

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

Dear Sir:

The following resolution was acted on and passed by the City Council. Our main concern is the effect that a park would have on the residents of Aleknagik. The residents depend solely on fishing and as you know the fishing industry is unpredictable and therefore we have to depend on a subsistent way of life. The poorer the season, the more we are dependant on the area for our subsistence.

The Tikchik Lake System is used by us residents. We would not like to see the right to hunt, trap, and fish taken away from us.

Sincerely yours,

*Patric Kohler Sr.*  
Pat Kohler, Mayor  
Aleknagik City Council

cc: Jay Hammond, Governor  
Curt McVee, State Director, BLM  
Hjalmar Olsen, Executive Director, BBNA  
James Brooks, Commissioner of Fish & Game

PROPOSAL

Bristol Bay Native Association  
Representing 29 Villages  
POSITIONS REGARDING PROPOSED  
WOODRIVER TIKCHIKS STATE PARK

- (1) That the Park Proposal alienates the affinity of the people for their land.
- (a) The proposed park is of questionable integrity in that very few backers of the proposal reside in Bristol Bay. The major opposition to the proposal, in fact, is located in this region. And, the major support to the parks is located in the Anchorage area. This leads one to conclude that the park will function as a recreation area, which is only logical. The frightening aspect of such an area, though, is that the actual land usage will at once be abrogated to a different group; and that such an abrogation will be met by the sheer force of numbers that will invade the area.
- (b) The methods of transportation are thus arrived at. A state park may or may not require access. If access is required, roads will be built, and thus, the park will be linked to Anchorage; with this route, there will also exist the expansion, because of the precedent set, to transportation corridors, which we are unalterably opposed to. Ready access is the heart of the matter. Anchorage favors the park, and controls the state legislature. If the park is allowed, tourism will boom; a once beautiful area will lose that beauty to the exploitive forces that will come. If access is not required, the land within park boundaries will be somewhat more protected, although in the latter case a question is raised; why build the park? If such property be left in its natural condition, there is little need to change the status of the Woodriver Tikchiks.

Access  
to the mountains

POSITIONS REGARDING PROPOSED WOODRIVER TIKCHIK STATE PARK

(c) There are no guarantees that the land will be open to subsistence hunting and fishing, or to trapping. Allotments exist within the perimeters of the park, and further, the people of the area have a right to the peace of such land holdings. What guarantees for subsistence life has the state made? Consider the regulations violated by Fish and Game Officers in non-state park land:

- (1) Iliamna area, where a man residing in an isolated area was arrested for shooting a moose out of season. A protection officer followed the man's snowmobile tracks to the house, found the moose, and arrested the hunter. The case was later thrown out, but the very action warrants careful and thoughtful consideration toward further state encroachment.
- (2) Woodriver, where old ladies, who have subsistence smelt fished most of their lives, are accosted by a protection officer, and coerced by the officer into buying a sport-fishing license.

These are two examples of the many unlawful incursions on the part of the state into the subsistence patterns of the people of the area. Are we to believe that those allotment owners within park boundaries would be unhampered?

The subsistence economy is the basic historical livelihood in Bristol Bay; all other forms of economic development should be undertaken to supplement subsistence economics.

POSITIONS REGARDING PROPOSED WOODRIVER TIKCHIK STATE PARK

- (2) The proposed park would replace the freedom of the subsistence economy through sheer expansion.
- (a) The prevalent argument, that tourism would bring needed jobs, is clearly overstated, and in total disregard of the prerogatives set forth in all materials agreed upon throughout the district. The park, occupying some of the most beautiful and unique country in the Western Hemisphere, is also an historically subsistence based area. With park visitors would come all the undesired elements to a true rural based and culturally nurtured society.
- (b) Therefore, we are confronted with the true problem; how much right do the people of the area have to decide the future of their area and lifestyles? Those who own the resources have a claim to the resources, and the Bristol Bay Region clearly has prior claim to the rights of the area. And further, the cultural heritage of the people of the region is without doubt based on subsistence economy.
- (c) The state holds the key to the development of Bristol Bay's economic stability, only because development in the region is contingent on wisely applied land-use policies. The constant pressure to utilize the lands held in other than to aid in the development of the region through adequately protecting the cultural heritage of subsistence economy is not only inconsistent, but morally objectionable. To push such a proposal as the Tikchiks Park in the face of massive opposition; and, to support such a venture when fully aware of the ramifications, is totally at odds with the very concepts of democracy.

POSITIONS REGARDING PROPOSED WOODRIVER TIKCHIKS STATE PARK

The typical and most numerous Bristol Bay resident is clearly the Native. To over ride the stated wishes of the people is to dictate. And further, to deny the people of the Tikchiks area their right to determine the changes in the lands they own, and the lifestyle that is dependent on the land, is a usurpation of the right to freedom of choice.

- (d) There is no guarantee that further expansion, more proposed state parks, are not in the offing. Any expansion by the state in such a way as to withdraw lands and to create recreational areas with those lands, in face of the potential destruction of the basic economy, is clearly unwarranted. It is clear that the state does plan to expand, and that further development of the region would be part of that general expansion. Even with guarantees, there is no certainty that the land policies and management would continue in light of state actions in the region.
- (3) That the land is the key to the economic development of the area.
- (a) As previously stated, the subsistence economy is the basic economy of the area. Food sources are readily available, though subsistence is becoming more and more victimized by protection officers. Any additional developments that in any way affect current land usages will have long range effects on the economy. The Tikchiks region, being a natural watershed, a place of unsurpassed beauty and with numerous attractions to tourists, is especially threatened, and must be stringently opposed.

POSITIONS REGARDING PROPOSED WOODRIVER TIKCHIKS STATE PARK

(b) With the advent of roads from Anchorage to the Tikchiks, the area will be unalterably destroyed.

(c) There is simply no adequately presented reason to justify the park system. The reasons weighed against the proposal are too expansive to justify such an undertaking:

\*Where 95% of the people of the region are subsistence hunters and fishermen.

\*Where allotments exist within the contiguous boundaries of the park system.

\*Where the basis of the economy is necessarily the land.

\*Where expansion of state authority would bring about a great detrimental effects to the prosperity and happiness of the people.

\*Where the people of the area are dependent upon the lands, and the game there is.

\*Where there is such wide spread opposition to any such incursion into the lands.

\*Where freedom of choice is denied, and the land resources inextricably dependent on that freedom of choice.

\*Where further development may mean roads, a boost in tourism, a destruction of the resources through carelessness. people is so threatened.

We feel that the Tikchiks Park, proposed, should be opposed vehemently.

From The Desk Of:

Dale P. Tubbs

The Honorable Ted G. Smith  
House of Representatives  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

April 17, 1975

Dear Representative Smith,

This is a draft agreement for the land exchange involving the fish incubation site and Wood-Tikchik State Park Bill. The agencies involved are now reviewing the draft agreement for comment and correction.



