

LIBRARY INFORMATION CENTER FILED

1997-1998

86/2

9397

HOUSE RESOURCES

33

**Alaska Communities, by Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Karluk	48	\$31,250	91.5%	3.6%	9.1%	40.0%
Anderson	565	\$53,413	3.7%	3.7%	11.5%	22.2%
Healy	603	\$56,313	1.4%	3.8%	3.9%	39.4%
Hoonah	906	\$36,442	67.2%	3.8%	14.9%	35.4%
Craig	2,043	\$47,250	22.9%	3.9%	8.4%	25.9%
Two Rivers	623	\$53,518	7.3%	4.0%	10.5%	32.2%
McKinley Park	196	\$40,313	2.9%	4.0%	13.4%	40.8%
Petersburg	3,432	\$49,318	10.4%	4.1%	4.2%	28.8%
Wainwright	550	\$33,333	94.3%	4.1%	10.2%	40.4%
Skagway	816	\$37,500	5.5%	4.2%	10.6%	27.5%
Polk Inlet	36	\$50,446	13.3%	4.4%	24.4%	36.3%
Cordova	2,467	\$46,304	11.2%	4.7%	3.1%	23.8%
Coffman Cove	246	\$44,063	7.0%	4.7%	14.7%	29.8%
Sitka	8,733	\$43,337	20.9%	4.8%	6.7%	26.7%
Naukati Bay	136	\$43,333	1.1%	4.8%	9.1%	26.8%
Haines	1,429	\$38,542	18.1%	4.9%	5.4%	30.9%
Homer	4,126	\$36,652	3.6%	5.0%	7.9%	35.6%
North Pole	1,631	\$32,937	5.4%	5.0%	10.2%	26.9%
Valdez	4,486	\$68,570	5.9%	5.1%	8.8%	26.0%
Thorne Bay	625	\$39,688	1.2%	5.2%	18.6%	38.4%
Port Lions	239	\$40,938	67.6%	5.3%	14.1%	41.8%
Juneau	30,396	\$47,924	12.9%	5.5%	4.8%	25.0%
Ketchikan	8,552	\$41,931	15.7%	5.5%	8.6%	31.2%
Cube Cove	137	\$51,280	5.8%	5.7%	0.0%	21.4%
Soldotna	4,092	\$38,004	4.5%	5.7%	8.7%	33.0%
Saxman	381	\$30,481	77.0%	5.7%	25.5%	51.6%
Shungnak	252	\$29,583	94.6%	5.7%	14.0%	64.9%
Mendeltna	72	\$18,750	5.4%	5.7%	0.0%	60.0%
Wrangell	2,543	\$37,538	20.0%	6.0%	9.0%	34.1%
Ridgeway	2,364	\$48,967	4.6%	6.1%	6.3%	30.6%
Kodiak	6,749	\$46,050	12.7%	6.2%	4.4%	23.0%
Palmer	4,167	\$34,940	7.7%	6.2%	16.7%	53.9%
Fort Greely	740	\$25,801	1.0%	6.3%	14.4%	21.7%
Chignik Lagocn	74	\$56,250	56.6%	6.4%	20.0%	84.0%
Knik	443	\$26,250	11.4%	6.5%	24.8%	54.2%
Nikiski	3,023	\$44,242	6.1%	7.0%	14.5%	42.2%
Anchorage	254,849	\$43,946	6.4%	7.0%	7.0%	26.7%
Kake	767	\$35,875	73.4%	7.0%	10.9%	46.8%
Kodiak Station	1,638	\$34,196	1.7%	7.0%	6.3%	12.1%
Elfin Cove	54	\$43,125	1.8%	7.1%	0.0%	28.2%
Saint Paul	764	\$39,922	66.1%	7.1%	10.8%	32.6%
Bettles	32	\$38,333	22.2%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Kachemak	398	\$55,000	3.0%	7.3%	4.0%	32.0%
Kenai	6,971	\$42,889	8.5%	7.3%	12.1%	38.2%
Barrow	4,380	\$56,688	63.9%	7.5%	11.5%	30.4%
Sterling	5,705	\$51,145	2.1%	7.6%	7.4%	38.9%
Whitestone Logging Camp	189	\$45,625	3.7%	7.6%	9.7%	23.8%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Butte	2,538	\$41,471	3.6%	7.7%	10.4%	35.5%
Eklutna	425	\$66,946	12.6%	8.0%	3.5%	29.1%
Salcha	373	\$35,909	4.2%	8.0%	14.5%	36.9%
Glennallen	513	\$30,833	6.7%	8.0%	4.4%	30.7%
Port Alice	19	\$28,750	6.7%	8.3%	0.0%	42.9%
Golovin	152	\$16,146	92.9%	8.3%	15.3%	44.4%
Klawock	704	\$39,583	54.3%	8.4%	17.3%	48.4%
Delta Junction	855	\$31,250	4.4%	8.4%	8.6%	35.4%
Tok	1,216	\$30,341	12.5%	8.7%	20.3%	44.4%
Fox River	435	\$93,848	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	45.7%
Point Hope	749	\$47,788	91.9%	9.2%	23.4%	52.0%
Fox	321	\$28,250	7.3%	9.2%	18.0%	47.8%
Moose Creek	683	\$25,326	2.5%	9.4%	10.5%	32.7%