Deputy Director, Alaska Division Of Lands

LAND EXCHANGE AGREEMENT

Draft #2  
4/17/75

This land exchange agreement entered into this First day of May, 1975 between the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska, the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Alaska, Choggiung Limited, and Bristol Bay Native Corporation, Inc., corporations organized under Alaska law pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, is to exchange lands of equal value as identified herein when each has sufficient title to pass title.

Witnesseth That:

Whereas, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game finds it necessary to have title vested in the State of Alaska to a parcel of land for the purpose of constructing a fish incubation site located adjacent to Lake Nunavaugaluk within protracted Sections 26 and 25, Township 11 South, Range 57 West, Seward Meridian, further described by the following metes and bounds description:

Beginning at the point at which East Creek flows into Lake Nunavaugaluk at elevation 32° as established from U.S.G.S. gauging station at said lake outlet, thence northerly along the east beach of said lake at elevation 32° a distance of 100 feet, thence due east a distance of 400 feet, thence due south 400 feet, thence due east 600 feet, thence due north 500 feet, thence due east 900 feet, thence due south 650 feet, thence due west 600 feet, thence due south 250 feet, thence due west 300 feet, thence due south 100 feet, thence due west to east beach of Lake Nunavaugaluk at

elevation 32°, thence northerly along the beach at 32° elevation to the point of beginning, said parcel containing 30 acres, more or less.

Whereas, said lands described above have been selected by Choggiung Limited as provided in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and title will be conveyed to Choggiung Limited by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and

Whereas, the Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska has the authority pursuant to Alaska Statute 38.95.060 to exchange lands with native corporations with consent of the Governor of Alaska; and

Whereas, Choggiung Limited is willing to exchange the lands needed by the State for the fish incubation site for equal value lands within the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park area as presently proposed in House Bill 57 of the first session of the 1975 Legislative Session; and

Whereas, the area from which the equal value lands in the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park has been identified by the Division of Parks, Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska to be in the vicinity of Agulukpak River between Lake Beverly and Lake Nerka;

Now, therefore, to provide for such a land exchange the Alaska Department of Fish and Game shall provide:

1. A cadastral survey of the site described above adjacent to Lake Nunavaugaluk. Said survey and plat shall be accomplished in general accordance with Alaska Division of Lands surveying criteria.

2. A land appraisal to determine the market value of said lands on Lake Nunavaugaluk and a land appraisal to determine a tract of land of equal value within the proposed Wood-Tikchik Lakes Park.

3. A cadastral survey of the equal value lands to be transferred to Choggiung Limited from within the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park. Said survey and plat shall be accomplished in general accordance with Alaska Division of Lands surveying criteria.

Choggiung Limited agrees upon receipt of working title of their land from the Bureau of Land Management to:

1. Transfer the then surveyed lands adjacent to Lake Nunavaugaluk to the State of Alaska by warranty deed. Said warranty deed will not include the mineral estate.

2. Allow the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Alaska immediate access effective the date of this agreement to the land adjacent to Lake Nunavaugaluk for the purpose of development of a fish incubation facility.

Choggiung Limited further agrees to:

1. Support House Bill 57 for the creation of the Wood-Tikchik State Park.

2. Use the lands to be conveyed to them in the land exchange in a manner that is compatible with the master plan for the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park as prepared by the Department of Natural Resources.

The Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska agrees:

1. That upon receipt of the warranty deed for the lands adjacent to Lake Nunavaugaluk from Choggiung Limited, the State shall provide a state patent to Choggiung Limited for the equal value land surveyed for the exchange from within the proposed Wood-Tikchik Lakes Park. Said patent shall contain a reservation to the State for the mineral estate.

The Bristol Bay Regional Corporation agrees:

1. That Choggiung Limited has the authority to enter into this land exchange under the terms listed herein.

2. That other qualified villages within the Bristol Bay Regional Corporation have no interest or claim to the land involved.

3. It will support House Bill 57 for creation of the Wood-Tikchik State Park.

That all parties signatory to this agreement agree:

1. That if the Wood-Tikchik State Park is not approved during the first regular session of the Ninth Alaska Legislature this land exchange agreement is null and void.

In witness whereof; the parties hereto have duly executed this land exchange agreement as of the <sup>date</sup> first above written.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Guy R. Martin  
Commissioner  
Department of Natural Resources

\_\_\_\_\_  
President  
CHOGGIUNG LIMITED

\_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Brooks  
Commissioner  
Department of Fish and Game

CONCURRED BY:

CONCURRED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay S. Hammond  
Governor  
State of Alaska

\_\_\_\_\_  
President  
BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH

Testimony of William P. Johnson

Director of Lands

Bristol Bay Native Corporation

TO: House Resources Committee  
State of Alaska

Subject: HB 57 ( Proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park )

Mr. Chairperson and members of the House Resources Committee, my name is William P. Johnson, Director of Lands for the Bristol Bay Native Corporation, a life long resident of Dillingham and have been and will continue to be a commercial fisherman of Bristol Bay area as others of our region, our state, the lower 48 and even our governor.

First, I would like to emphasize the importance of the Red Salmon resource to our state and nation. In the past, this resource has accounted for 60% of our nations total production or 20% of the worlds total production of processed Red Salmon. Recently, as in other fisheries, this resource has been drastically reduced by mismanagement and other natural causes. Since this situation exists and the Park proposed calls for development for recreation and tourism, our Salmon resource would be further jeopardized. It has been stated by Sen. Tillion that everywhere access was made to Salmon streams, this resource was drastically reduced or lost entirely.

The spawning grounds in this area has provided up to six million dollars worth of Salmon to the processor per year over a 12 year period, according to published statistics. Thus, the depletion or threatening acts which could lead to depletion of the harvestable return are our foremost concern. Therefore we stand solidly in opposition to the creation of the Wood-Tikchik State Park on the grounds that this is not the best use of the area, but wholeheartedly recommend that the State provide the means to manage this area in conjunction with the proposed National Iliamna Resource Range, which is aimed to the enhancement of this resource.

We submit this recommendation without reservations as this classification for the enhancement of our renewable resources would still provide adequate protection for the land provided that legislation to this affect can be passed. In addition, we strongly recommend that a total resource inventory of all lands, proposed for classification, be accomplished prior to the creation of any park. This recommendation is made for we believe that if an in-depth study was made of the Woodriver-Tikchik area, a resource range would have been recommended for the enhancement and protection of our Salmon resource.

ANCHORAGE HEARING  
1-20-76

ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY  
Upper Cook Inlet Chapter

Statement on Proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

I am Claudia Martin and I represent the Upper Cook Inlet Chapter of the Alaska Conservation Society. We would like to enter the following statement, concerned with the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park, into the hearing record.

The Wood River-Tikchik Lakes area, a scenic and spectacular chain of 12 major lakes, has been recognized for many years as one of the most outstanding natural areas in Alaska. Virtually untrammled by modern man, this region of rugged mountains, clear water and forests has received the focused attention of the National Park Service, the State Division of Parks, sport anglers, guides and those concerned with wilderness beauty for several decades. Those who have visited the area have reported their enthusiasm for the two large drainages in such publications as NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, ALASKA magazine and a diverse assortment of publications dealing with sport fishing and wilderness protection. Members of the Alaska Conservation Society have kayaked and hiked over much of the lands now proposed for inclusion within this state park. In all cases, both the spoken and written reports have been the same: the area is without rival as one of the scenic gems of the world.

The opinions of our members have been underscored by government resource planners from the National and State Park system. There are few who disagree that the area is deserving of wise use and protection. It is now time, indeed, it is past due that the State legislature take action by passing legislation creating the Wood-Tikchik State Park.

We fully realize that some local residents in the Bristol Bay Region have expressed opposition to the proposal. When one considers the alternatives to placing these lands in park status, such as resource extraction activity, conversion to private land or a host of other activities depreciative to their scenic quality, we become doubly concerned over the future of this area. It is our feeling that the studies have been done; it is time for action.

We have examined the legislation before you, and we offer some proposed changes:

1. In Sec. 41.20.420, it states that "The high quality sport fishing that exists in the area shall be managed to sustain it in perpetuity." We agree with this concept and would recommend that it be strengthened through the provision of a sport fish biologist whose specific concern is the Wood River-Tikchik Lakes. This Committee, therefore, should request the Department of Fish and Game to prepare a fiscal note relative to the above statement, and to put your full power behind the budget request to see a biologist provided for the area.
2. Our other comment regarding the legislation is concerned with Sec. 41.20.530, INCOMPATIBLE USES. The legislation here specifies that the area is "open to mineral entry". We ask you to change this, closing the area to the opportunity for mining. Fishery habitat, recreation and wilderness beauty are the resources to be protected here, not the opportunity to mine in a marginally ore-rich area. We do not want multiple-use parks. Geochemical investigations have shown no significant economically workable ore deposits in this proposed park, so we emphasize: close the area to mineral entry.

The boundary of the proposed park was drawn based on surrounding land tenures. It is not an ideal boundary, for it excludes much of Lakes Nerka and Aleknagik. We understand the native land selections to the south which required this. We can accept this. To the west, it would be valuable to have a hydrographic boundary between the Wood-Tikchik and Togiak watersheds. In general, however, we support the boundary.

In conclusion, we ask this Committee to remember that your responsibility is to all the citizens of the state when you consider state land uses. The Wood-Tikchik area is as much Anchorage's or Fairbanks' as it is Dillingham's. We become very concerned over the state-wide perspective of this Committee when we read that "no more park bills are coming out of house resources". This is an unfortunate attitude which we strongly oppose, but we think our point is self-evident to those who do not see state parks as "lockups" of land, but rather as guarantees that certain public treasures will be protected and that the public can be guaranteed that they will not be locked out. Remember, the ultimate lockup is a "no trespassing" sign.

Thank you.

## BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

P. O. BOX 179  
DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576  
PHONE (907) 842-3322

Speech presented at Public Hearing to State Officials, on the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park, at Dillingham, Alaska, January 19, 1976

Presented by William H. Nicholson, Director Community Advocates,  
BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

### PROTECTION OF A SUBSISTENCE LIFESTYLE

Honorable Legislative Representatives from Juneau, distinguished gentlemen, citizens of Aleknagik and Dillingham, and to anyone involved in decision making processes which will effect the future lives, and ultimate destiny of the Natives of Bristol Bay, and more particularly those of the Village of Aleknagik.

By way of identification, my name is William H. Nicholson. I have been a resident in this unique and beautiful Bristol Bay region since birth. My current official position is Director of Village Advocates. I work for the BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION. This is a very important and influential position. My function as I view it, is to be a strong advocate for the 29 Villages of Bristol Bay. In doing so, this Office attempts to promote the physical, economic, and social well-being of the Natives of the Bristol Bay region. Another important objective is to promote good government by reminding those who govern and those governed of their joint and mutual responsibilities.

Through means of this public hearing on the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park, I hope to speak clearly and effectively concerning the creation of the proposed State Park, or one similar to it.

Before House Bill 57 becomes law, we hope you will listen to what we have to say. As we speak, and you listen, we realize that probably thousands of city dwellers, sportsman, pleasure seekers, photographers, and hunters are waiting patiently for State of Alaska development of the Wood-River and Tikchik Lake systems. This unique area, created as a wonder by God himself with its great scenic views, rugged mountain peaks, placid lake and turbulent rivers...this 1.4 million acre plot of land and water with its abundant Salmon, Trout, Pike, and Grayling... this centuries old hunting ground of some of the world's best and expert hunters...the Eskimo hunters who pursue magnificent Big Game such as the Moose and Brown Bear, is currently threatened with development. This beautiful area with its teeming amounts of fish and game has been traditionally, and is now presently the site of much, substantial, subsistence activity. Natives of Aleknagik and some Nushagak River Villages have depended upon this area for sustenance of their culture. Many say, the Native culture is dying, but the fact remains that most Aleknagik Natives depend upon subsistence activity for their very survival.

We recognize that development must come, and will eventually come, although oftentimes, we do not desire it. Development is surely inevitable! Although we recognize that change must come, we advocate strongly that the humanitarian value of the Native people, however small the numbers, should take precedence over any special economic interests in Bristol Bay.

It is not a simple task to take over management of almost 1.5 million acres of land. This is complicated by the inalienable rights of the Native who lives within a democratic society.

This is even complicated still further, when we recognize that the State of Alaska has a constitutional mandate to protect renewable resources such as subsistence resources, and establish preference among users of these resources.

We are happy that a number of representatives from the State of Alaska are here to listen to us. Through their careful listening to us, maybe, we can insure some protection of our subsistence way of life. Hopefully, protection of the salmon spawning grounds will be insured also.

General feeling of the Natives who are directly affected by the creation of the proposed State Park, indicates a reluctance to allow the Alaska Legislature in Juneau to provide passage of House Bill 57 into law. There is a real, human fear, that the subsistence way of life will be threatened.

Recently, I conducted a study entitled: A SUBSISTENCE ACTIVITY REPORT OF ALEKNAGIK FOR 1975. Copies will be furnished for you. In this report, I found some interesting aspects which should be recognized by those of us involved in decision making processes which may influence lifestyles of many concerned and democratic Natives:

1. Most of the Aleknagik Natives, as well as the majority of the villagers in the Bristol Bay region live within a subsistence economy.
2. It is generally felt that the subsistence economy is far more important to the Native people of Bristol Bay than the monetary economy within Bristol Bay. A valid conclusion shows that the subsistence economy is worth twice as much to the Aleknagik Native than the monetary economy. (The sole source of income for the Natives is Commercial fishing for Salmon.)
3. If the subsistence activity is taken away from the Natives, or some limitations imposed, the Natives will have no other option or recourse, but to become dependant upon welfare and food-stamps. The Natives do not desire this to happen.