Dillingham	2,252	\$44,083	55.8%	9.5%	6.7%	37.7%
College	11,663	\$43,329	8.4%	9.6%	7.8%	32.3%
Ninilchik	655	\$31,518	19.5%	9.6%	24.4%	59.7%
Houston	994	\$32,344	3.6%	9.7%	15.4%	52.0%
Copperville	196	\$47,188	26.4%	9.8%	26.6%	51.8%
Metlakatla	1,595	\$38,370	82.4%	9.8%	12.8%	49.2%
Salamatof	1,134	\$38,203	10.4%	9.8%	14.6%	64.9%
Nome	3,656	\$45,812	52.1%	9.9%	11.0%	36.0%
King Cove	773	\$53,631	39.2%	10.0%	1.8%	24.0%
Northway Junction	114	\$41,875	70.5%	10.0%	36.8%	73.9%
Ouzinkie	246	\$48,393	85.2%	10.2%	18.9%	51.9%
Cantwell	144	\$44,000	22.4%	10.3%	34.6%	57.6%
Fairbanks	31,850	\$32,033	9.2%	10.3%	11.6%	29.6%
Nenana	440	\$27,292	47.8%	10.4%	17.5%	52.8%
Yakutat	833	\$36,875	55.1%	10.5%	11.8%	33.7%
McGrath	456	\$36,250	47.0%	10.5%	9.9%	36.3%
Seward	2,999	\$37,049	15.2%	10.7%	9.2%	44.9%
Wasilla	4,917	\$37,619	5.3%	10.8%	11.1%	36.6%
Tenakee Springs	116	\$18,125	9.6%	10.8%	20.0%	74.0%
Circle	83	\$17,083	86.3%	10.9%	36.7%	62.7%
Nanwalek	177	\$46,563	91.1%	11.0%	46.4%	66.7%
Big Lake	2,243	\$36,583	3.7%	11.3%	12.9%	43.8%
Unalakleet	803	\$34,531	81.8%	11.6%	19.2%	46.0%
Lazy Mountain	1,043	\$36,250	4.3%	11.7%	21.3%	53.9%
Northway	119	\$39,375	64.2%	11.9%	26.0%	54.9%
Iliamna	103	\$41,250	66.0%	12.1%	0.0%	42.1%
Kalifornsky	335	\$52,354	4.2%	12.2%	25.6%	47.8%
Bethel	5,277	\$42,232	63.9%	12.2%	9.0%	36.6%
Sand Point	870	\$42,083	49.3%	12.5%	2.9%	32.1%
Meadow Lakes	4,693	\$33,106	2.9%	12.5%	13.3%	44.1%
Grayling	186	\$21,641	93.3%	12.6%	29.6%	57.5%
Kotzebue	3,232	\$42,367	75.1%	12.7%	13.1%	41.2%
Ester	236	\$44,688	4.8%	12.8%	11.5%	33.0%
Dry Creek	110	\$40,625	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	13.7%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Pilot Point	115	\$38,750	84.9%	12.9%	0.0%	55.3%
Copper Center	536	\$34,643	34.5%	12.9%	0.0%	53.8%
Whittier	289	\$33,636	12.3%	13.0%	8.0%	37.0%
Akiachak	560	\$23,750	95.0%	13.0%	12.7%	54.5%
Nuiqsut	435	\$32,188	92.7%	13.3%	33.1%	48.2%
Pelican	187	\$27,083	29.3%	13.6%	3.4%	17.2%
Central	57	\$28,036	1.9%	13.7%	19.0%	64.6%
Whale Pass	79	\$49,583	2.7%	14.0%	35.7%	59.1%
Takotna	63	\$18,750	44.7%	14.2%	0.0%	36.0%
Hyder	151	\$23,750	1.0%	14.4%	22.7%	47.4%
Willow	408	\$34,773	1.1%	14.7%	0.0%	48.3%
Atkasuk	235	\$56,352	93.1%	15.2%	29.7%	45.1%
Hollis	175	\$31,250	2.7%	15.2%	8.3%	44.3%
Unalaska	4,251	\$56,215	8.4%	15.3%	1.0%	7.8%
Ferry	69	\$25,625	12.5%	15.5%	39.1%	65.0%
Cohoe	598	\$33,550	1.8%	15.9%	14.0%	49.5%
Anaktuvuk Pass	301	\$37,292	84.9%	16.1%	23.6%	45.5%
Clark's Point	66	\$17,083	88.3%	16.1%	18.5%	42.1%
Atka	111	\$40,625	91.8%	16.2%	25.7%	44.7%
Trapper Creek	306	\$31,071	6.1%	16.2%	30.3%	60.2%
Seldovia	285	\$27,500	15.2%	16.2%	11.8%	50.3%
Aniak	578	\$32,641	70.7%	16.4%	9.7%	32.2%
Noorvik	631	\$32,969	93.8%	16.6%	17.5%	60.7%
Akutan	420	\$27,813	13.6%	16.6%	0.4%	7.4%
Hughes	69	\$15,833	92.6%	16.6%	15.4%	53.2%
Marshall	318	\$28,750	92.7%	16.9%	19.0%	55.5%
Noatak	401	\$36,458	96.7%	17.1%	45.1%	75.1%
Eagle Village	34	\$11,875	80.0%	17.1%	93.1%	93.8%