4. The Aleknagik Native people do not consider themselves poor, as long as they can hunt, trap, and fish. This sustains a pride within themselves. They depend upon subsistence activity to provide an average of over 76% of total food consumption per year, from fish and game.
5. Aleknagik Native people prefer subsistence food over local store bought canned or fresh goods.
6. For a one year period of time, it is estimated that the monetary evaluation of subsistence activity for the entire 31 family (210 population) village of Aleknagik, tabulated to \$186,976.64. The average amount per Aleknagik household, per year, comes to the equivalent of \$6,031.51. This is the monetary evaluation of Big Game, Furbearers, Porcupine, Waterfowl and Birds, Fish, and Berries.
7. Much subsistence activity occurs within the proposed boundaries of the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park. A monetary value has been placed to the amount of \$106,525.89. This amount is the value of subsistence fish, game, and furbearers which are caught by the Aleknagik Natives in 1975, in the proposed Wood-Tikchik Park area.

In conclusion, we can see quite clearly that Subsistence activity is a way of life for most Aleknagik Natives. Does one way of life have to die so another might live? This question should be carefully investigated and thought through by proper authorities. The Office of Village Advocacy, BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION, advocates that the subsistence lifestyle must be protected as much as possible. Without this, the Natives of Aleknagik will experience social and economic disruption. Without the subsistence lifestyle activity insured, within the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park, the age-old values the Aleknagik Natives have, will disappear. Let us remember that their values are cultural, and are different than the values that the white culture esteems. They are just as important, and must be allowed to perpetuate as they have for centuries.

A policy statement has been prepared by the Office of

Village Advocacy, for the BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION.

This policy statement shows the stance of Native leadership in relation to the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park:

We do not advocate, and are completely opposed to the creation of the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park, for a period of time.

We need to have a substantial period of time permitted to allow for a more documented study to be done on the social and economic impact of the proposed State Park upon Natives of this region who utilize the boundaries of the proposed State Park for subsistence activity.

Thank you for listening to what I had to say, for the benefit of the Native people of Bristol Bay.

*William N. Johnson*

File

Statement by Robert C. Bacon, General Manager

Bristol Bay Native Corporation

Dillingham, Ak.

My name is Robert C. Bacon. I am a Mining Engineer by profession and worked for some 20 years in exploration, development and operation of mineral deposits. For the past 20 years I have held executive positions in both the United States and abroad.

One of the areas of concern which both I and my company have regarding the proposed Wood River- Tikchik park is that there have apparently been no in-depth studies on the mineral potential of the region in question. Before a decision is made to create the park, it would appear to be imperative to assess the effect of withdrawing this land from multi-use.

The United States is short on many minerals which are used by all of us in our daily lives. Like "project independence" in the petroleum field, it is necessary to develop our own mineral resources and break away from dependence on foreign sources which can strangle our economy.

There are land use conflicts when mining is mentioned. Most people criticizing the mining industry and claiming it despoils the land, simply do not understand modern mining techniques which reclaims land and restore its contours. A recent study cites that since 1930 only 0.16% of the land mass of the United States has been utilized by the mining industry and that 40% of such land has been reclaimed,

It seems to us that a minerals survey using geochemical techniques and aereol photography should be made before any decisions is reached on the entire proposed park area.

I would assume that similar studies on salmon spawning, petroleum potential, future transportation needs and hydro electric power would be carefully made and evaluated. Without this approach a decision now can adversely effect the lives of future generations of our population and would be premature and irresponsible.

Thank you.

HOUSE RESOURCES STAFF SUGGESTIONS

(ROUGH DRAFT ONLY)

Address Comments to:  
Guy Van Doren  
Pouch Y, Rm. 116  
Juneau, Ak. 99811

Whereas: The Wood Tikchik area is one of the most valuable salmon spawning areas in the Bristol Bay area, and

Whereas: The area encompassed by the boundaries of Wood Tikchik State Park is used extensively by the village people for subsistence purposes, and

Whereas: The area encompassed by the boundaries of Wood Tikchik State Park is some of the most scenic and desirable land in the State of Alaska, and

Whereas: The people of the villages of Aleknagik and Dillingham have demonstrated concern over the proposed Wood Tikchik State Park because of interference with a subsistence way of life, and

Whereas: The Director of the State Division of Parks has stated publicly that the Division does not intend to use the existing management plan for Wood Tikchik State Park, and

Whereas: The Director of the State Division of Parks has stated that he will develop a new management plan based on the needs of the people of the area, working with a Wood Tikchik State Park Advisory Council , and

Whereas: It is the desire of the Legislature to preserve the area within the boundaries of Wood Tikchik State Park in its natural state as it exists now

Respectfully,

Be it therefore resolved that the Legislature request the Governor of the State of Alaska to direct the Commissioner of Natural Resources to place the area encompassed by the boundaries of the proposed Wood Tikchik State Park be held in a status that will allow no changes for a period of five years, and

Be it further resolved that the Director of the Division of State Parks develop a new master plan for Wood Tikchik State Park working with an established Wood Tikchik State Park Advisory Council consisting of the Director of State Parks, two people from the village of Aleknagik, two people from the city of Dillingham and one person from Anchorage, taking into consideration the subsistence way of life of the people in the area and the preservation of the valuable salmon spawning areas, as well as a scenic-recreation area.

# STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

DIVISION OF PARKS

323 E. 4TH AVENUE — ANCHORAGE 99501

## TESTIMONY WOOD-TIKCHIK STATE PARK

Mr. Chairman, members of the Natural Resources Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Russ Cahill and I am the Director of the Alaska Division of Parks. I am here today to testify on behalf of the sponsor substitute for House Bill 57, the Act creating the Wood-Tikchik State Park and to attempt to answer questions you may have regarding the potential management of this proposed park by my agency.

There has been a great deal of study and debate over this proposal and others for the area, and I will not try to bring all of that up at this time. However, for most of you, this is the first meeting you have had with the Parks side of Governor Hammond's administration, and I would like to take this opportunity to outline my policies as they would apply to this bill.

### General

We are in favor of this proposal for several reasons. The area is one of superb scenery, outstanding fish and wildlife

resources, and has plenty of room for recreation use which does not conflict with the valuable fisheries or the needs of local subsistence users.

### Park Development

Many studies have been made. Those studies recommend various alternatives including more lodges, inexpensive lodges, big campgrounds, small campgrounds, roads, trails and so forth. There are three criteria that these proposals will have to meet.

(1) There must be funds available.

(2) Plans must be worked out in consultation with people living in the area, and must not make any significant adverse impacts on the life style of the people.

(3) There must be minimal environmental impact on the fish and game, scenery and water quality of the area. There is a strong probability that development will be minimal.

Management will be based on the above criteria. Every attempt will be made to hire park employees from the local labor pool. Potential State employees would be park rangers and maintenance people.

Mineral Development

After research, we find that the minerals potential of this area is marginal or worse. We are not interested in "across the board" closures on mineral entry in all parks. In our Talkeetna Mt. State Park Proposal, we have included a mineral use zone in the bill to allow extraction in an area where it has been historic and economical to take the minerals out.

In this bill, we would prefer that Sec. 41.20.430(a) be changed to exclude mineral entry. We feel that the areas scenic and fisheries values should be protected and that mining is incompatible with those values. We can certainly operate this park under the bill as drafted, but would prefer a mining closure.

Master Plan for Park

The existing master plan, which has received wide circulation, does not represent the policy of the State at this time. Before any work would be done in this proposed park, I would demand a revised plan be worked out with the people of the Bristol Bay Region. I think it is time for us to make our decisions on the resource values, operating in teamwork with the local population.

That is my statement, Mr. Chairman, and I will be happy to try to answer any questions you have. Thank you.

TELETYPE

TELEGRAM

MAIL

TO Mr. Sam Fortier

AT BBNA

SUBJECT Meeting re: Wood-River, Tichik Park

DATE Nov. 12

I agree with your meeting idea. Please set it up for  
late November. I will be home Nov. 26 ( am traveling  
on Coastal Zone Management hearings till then).

Rep. Nels A. Anderson, Jr.

Rediform<sup>TM</sup>

45 461

only Post 150 sets) 4P461

SIGNED

*copy to HB 57 file*

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Tom Hawkins, Planner  
FROM: Samuel J. Fortier  
DATE: October 31, 1975  
SUBJECT: Your memo of October 10

C  
O  
P  
Y  
Tom - thank you for soliciting BBNA for ideas on the important issue of proper land management, especially concerning D-2 legislation and the Tikchik - Woodriver Park proposal. Then too, thanks for waiting patiently.

Bristol Bay Native Association has prioritized the fishery economy and subsistence economy as key issues in the region. Indeed, and lifestyle immensely. We are working toward developing a package that truly represents this case - and that subsistence is a right. Our efforts are being coordinated through the Bristol Bay Regional Development Council (a state-funded planning grant, as well as a state commission within the Department of Commerce and Economic Development) as well as a special D-2 committee appointed by the BBNA Board 2 weeks ago and the BBNA staff, including the EDA/Planning department.

D-2 legislation also enters into the Woodriver - Tikchik proposal - perhaps its a first step by the State (and later the feds) to test the validity of subsistence rights as eminent domain (manifest destiny?). At any rate, we are slowly sitting through the proposal, and are arriving at some conclusions - some ideas.

The proposal, though, may very well endanger not only the subsistence facet of the Bristol Bay economy, but also the monetary facet. In any related struggle between the urban and the rural, the inevitable crisis seems to revolve around recreation as survival. The Tikchik - Woodriver case is a product of such a struggle. Ultimately, the resource that first creates that clash forms the crucible for the ensuing showdown (a showdown encompassing different lifestyles and cultures - perhaps a neo-colonialism?). The resource is the Woodriver - Tikchik region. The value of the region is its inherent quality to provide all phases of the economy to the people of the region. And the proposed parts is not an accurate depiction of the true value of the resource. The park will impact the lifestyles of the residents of the area, the Bristol Bay fishery, and the twin economy of the residents of the Woodriver, Nushigak, and Mulchatna drainages.

55 HB 57 file

Page 2

Memorandum: Your memo of October 10

I suggest that you, members of the Dillingham Native Association, the Village of Aleknagik, and members of the Bristol Bay Native Association, as well as Nels and whoever else may be concerned, hold a series of meetings between now and January to determine what may yet be done. Perhaps a meeting initially, near November 20 would be a good time to begin.

In the upcoming weeks, I'd like to have a planning meeting or 2 with Aleknagik people, you, Nels, and whoever else you might suggest.

And, I'm taking the liberty of sending copies of this memo to the interested parties.

We're looking forward to sharing ideas.

cc: Hjalmar Olson, Jr.  
Village of Aleknagik  
Dillingham Native Association  
Nels A. Anderson, Jr.

SJF:bm

C  
O  
P  
Y

BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION

P. O. BOX 179  
DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576  
PHONE (907) 842-3322

*File  
SSH 57*

November 12, 1975

Mr. Henry W. Cavallero, Esq.  
Alaska Legal Services Corp.  
General Delivery  
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

Reference: Tikchik State Park  
Planning

Dear Hank:


A meeting has been tentatively arranged, for preplanning purposes on or about November 26; I have had no response, but eagerly await confirmation by principals of this premier planning session.

I hopw you will attend the meeting! I had intended to cc a copy of the memo sent in late October, but apparently forgot. I am confident that such an oversight will not impinge your enthusiasm, and that you will be in attendance (a special invitation is herewith delivered!).

See you then - I'll let you know of any changes.

Sincerely,

Bristol Bay Native Association

  
Samuel J. Fortier  
Manpower Director

SJF:bm

*cc. Tom Hawkins, Chogging  
Aleknagik Village Council  
Rep. Nels Andersen, Jr*

File with  
SSTG 57 bill

# STATE OF ALASKA

**DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

DIVISION OF PARKS

323 E. 4TH AVENUE - ANCHORAGE 99501

December 16, 1975

The Honorable Nels A. Anderson, Jr.  
Alaska House of Representatives  
Box 234  
Dillingham, Alaska 99576


Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am sorry that I haven't had the opportunity to meet with you regarding the proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park. I am aware of the concern you and your constituents share over land use in the Bristol Bay area. It has been our desire to plan for the use of state lands in the Wood River and Tikchik drainages in consonance with local and statewide desires.

I realize that you will soon be conducting hearings on the proposed park legislation in Dillingham and Aleknagik. Since the proposed park is of statewide, as well as local significance, we respectfully request that a hearing also be scheduled for Anchorage.

I look forward to working closely with you on this, as well as other park legislation.

Sincerely,



Russell W. Cahill  
Director

NJ:po

# Alaska State Legislature

REPRESENTATIVE  
TED SMITH  
2616 SORBUS CIRCLE  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99504

WHILE IN JUNEAU  
POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811



COMMITTEES  
RESOURCES  
BUDGET & AUDIT  
LABOR & MANAGEMENT

## House of Representatives

15 January 1976

Mr. Guy R. Martin, Commissioner  
Department of Natural Resources  
Pouch M  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Guy:

During the hearings last year on HB 57 concerning Wood River - Tikchik Lakes State Park many people in Dillingham expressed the view that they did not wish to see a park established in that area although they did wish to maintain public access to the land.

Could you please comment on the likely future use of the land in that area should the Legislature decide not to designate this for retention in public ownership?

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ted Smith".