Saint Mary's	504	\$28,542	83.0%	17.3%	19.2%	44.3%
Chistochina	55	\$24,167	61.7%	17.7%	52.0%	72.1%
Kotlik	543	\$20,417	97.0%	17.7%	36.6%	65.2%
False Pass	64	\$21,667	76.5%	17.9%	0.0%	53.1%
Galena	543	\$28,611	45.3%	18.2%	9.2%	24.7%
Port Alexander	94	\$20,625	2.5%	18.2%	11.5%	31.3%
Ivanof Bay	27	\$21,500	94.3%	18.4%	0.0%	45.8%
Slana	58	\$25,417	6.3%	19.0%	44.4%	62.5%
Tatitlek	99	\$27,188	86.6%	19.8%	0.0%	75.8%
Covenant Life	54	\$23,571	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Chiniak	74	\$44,375	5.8%	20.2%	5.1%	28.8%
Gulkana	95	\$38,750	59.2%	20.3%	27.3%	59.5%
Nondalton	221	\$21,750	89.3%	20.3%	42.6%	70.0%
Kasigluk	514	\$26,563	95.3%	20.4%	34.8%	66.3%
Kaktovik	222	\$46,250	84.4%	20.6%	30.7%	50.0%
Emmonak	10	\$25,625	92.1%	20.9%	34.6%	62.0%
Saint Michael	341	\$23,194	91.2%	20.9%	22.9%	60.6%
Deering	158	\$15,208	94.3%	21.6%	6.7%	41.7%
Pedro Bay	37	\$38,125	90.5%	21.9%	0.0%	34.8%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Angoon	616	\$32,083	82.3%	21.9%	35.1%	54.1%
Tazlina	297	\$45,625	23.1%	22.0%	13.2%	36.4%
Newhalen	177	\$26,250	94.4%	22.4%	5.5%	46.9%
Shaktoolik	226	\$8,438	94.4%	22.8%	31.9%	54.4%
Selawik	696	\$21,833	95.5%	23.1%	31.3%	67.2%
Big Delta	508	\$32,813	4.0%	23.2%	1.6%	54.0%
Tanacross	85	\$14,750	94.3%	23.8%	35.4%	59.7%
Tanana	299	\$17,000	78.3%	24.1%	21.8%	53.9%
Skwentna	77	\$17,692	1.2%	24.2%	0.0%	66.7%
Port Heiden	116	\$35,000	72.3%	24.3%	22.0%	45.8%
Ruby	217	\$15,000	74.1%	24.4%	12.8%	52.9%
Kiana	415	\$28,125	93.5%	24.5%	27.4%	62.1%
Brevig Mission	265	\$15,000	92.4%	24.7%	35.3%	54.6%
Kenny Lake	500	\$21,786	9.7%	24.8%	22.9%	50.7%
Elim	301	\$16,250	91.7%	25.1%	36.1%	66.2%
Mountain Village	738	\$26,750	91.1%	25.3%	36.7%	68.0%
Perryville	107	\$25,000	94.4%	25.4%	13.6%	72.9%
Levelock	115	\$12,159	82.9%	25.8%	20.9%	57.5%
Nelson Lagoon	90	\$44,583	80.7%	26.0%	0.0%	80.8%
Andreafsky	469	\$28,958	84.4%	26.0%	18.6%	43.8%
South Naknek	149	\$23,750	79.4%	26.3%	27.5%	58.0%
Hydaburg	425	\$20,139	89.1%	26.3%	21.8%	60.5%
Tununak	330	\$18,750	96.2%	26.3%	14.0%	50.0%
Chenega Bay	91	\$22,083	69.1%	26.6%	14.3%	41.9%
Chevak	721	\$17,222	93.0%	27.0%	17.8%	53.5%
Oscarville	59	\$26,250	91.2%	27.2%	0.0%	56.0%
Shishmaref	542	\$15,625	94.5%	27.3%	18.0%	65.1%
Pitka's Point	154	\$17,813	95.6%	28.2%	5.1%	57.0%
Eek	277	\$21,000	95.7%	28.6%	23.9%	63.4%
Manokotak	387	\$20,500	95.6%	28.6%	16.1%	58.1%
Crooked Creek	138	\$16,250	90.6%	28.7%	27.3%	64.7%
Aleknagik	226	\$21,875	83.2%	28.8%	14.3%	62.2%
Alakanuk	651	\$17,708	95.8%	29.4%	26.8%	61.5%
Tetlin	68	\$15,750	95.4%	29.6%	25.0%	58.5%
Manley Hot Springs	90	\$31,250	14.6%	30.0%	12.5%	32.3%
Koyuk	272	\$18,750	94.8%	30.0%	37.3%	64.6%
Kongiganak	349	\$33,250	97.3%	30.3%	16.3%	60.0%
Red Devil	49	\$25,000	50.9%	30.7%	14.3%	63.6%
Ambler	333	\$22,500	89.7%	31.1%	39.3%	66.3%
Chickaloon	205	\$32,083	6.2%	31.2%	26.7%	38.2%
Old Harbor	301	\$16,875	88.7%	31.5%	39.1%	75.9%
Mekoryuk	192	\$14,792	99.4%	31.5%	16.7%	59.1%
Arctic Village	121	\$9,661	93.8%	31.5%	12.5%	52.5%
Teller	265	\$20,000	86.8%	32.1%	3.3%	38.9%
Fort Yukon	575	\$17,969	85.0%	32.1%	27.4%	55.4%
Kivalina	357	\$28,036	97.5%	32.2%	55.6%	71.4%
Beaver	118	\$20,313	95.1%	32.2%	22.6%	63.6%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Stebbins	513	\$23,333	94.8%	32.3%	39.2%	64.0%
Buckland	412	\$18,906	95.0%	32.8%	12.2%	59.4%
Happy Valley	391	\$16,250	6.1%	32.8%	25.6%	68.6%
Meyers Chuck	28	\$16,250	10.8%	33.3%	0.0%	54.2%
Hope	152	\$17,250	3.1%	33.5%	38.4%	50.8%
Akiak	327	\$13,571	97.2%	33.9%	16.0%	60.2%
Egegik	127	\$20,625	70.5%	34.1%	24.3%	69.6%
Napaskiak	399	\$18,750	94.8%	34.3%	22.7%	63.4%
Talkeetna	347	\$11,991	1.6%	34.3%	10.1%	26.1%
Kobuk	89	\$20,625	89.9%	34.7%	35.0%	66.7%
Shageluk	145	\$16,250	95.0%	34.8%	22.9%	67.5%
Minto	244	\$17,656	97.2%	35.0%	60.3%	81.6%
Wales	162	\$15,000	88.8%	35.2%	19.3%	53.5%
Chefornak	405	\$20,278	97.5%	35.4%	6.2%	66.8%
Koliganek	194	\$18,125	96.1%	35.6%	11.1%	72.4%
Platinum	41	\$23,056	92.2%	35.8%	8.0%	54.0%
Nulato	365	\$17,143	96.9%	35.9%	25.7%	66.7%
Evansville	20	\$29,167	57.6%	36.1%	16.0%	16.0%
Napakiak	354	\$18,125	94.3%	36.2%	33.3%	61.3%
Rampart	54	\$15,000	94.1%	36.2%	78.8%	87.5%
Tyonek	151	\$11,591	92.2%	37.1%	37.7%	64.5%
Quinhagak	567	\$17,500	93.8%	37.2%	5.9%	60.6%
Alexander Creek	38	\$8,166	25.0%	38.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Sutton	431	\$23,393	5.8%	38.1%	17.2%	47.6%
White Mountain	193	\$15,893	87.8%	38.3%	36.4%	67.3%
Kwethluk	672	\$16,000	96.4%	38.7%	11.8%	72.0%
Mosquito Lake	92	\$28,750	1.3%	38.8%	7.3%	32.1%
Toksook Bay	496	\$21,875	95.5%	39.2%	25.5%	59.1%
Koyukuk	126	\$13,929	97.6%	39.2%	27.0%	62.0%
Upper Kalskag	198	\$16,250	84.9%	39.6%	25.5%	68.5%
Nunapitchuk	489	\$17,083	97.1%	40.0%	12.3%	60.8%
Scammon Bay	459	\$15,179	96.5%	40.7%	18.4%	60.1%
Chitina	84	\$13,125	46.9%	40.9%	33.3%	64.7%
Kaltag	245	\$15,500	92.5%	41.4%	24.1%	52.9%
Goodnews Bay	263	\$13,523	95.9%	41.8%	3.1%	56.6%
Saint George	184	\$25,250	94.9%	41.9%	14.9%	52.9%
Chignik Lake	127	\$19,167	91.7%	42.0%	15.2%	68.2%
Kwigillingok	333	\$14,500	95.0%	43.1%	9.2%	58.6%
Eagle	165	\$12,500	3.0%	43.4%	32.5%	52.5%
Hooper Bay	1,012	\$18,125	96.0%	43.5%	41.7%	66.3%
Huslia	245	\$13,333	90.8%	43.7%	38.5%	67.5%
Mentasta Lake	122	\$11,250	72.9%	44.1%	18.8%	81.9%
Nikolai	108	\$11,250	89.0%	44.5%	35.5%	73.0%
Russian Mission	295	\$21,667	94.7%	45.0%	21.0%	61.1%
Anvik	83	\$10,694	91.5%	45.0%	13.6%	60.4%
Port Protection	58	\$10,000	1.6%	45.6%	75.0%	95.3%
Tuntutuliak	351	\$14,444	96.7%	46.0%	6.4%	59.5%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Nikolaevsk	474	\$19,688	1.3%	46.1%	0.0%	52.5%
Togiak	762	\$15,000	87.3%	46.3%	23.1%	72.9%
Gambell	653	\$15,938	96.2%	46.4%	16.8%	71.1%
Allakaket	182	\$11,477	94.1%	46.9%	69.4%	78.4%
Northway Village	110	\$13,333	94.7%	47.0%	51.3%	72.1%
Venetie	241	\$14,688	94.0%	47.2%	37.5%	69.8%
Chuathbaluk	115	\$13,750	89.7%	47.4%	8.6%	47.5%
Atmautluak	292	\$15,833	96.9%	47.6%	25.3%	55.3%
Holy Cross	260	\$13,750	93.5%	48.8%	38.6%	72.3%
Twin Hills	59	\$11,667	92.4%	50.0%	25.0%	72.7%