TED SMITH  
Chairman  
Labor and Management Committee

TS:mb

RECEIVED  
JAN 15 1976

Department of  
Natural Resources

# STATE OF ALASKA

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

POUCH 4 - JUNEAU 29811

January 15, 1976

The Honorable Ted Smith  
Chairman, Labor and  
Management Committee  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. <sup>Ted</sup> Smith:

Thank you very much for your letter regarding HB 57 concerning Wood River - Tikchik Lakes State Park. Although your inquiry was directed to a specific aspect of this park proposal, I hope you will allow me the privilege of a more complete and comprehensive response. First, I think we should all agree that the final shape of a park proposal for this beautiful and high quality area is yet to be determined, and should await the full expression of the people in the local area which would be affected by any park establishment. Although the Administration does believe that this area qualifies for park status in virtually every respect, and further believes that designation as a State park may well offer the best possible vehicle for long-range protection of this area, especially given the expressed interest of the local residents, it is important to remember my personal commitment with regard to the establishment of such parks is that they be flexible and responsive to the needs of the people who must live with them.


As I read through the comments of individuals from Bristol Bay area, and as I have discussions with people like Representative Nels Anderson, I hear the recurrent theme of protection of the land for its subsistence and spiritual resources, of an unwillingness to see park status imposed only as a preliminary to development, and of desire for uses in any future park which are consistent with the traditions of the area. These thoughts echo my own, and I am hopeful that you along with Representative Anderson and others from this area will be able to translate the wishes of the people into a proposal which will be acceptable.

As you know, my concern that this area be considered for possible inclusion in the State Park System is not limited to the simple desire to add additional acreage to that system. On the contrary, my interest is that it be considered as a unit to be held

January 15, 1976

in its natural state, and that such consideration take place at a time when our alternatives are still open. You are aware, I am sure, that there are substantial demands on the land throughout Alaska, and that there is a growing and legitimate case being made for private land ownership in important recreational areas. I am certain that this pressure has been felt and will continue to be felt, in the Bristol Bay region as citizens of large urban areas seek private land ownership in beautiful and remote areas of Alaska. It is the job of the Department of Natural Resources to balance these uses, and within that balance the task of the Division of Parks to propose those areas for inclusion in the Park System at a time when we are still capable of considering the broadest public uses. I ask that you work closely with the local people of Bristol Bay as a legislator to convey to them the hard choices which confront them as the pressures for use of this land increase. I hope that this has been responsive and helpful regarding your request, and look forward to speaking with you, Representative Anderson and others in this area as this proposal is considered in the public process.

Sincerely,



Guy R. Martin  
Commissioner

cc: The Hon. Nels A. Anderson, Jr.  
W/Enclosure

File

January 19, 1976

Mr. Nels Anderson  
Chairman, House Resource Committee  
District #16 Representative  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Anderson:

We reviewed the proposed bill for the Woodriver/Tikchik Lakes area. We found many shortcomings in the plan and the resource evaluation. The board feels the emphasis on recreation and tourism rather than salmon and subsistence reflects a misunderstanding of the economic realities of the area. The board also objects to the level of development proposed in the plan, particularly that associated with promotion and advertising to attract tourists from outside. We believe a higher emphasis should be placed on wilderness values or no development. We question the economic value of this project to the local economy. Another worrisome aspect of the plan is its transportation and highway emphasis. Finally, the lake system is rich in cultural and historical values for the native people of this region. The plan threatens these values. We would like to explore each of these issues in more depth.

First, the board feels that the proposal places tourists ahead of salmon and recreation in front of subsistence. In our opinion both of these priorities are reversed. The area is worth an estimated \$6 million per year for its salmon spawn. With rehabilitation and restoration this value could double. The primary development concept of the park, puts salmon secondary in importance. You must realize that 75% of the region's people depend on that salmon harvest. Then the report explains that it does not intend to preclude fish rehabilitation projects but it goes on to describe how they must not conflict with the recreation values. We fear that tourists might negatively impact the salmon values and feel that should be placed first and any development spending should be directed towards the restoration of the run.

Secondly, the board objects to the level of development proposed in the Master Plan. We aim this objection primarily at the exaggerated demand figures that depend so heavily on public relations hucksterism. The native people of this area do not want to compete with hordes of wealthy tourists for fish and game. This food is basic to our subsistence oriented lifestyle. We do not want to see connector roads opening the park to an elbow to elbow sport fishery. In short, this threat to native subsistence and social values is unacceptable. We agree that the area should be protected but do not feel that development and advertising will accomplish this protection.

Third, we question the economic value of this plan to the local community.

Mr. Nels Anderson  
January 19, 1976  
Page 2

Studies show that the area has an extremely high dollar value for subsistence purpose. We pointed out earlier the value of this area in salmon terms. Now we read that this project could generate \$240,000 income per season. Can we have both? Or will increased use of the area while the salmon are spawning result in a deminished fish and subsistence harvest. Even more important is the question WHO will benefit? Certainly the airlines and the existing lodge owners will, but is it fair to benefit essentially non-local residents and place the costs on native people. We feel that it is not. We have learned from the pipeline that local hire does not work. We can see that the plan has no provisions to utilize the local labor force through job training or other programs. We have no desire to see the lakes become the backbone of another non-resident industry.

Fourth, we must discuss briefly the issue of roads into this area from Anchorage. The plan stresses the importance of a good transportation network to the park. It goes on to point out that all that is needed to bring a road to Dillingham would be increased economic justification. The park would provide the cornerstone of this economic base. The people of this area do not want roads linking them to the hordes of campers that would soon follow. We resent this domino theory of state empire building. Listen to the people. They do not want a road net link to the outside.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that the lakes area is rich in historical and cultural values for the native people of this region. Park planners clearly overlooked these values when they committed less than .0025 per cent of the included acreage to their preservation. But more important to native people is the protection of this natural area so that we may continue hunting, trapping, and fishing here as generations of our people have done. We just cannot believe that vigorous tourist use of this area is in our best interest. Preservations, promotion, tradition, and development don't mix.

We ask the State to weigh these comments and recognize the values that we wish to protect. An alternative proposal that stressed salmon rehabilitation, subsistence lifestyles and wilderness preservation or no development would be infinitely more suitable. As it stands the costs are here and real while the benefits are not. Nothing in the proposed bill changes the feelings that we expressed last year.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Herman Schroeder  
CHOGGIUNG LIMITED



Anchorage  
Herring - 1-20-76

# CHOGGIUNG LIMITED

P.O. BOX 247 • DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576 • PHONE (907) 842-3083

January 20, 1976

Mr. Nels Anderson  
Chairman, House Resource Committee  
District #16 Representative  
Bouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Camai Gentlemen:

We appreciate the opportunity to speak to you in person about a matter that strikes so close to our homes. We have testified before about the Wood-Tikchik State Park. Last year we told you that there were a number of things in the bill and the proposed development plan that we found unacceptable. Our review of these documents this year suggests that nothing has changed. The State is coming right back at us with the same proposal. Let us consider our objections again.