Newtok	269	\$14,844	93.2%	50.2%	25.9%	68.2%
Savoonga	622	\$11,339	95.2%	50.9%	14.7%	72.2%
New Stuyahok	452	\$12,083	95.9%	51.0%	17.7%	74.9%
Tuluksak	385	\$20,446	95.5%	51.2%	2.5%	56.9%
Pilot Station	547	\$16,000	95.0%	51.3%	35.1%	62.9%
Ekwok	124	\$10,833	87.0%	52.0%	23.5%	73.1%
Kokhanok	168	\$14,286	90.1%	53.4%	7.7%	65.4%
Sheldon Point	177	\$16,250	92.7%	56.2%	13.0%	41.2%
Game Creek	67	\$12,500	0.0%	59.6%	0.0%	13.8%
Gakona	23	\$32,500	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Lower Kalskag	278	\$10,357	98.3%	61.2%	37.9%	77.5%
Nightmute	217	\$17,813	95.4%	62.0%	26.9%	68.6%
Sleetmute	102	\$10,000	86.8%	62.6%	12.9%	67.5%
Diomedea	174	\$14,375	93.8%	63.0%	0.0%	60.4%
Edna Bay	70	\$12,250	0.0%	63.7%	25.0%	67.2%
Lime Village	47	\$9,257	95.2%	63.8%	13.6%	36.7%
Chalkyitsik	87	\$12,750	92.2%	67.3%	31.3%	81.0%
Healy Lake	60	\$5,841	85.1%	70.8%	33.3%	85.7%
Stevens Village	99	\$10,000	91.2%	73.9%	43.3%	72.6%
Circle Hot Springs	32	\$6,250	0.0%	74.1%	33.3%	54.5%
Kipnuk	567	\$4,999	97.4%	76.6%	12.9%	78.7%
Alatna	32	\$6,030	93.5%	83.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Birch Creek	37	\$5,032	90.5%	92.6%	0.0%	48.0%
Portage Creek	14	\$5,360	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Stony River	42	\$5,156	88.2%	100.0%	26.7%	64.5%
Wiseman	24	\$4,999	15.2%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%

* % Unemployment =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment, calculated from unemployment compensation claims

** % Adults Not Working =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment and those not actively seeking employment ("discouraged workers", in school, retired, disabled, or at home raising children, for example)

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Deadhorse	24	\$102,264	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fox River	435	\$93,848	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	45.7%
Lake Minchumina	45	\$75,222	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.3%
Lutak	52	\$70,485	17.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.4%
Halibut Cove	78	\$68,760	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chase	53	\$61,359	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clam Gulch	100	\$60,233	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	61.3%
Kupreanof	24	\$55,447	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Alcan	16	\$53,338	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Hobart Bay	107	\$52,377	6.4%	1.0%	0.0%	10.9%
Harding Lake	29	\$52,126	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.0%
Cube Cove	137	\$51,280	5.8%	5.7%	0.0%	21.4%
Primrose	62	\$46,563	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%
Cold Bay	120	\$45,625	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.9%
Nelson Lagoon	90	\$44,583	80.7%	26.0%	0.0%	80.8%
Crown Point	88	\$43,864	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%
Telida	5	\$43,750	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Elfin Cove	54	\$43,125	1.8%	7.1%	0.0%	28.2%
Cooper Landing	271	\$42,250	1.2%	3.6%	0.0%	53.8%
Igiugig	46	\$41,250	78.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%
Iliamna	103	\$41,250	66.0%	12.1%	0.0%	42.1%
Dry Creek	110	\$40,625	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	13.7%
Prudhoe Bay	47	\$39,673	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pilot Point	115	\$38,750	84.9%	12.9%	0.0%	55.3%
Betties	32	\$38,333	22.2%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Pedro Bay	37	\$38,125	90.5%	21.9%	0.0%	34.8%
Willow	408	\$34,773	1.1%	14.7%	0.0%	48.3%
Copper Center	536	\$34,643	34.5%	12.9%	0.0%	53.8%
Gakona	23	\$32,500	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Paxson	34	\$31,250	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	30.0%
Port Alice	19	\$28,750	6.7%	8.3%	0.0%	42.9%
Tatitlek	99	\$27,188	86.6%	19.8%	0.0%	75.8%
Oscarville	59	\$26,250	91.2%	27.2%	0.0%	56.0%
Jakolof Bay	35	\$21,875	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%
False Pass	64	\$21,667	76.5%	17.9%	0.0%	53.1%
Ivanof Bay	27	\$21,500	94.3%	18.4%	0.0%	45.8%
Nikolaevsk	474	\$19,688	1.3%	46.1%	0.0%	52.5%
Mendeltna	72	\$18,750	5.4%	5.7%	0.0%	60.0%
Takotna	63	\$18,750	44.7%	14.2%	0.0%	36.0%
Skwentna	77	\$17,692	1.2%	24.2%	0.0%	66.7%
Tonsina	46	\$16,250	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Meyers Chuck	28	\$16,250	10.8%	33.3%	0.0%	54.2%
Diomedes	174	\$14,375	93.8%	63.0%	0.0%	60.4%
Nikolski	43	\$13,750	82.9%	0.0%	0.0%	53.3%
Game Creek	67	\$12,500	0.0%	59.6%	0.0%	13.8%
Port Clarence	24	\$12,264	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Point Baker	57	\$12,083	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.0%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Alexander Creek	38	\$8,166	25.0%	38.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Portage Creek	14	\$5,360	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Birch Creek	37	\$5,032	90.5%	92.6%	0.0%	48.0%
Wiseman	24	\$4,999	15.2%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Akutan	420	\$27,813	13.6%	16.6%	0.4%	7.4%
Unalaska	4,251	\$56,215	8.4%	15.3%	1.0%	7.8%
Big Delta	508	\$32,813	4.0%	23.2%	1.6%	54.0%
King Cove	773	\$53,631	39.2%	10.0%	1.8%	24.0%
Tuluksak	385	\$20,446	95.5%	51.2%	2.5%	56.9%
Sand Point	870	\$42,083	49.3%	12.5%	2.9%	32.1%
Cordova	2,467	\$46,304	11.2%	4.7%	3.1%	23.8%
Goodnews Bay	263	\$13,523	95.9%	41.8%	3.1%	56.6%
Teller	265	\$20,000	86.8%	32.1%	3.3%	38.9%
Pelican	187	\$27,083	29.3%	13.6%	3.4%	17.2%
Eklutna	425	\$66,946	12.6%	8.0%	3.5%	29.1%
Healy	603	\$56,313	1.4%	3.8%	3.9%	39.4%
Naknek	640	\$50,907	41.0%	1.7%	3.9%	36.0%
Kachemak	398	\$55,000	3.0%	7.3%	4.0%	32.0%
Petersburg	3,432	\$49,318	10.4%	4.1%	4.2%	28.8%
Chignik	125	\$36,875	45.2%	0.0%	4.2%	38.2%
Eyak	166	\$150,001	7.6%	0.0%	4.3%	22.1%
Kodiak	6,749	\$46,050	12.7%	6.2%	4.4%	23.0%
Glennallen	513	\$30,833	6.7%	8.0%	4.4%	30.7%
Pleasant Valley	552	\$49,464	4.7%	0.0%	4.5%	24.2%