We recognize that the Wood River lakes and the Tikchik lakes are blessed with outstanding scenery. The Parks people estimate that scenery is worth \$240,000 per year to local economy if the park is developed. But the same lakes are worth \$6 million per year for their salmon spawn. They also generate a substantial subsistence economy for local people who trap, fish and hunt in this area. Now perhaps we can have both. But we know the value of the salmon run could double if restoration efforts were made. The subsistence value can be documented with more research. But the bill and the plan only pay lip service to these values. 75% of the area's residents depend on the commercial salmon season and subsistence hunting and trapping for their livelihood. And these values are only raised in passing in the bill and the plan. We feel that these values should be the dominant purpose for preserving this area. Let us rehabilitate the salmon run and enhance the subsistence habitat first. When these goals are assured then turn to the development of the recreation potential.

We also have fears about the campsites, roads and further development proposed in the plan. Our review indicates that 90% of the proposed campsites are adjacent to major salmon spawning areas. The proposed 5th lodge is right on the most prolific spawning stream in the system. The connector roads are routed through areas with possible archeological values. The entire development mystique descends from above when one reads the proposal. It's as if the Parks people were arguing; we must develop this land to preserve it. Once again we must protest as we fear that the level and location of proposed park development is not in harmony with the highest and best use of the land.

Chairman, House Resource Committee  
January 20, 1976  
Page 2

Our economic argument can be short and sweet. Salmon is the dominant resource value in the lakes. Subsistence wildlife is the second resource value. These are in dollar terms. We need guarantees that these values will not be destroyed in favor of recreation potential. We do not find them in the bill or the proposed plan. We cannot support it until these values are recognized and protected. Perhaps there are other values in this region too. The Rural Development Council study of agricultural potential speaks highly of the lands east of the lakes. Some mining claims are active in this area too. About these values we cannot speak with authority. But we know salmon and subsistence and they are the backbone of our economy. We cannot afford to lose them.


A point should be made about roads. In the plan the Park was touted as an economic justification for extending the road net to Dillingham. Sort of a domino theory appears here that frightens our people. We do not want to be linked to the outside by roads. If the Park must eventually have a road link to the outside we will always be against it. Listen to the people talking. They do not want a road link to state's main highway system.

We would also like to raise the issue of cultural values. Recent anthropological investigations show that the lake system is rich in historical and cultural values. Vanstone's study of the Nushagak Eskimo and Tikchik village are a strong indication of the importance of these lake systems in our state's aboriginal history. Yet park planners paid little attention to these items in their development plan. Besides the fact that these values are placed in an also ran category there is no mechanism in the proposed bill that would utilize local expertise in the development of the park. This is an obvious shortcoming that Juneau should understand well as they face the same problem with the Federal government.

So, Mr. Anderson these are the comments that we would like you to consider before any Park bill is authored by your committee. We feel that continued research on this issue must come before action is taken. As presented to us the Wood-Tikchik Park proposal falls far short of the ideal utilization of the lakes system.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on these issues.

Sincerely,

  
William Tennyson  
President

# STATE OF ALASKA

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF PARKS

323 E. 4TH AVENUE - ANCHORAGE 99501

January 21, 1976

Hon. Nels Anderson  
Chairman  
House Resources Committee  
State of Alaska  
House of Representatives  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the hearings held at Aleknagik, Dillingham, and Anchorage. I am submitting the following statements as a supplement to my testimony on House Sponsor Substitute for House Bill 57, introduced by Representative Smith.

The master plan document entitled "Proposed Wood-Tikchik State Park Alaska" does not represent the policy of this administration in regards to development within the Wood-Tikchik proposal. Specifically, this Division has no intention of proposing roads or new lodges on State lands within the proposed park.


I would also like to state for the record that it is my opinion that park status would give the extremely valuable salmon resource of the Wood-Tikchik area the best protection it could possibly have under existing State laws. I believe that this administration's record of action in regards to protection of fisheries resources in the Kachemak Bay area, and as a part of the recent negotiations with the Cook Inlet Region and the Interior Department are strong evidence of our concern for these resources and I personally promise that this Division will take no actions detrimental to any fisheries resources in the State.

Hon. Nels Anderson  
January 21, 1976  
Page 2 -

I expect to rewrite this proposed master plan for Wood-Tikchik State Park and to hold public meetings with the people in the region involved during that process.

As promised, I will supply your committee with a copy of the State's geochemical report on the Wood-Tikchik area.

Sincerely yours,



Russell W. Cahill  
Director

RWC:pg

Bristol  
Bay  
Native  
Corporation

P.O. BOX 237 / DILLINGHAM / ALASKA 99576 / PH. (907) 842-3070.

January 23, 1976

Mr. Nels A. Anderson, Jr.  
Chairman, House Resource Committee  
District #16 Representative  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Anderson:

We have reviewed the proposed Woodriver-Tikchik State Park and also attended the hearings held in Bristol Bay and Anchorage. We have several comments that we hope are considered by your committee. The Bristol Bay Native Corporation is strongly opposed to the creation of a Park in this area at this point in time, despite the fact that several changes have been made to the original bill, for the following reasons:

1. The most important resource of the Bristol Bay Region to its residents is the salmon. The salmon spawning grounds in the proposed park area provide upwards of \$6,000,000.00 worth of salmon to the processor per year, over a twelve year period, according to public statistics. However, the high subsistence values of the salmon must also be considered. The depletion of the harvestable return is the foremost concern of the resident population of the Bay area. Thus, there is a need to increase this harvestable return by whatever means - such as hatcheries and/or predator control measures. If this park becomes a reality, it is unknown how the increased traffic, number of people utilizing the lakes, and development projects will affect the important salmon spawning grounds.
2. The second most important resource of the Bristol Bay Region is the subsistence values of hunting, fishing, berry gathering, and trapping. Although the State indicates that the continuation of the subsistence activities will be allowed within the proposed park, the people feel that the continuation of the subsistence way of life is not assured or guaranteed. The people are afraid that once the park bill is passed, the State will turn around and find some sort of justification for closing the area to subsistence activities. The Native people are very concerned about retaining this traditional right. We feel that the overall impact upon the local residents will be adverse, especially the village people of Aleknagik, Koliganek and other villages surrounding the pro-

posed park boundaries.

4. We are not in favor of this area being closed to mineral entry as preferred by the Alaska Division of Parks. We feel that the geological reconnaissance is incomplete and the mineral potential is still unknown.
5. The very short tourist season of this area does not justify the creation of a 1.4 million acre playground for the rich nor the expenditure for its maintenance.

In conclusion, we would like to see this area be put to its best possible use without making any significant adverse impacts upon the salmon spawning grounds and on the life style of the people. We are not sure and the people are not sure that a park is the best use of this land. Therefore, we suggest that further in-depth studies be made of this area, before the legislature takes any further action, so that all the possible adverse impacts can be determined in detail. During this study period, the land should not be designated for any other uses such as open to entry.

We further suggest that the S.S. HIB57 be tabled indefinitely until the previous questions are answered.