Gustavus	346	\$41,538	3.9%	3.6%	4.6%	26.2%
Juneau	30,396	\$47,924	12.9%	5.5%	4.8%	25.0%
Chiniak	74	\$44,375	5.8%	20.2%	5.1%	28.8%
Pitka's Point	154	\$17,813	95.6%	28.2%	5.1%	57.0%
Haines	1,429	\$38,542	18.1%	4.9%	5.4%	30.9%
Newhalen	177	\$26,250	94.4%	22.4%	5.5%	46.9%
King Salmon	478	\$54,072	15.5%	3.0%	5.8%	16.2%
Quinhagak	567	\$17,500	93.8%	37.2%	5.9%	60.6%
Fritz Creek	1,972	\$45,143	3.4%	3.4%	6.1%	38.5%
Chefornak	405	\$20,278	97.5%	35.4%	6.2%	66.8%
Ridgeway	2,364	\$48,967	4.6%	6.1%	6.3%	30.6%
Kodiak Station	1,638	\$34,196	1.7%	7.0%	6.3%	12.1%
Tuntutuliak	351	\$14,444	96.7%	46.0%	6.4%	59.5%
Womens Bay	662	\$44,861	10.5%	3.2%	6.5%	26.2%
Dillingham	2,252	\$44,083	55.8%	9.5%	6.7%	37.7%
Sitka	8,733	\$43,337	20.9%	4.8%	6.7%	26.7%
Deering	158	\$15,208	94.3%	21.6%	6.7%	41.7%
Anchorage	254,849	\$43,946	6.4%	7.0%	7.0%	26.7%
Mosquito Lake	92	\$28,750	1.3%	38.8%	7.3%	32.1%
Sterling	5,705	\$51,145	2.1%	7.6%	7.4%	38.9%
Kokhanok	168	\$14,286	90.1%	53.4%	7.7%	65.4%
College	11,663	\$43,329	8.4%	9.6%	7.8%	32.3%
Homer	4,126	\$36,652	3.6%	5.0%	7.9%	35.6%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Whittier	289	\$33,636	12.3%	13.0%	8.0%	37.0%
Platinum	41	\$23,056	92.2%	35.8%	8.0%	54.0%
Hollis	175	\$31,250	2.7%	15.2%	8.3%	44.3%
Craig	2,043	\$47,250	22.9%	3.9%	8.4%	25.9%
Ketchikan	8,552	\$41,931	15.7%	5.5%	8.6%	31.2%
Delta Junction	855	\$31,250	4.4%	8.4%	8.6%	35.4%
Chuathbaluk	115	\$13,750	89.7%	47.4%	8.6%	47.5%
Soldotna	4,092	\$38,004	4.5%	5.7%	8.7%	33.0%
Valdez	4,486	\$68,570	5.9%	5.1%	8.8%	26.0%
Bethel	5,277	\$42,232	63.9%	12.2%	9.0%	36.6%
Wrangell	2,543	\$37,538	20.0%	6.0%	9.0%	34.1%
Naukati Bay	136	\$43,333	1.1%	4.8%	9.1%	26.8%
Karluk	48	\$31,250	91.5%	3.6%	9.1%	40.0%
Seward	2,999	\$37,049	15.2%	10.7%	9.2%	44.9%
Galena	543	\$28,611	45.3%	18.2%	9.2%	24.7%
Kwigillingok	333	\$14,500	95.0%	43.1%	9.2%	58.6%
Whitestone Logging Camp	189	\$45,625	3.7%	7.6%	9.7%	23.8%
Aniak	578	\$32,841	70.7%	16.4%	9.7%	32.2%
Rowan Bay	9	\$58,295	6.8%	0.0%	9.8%	22.4%
McGrath	456	\$36,250	47.0%	10.5%	9.9%	36.3%
Talkeetna	347	\$11,991	1.6%	34.3%	10.1%	26.1%
Wainwright	550	\$33,333	94.3%	4.1%	10.2%	40.4%
North Pole	1,631	\$32,937	5.4%	5.0%	10.2%	26.9%
Butte	2,538	\$41,471	3.6%	7.7%	10.4%	35.5%
Two Rivers	623	\$53,518	7.3%	4.0%	10.5%	32.2%
Port Alsworth	67	\$36,250	1.8%	0.0%	10.5%	54.1%
Moose Creek	683	\$25,326	2.5%	9.4%	10.5%	32.7%
Skagway	816	\$37,500	5.5%	4.2%	10.6%	27.5%
Saint Paul	764	\$39,922	66.1%	7.1%	10.8%	32.6%
Kake	767	\$35,875	73.4%	7.0%	10.9%	46.8%
Nome	3,656	\$45,812	52.1%	9.9%	11.0%	36.0%
Wasilla	4,917	\$37,619	5.3%	10.8%	11.1%	36.6%
Koliganek	194	\$18,125	96.1%	35.6%	11.1%	72.4%
Barrow	4,380	\$56,688	63.9%	7.5%	11.5%	30.4%
Anderson	565	\$53,413	3.7%	3.7%	11.5%	22.2%
Point Lay	207	\$49,583	81.3%	3.3%	11.5%	22.7%
Ester	236	\$44,688	4.8%	12.8%	11.5%	33.0%
Port Alexander	94	\$20,625	2.5%	18.2%	11.5%	31.3%
Fairbanks	31,850	\$32,033	9.2%	10.3%	11.6%	29.6%
Yakutat	833	\$36,875	55.1%	10.5%	11.8%	33.7%
Seldovia	285	\$27,500	15.2%	16.2%	11.8%	50.3%