Sincerely,

BRISTOL BAY NATIVE CORPORATION



Harold H. Samuelson  
President

HHS/es

STATE  
of ALASKA**MEMORANDUM**Department of Natural Resources  
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERTO:  Nels Anderson, Jr., Chairman  
House Resources Committee

DATE : January 28, 1976

FROM: Guy R. Martin *Guy* Commissioner  
SUBJECT: Status Report  
Beaufort Sea Lease Sale

As you know, the Governor announced last year, following the preparation of an impact statement and the holding of a series of hearings, that it was his decision that an oil and gas lease sale should be held this year in the State owned areas of the Beaufort Sea. The setting of a date for the sale, and the selection of the sale area were questions left open at that time, and which remain open at the present time.

Since the Governor's decision, several courses of action have been pursued to prepare for such a sale. First, it has been the intention of the Administration from the beginning to hold such a sale utilizing a procedure which is substantially more open and publicly responsive than in the past. The preparation of stipulations for the lease sale have been pursued with this as an objective. An interdepartmental committee of the Administration has worked diligently to prepare new environmental stipulations for such a sale and this process should be completed in the near future. At that time the stipulations will be subjected to public hearing in the area of the sale as well as in at least one other location in Alaska.

At the same time, the Department of Law and the Department of Natural Resources have been attempting to consummate an interim agreement with the Federal Government with regard to the small disputed tracts which appear in certain sale areas the State is considering. Such an agreement would permit the sale to proceed and place proceeds related to the disputed areas in an escrow account subject to later determination of Federal or State ownership. While this agreement is not yet completed, it is my view that satisfactory progress has been made, and that it will be possible to complete an agreement some time during the middle part of 1976.

Still another interdepartmental working group is dealing with certain technical and legal aspects in preparation for sale. These aspects include necessary changes in the lease, the evaluation of bidding methods, and preparation for sale area and tract selection. Again, this work is progressing satisfactorily, and should permit a sale in the middle to late part of 1976.

Nels Anderson, Jr.

-2-

January 28, 1976

No definition of sale area has yet been undertaken, and the entire area from the eastward boundary of Pet 4 to the Canadian border is under general study. It has been the general intention of the Administration to sell only a portion of this area, and the ultimate choice will depend upon a wide range of factors including jurisdictional difficulties exploration activity, the tract selection process overall, and all of the other factors which should be expected to influence such a choice.

Because there has been no specific definition of the sale area at this time, it is virtually impossible to supply revenue estimates for any sale. Generally speaking, the area in question is one of high interest on the part of industry, and the expectation for such a sale is optimistic. Intervening events may well be the most important determinate for the success of a sale in this area or for the determination to hold a sale on an early schedule. Such events include Federal oil pricing policy, State taxing policy, and the interrelationship of the State program with the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Program. Other factors will also have an effect on the success and viability of the sale.

cc: Commissioner Gallagher, Revenue  
Attorney General Gross, Law

**BRISTOL BAY NATIVE ASSOCIATION**

P. O. BOX 179  
DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576  
PHONE (907) 842-3322

February 5, 1976

Mr. Guy Van Doren  
Pouch Y - Room 122  
Capitol Building  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Van Doren:

Per our telephone conversation on January 29, 1976 concerning Wood-Tikchik State Park Proposal.

Bristol Bay Native Association held their Full Board of Directors meeting February 4th after 2 days of delay due to weather.

The Full Board unanimously passed a revised resolution with a few minor changes as you will note.


It is taken into consideration that your staff may or may not agree with the changes, especially the last part of the resolution concerning who should be on the Wood-Tikchik Advisory Committee.

I am enclosing a revised resolution passed by the Board and your original rough draft of the resolution.

If you have any questions or additional comments, please respond.

Sincerely,

Bristol Bay Native Association

  
Jeff Moxie  
Community Advocate

JM:nw

CHAIRMAN:  
NELS A. ANDERSON, JR.

STAFF ASSISTANT:  
GUY VANDOREN

POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811



VICE CHAIRMAN:  
TED SMITH

SECRETARY:  
~~BEN KOTZAK~~  
Ruth I. Allington

PHONE: 465-3715  
465-3781

## House Resource Committee

FRED BROWN

ALVIN OSTERBACK

DICK ELIASON

LEO RHODE

MIKE HERSHBERGER

LESLIE (RED) SWANSON

JAMES HUNTINGTON

February 6, 1976

Mr. Bob Engelback, Chairperson  
Alaska Chapter, Sierra Club  
PO Box 2025  
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Dear Mr. Engelback:

Thank you for your concern about the Wood River-Tikchik State Park proposal. As you probably know, we have already held hearings in Aleknagik, Dillingham, Anchorage, and Juneau on this issue.

The following letter, copy attached, states my view at the current time on such issues. If you are in Juneau, I will be glad to talk with you about this or other proposals you have a concern for.

Again, thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Nels A. Anderson, Jr.,  
NAA/ra

encl.

File Wood  
River SS HB 57  
Correspondence

Alaska Chapter, Sierra Club  
P.O. Box 2025  
Anchorage, Alaska 99510  
January 20, 1976

Rep. Nels Anderson, D - Dillingham  
Alaska State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Nels,

At its January Executive Board meeting, the Alaska Chapter discussed its hope for a Wood River - Tikchik Wilderness State Park. We would like to talk with you concerning the status of this park proposal and our hopes for legislative action during this session. Would it be possible for you to meet with us here in Anchorage on your way to or from Juneau sometime in the near future? We would suggest either a private meeting among conservationists at the Alaska Center for the Environment, or a public hearing or meeting. Please let us know what date would be most convenient, and we will work with you to schedule a meeting. We look forward to talking with you.

Sincerely,

*Bob Engelbach*

Bob Engelbach, Chairperson

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT(S) MAY NOT FILM  
LEGIBLY BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY OF THE  
ORIGINAL.

*(Handwritten mark)*

Billings, Alaska

Dear Sir:

Concerning the Woodriver-Tikobik Lake Area which is proposed for a State Park: I as Village Administrator for Koliganek Village.

This is an important issue and vital matter which is going to be the worst event since Alaska became a State. What freedoms are my people ~~are~~ going to be permitted after woodriver-tikobik turned to a state park. Are we going to be permitted as our ancestors to use the lake for subsistence hunting, fishing or trapping. Anthropologists and historians claim that native Alaskans came across Bering sea back 10,000 years ago from great land of Siberia. They came to search for better land, better hunting of wild animals for their subsistence and livelihood. As they came deeper into this great land they found more game for their families. What I see the poet about Christopher Columbus, sailed from Spain about 500-600 years ago. He claim that he landed his ship into a new world. The American Indians originally occupy the new world, who has the authority to use the land for subsistence hunting, fishing, or trapping.

I hope you take this important consideration for the people and help the people to preserve their subsistence hunting, fishing, and trapping in the woodriver-tikobik lake area.

Sincerely,  
*Almita Johnson*  
District T. Johnson  
Village Administrator