Kwethluk	672	\$16,000	96.4%	38.7%	11.8%	72.0%
Kenai	6,971	\$42,889	8.5%	7.3%	12.1%	38.2%
Buckland	412	\$18,906	95.0%	32.8%	12.2%	59.4%
Nunapitchuk	489	\$17,383	97.1%	40.0%	12.3%	60.8%
Manley Hot Springs	90	\$31,250	14.6%	30.0%	12.5%	32.3%
Arctic Village	121	\$9,661	93.8%	31.5%	12.5%	52.5%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Akiachak	560	\$23,750	95.0%	13.0%	12.7%	54.5%
Metlakatla	1,595	\$38,370	82.4%	9.8%	12.8%	49.2%
Ruby	217	\$15,000	74.1%	24.4%	12.8%	52.9%
Big Lake	2,243	\$36,583	3.7%	11.3%	12.9%	43.8%
Sleetmute	102	\$10,000	86.8%	62.6%	12.9%	67.5%
Kipnuk	567	\$4,999	97.4%	76.6%	12.9%	78.7%
Eielson AFB	4,203	\$25,924	0.9%	2.8%	13.0%	18.2%
Sheldon Point	177	\$16,250	92.7%	56.2%	13.0%	41.2%
Kotzebue	3,232	\$42,367	75.1%	12.7%	13.1%	41.2%
Tazlina	297	\$45,625	23.1%	22.0%	13.2%	36.4%
Meadow Lakes	4,693	\$33,106	2.9%	12.5%	13.3%	44.1%
McKinley Park	196	\$40,313	2.9%	4.0%	13.4%	40.8%
Dot Lake	80	\$38,333	54.3%	3.2%	13.6%	47.2%
Perryville	107	\$25,000	94.4%	25.4%	13.6%	72.9%
Anvik	83	\$10,694	91.5%	45.0%	13.6%	60.4%
Lime Village	47	\$9,257	95.2%	63.8%	13.6%	36.7%
Cohoe	598	\$33,550	1.8%	15.9%	14.0%	49.5%
Shungnak	252	\$29,583	94.6%	5.7%	14.0%	64.9%
Tununak	330	\$18,750	96.2%	26.3%	14.0%	50.0%
Port Lions	239	\$40,938	67.6%	5.3%	14.1%	41.8%
Red Devil	49	\$25,000	50.9%	30.7%	14.3%	63.6%
Chenega Bay	91	\$22,083	69.1%	26.6%	14.3%	41.9%
Aleknagik	226	\$21,875	83.2%	28.8%	14.3%	62.2%
Fort Greely	740	\$25,801	1.0%	6.3%	14.4%	21.7%
Nikiski	3,023	\$44,242	6.1%	7.0%	14.5%	42.2%
Salcha	373	\$35,909	4.2%	8.0%	14.5%	36.9%
Salamatof	1,134	\$38,203	10.4%	9.8%	14.6%	64.9%
Coffman Cove	246	\$44,063	7.0%	4.7%	14.7%	29.8%
Savoonga	622	\$11,339	95.2%	50.9%	14.7%	72.2%
Hoonah	906	\$36,442	67.2%	3.8%	14.9%	35.4%
Saint George	184	\$25,250	94.9%	41.9%	14.9%	52.9%
Lignite	122	\$38,125	0.0%	1.9%	15.2%	43.5%
Chignik Lake	127	\$19,167	91.7%	42.0%	15.2%	68.2%
Golovin	152	\$16,146	92.9%	8.3%	15.3%	44.4%
Houston	994	\$32,344	3.6%	9.7%	15.4%	52.0%
Hughes	69	\$15,833	92.6%	16.6%	15.4%	53.2%
Evansville	20	\$29,167	57.6%	36.1%	16.0%	16.0%
Akiak	327	\$13,571	97.2%	33.9%	16.0%	60.2%
Manokotak	387	\$20,500	95.6%	28.6%	16.1%	58.1%
Kongiganak	349	\$33,250	97.3%	30.3%	16.3%	60.0%
Palmer	4,167	\$34,940	7.7%	6.2%	16.7%	53.9%
Mekoryuk	192	\$14,792	99.4%	31.5%	16.7%	59.1%
Gambell	653	\$15,938	96.2%	46.4%	16.8%	71.1%
Sutton	431	\$23,393	5.8%	38.1%	17.2%	47.6%
Klawock	704	\$39,583	54.3%	8.4%	17.3%	48.4%
Anchor Point	1,157	\$42,847	3.7%	0.7%	17.5%	53.0%
Noorvik	631	\$32,969	93.8%	16.6%	17.5%	60.7%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Nenana	440	\$27,292	47.8%	10.4%	17.5%	52.8%
New Stuyahok	452	\$12,083	95.9%	51.0%	17.7%	74.9%
Chevak	721	\$17,222	93.0%	27.0%	17.8%	53.5%
Fox	321	\$28,250	7.3%	9.2%	18.0%	47.8%
Shishmaref	542	\$15,625	94.5%	27.3%	18.0%	65.1%
Kasilof	539	\$51,439	2.9%	2.5%	18.4%	40.8%
Scammon Bay	459	\$15,179	96.5%	40.7%	18.4%	60.1%
Clark's Point	66	\$17,083	88.3%	16.1%	18.5%	42.1%
Thorne Bay	625	\$39,688	1.2%	5.2%	18.6%	38.4%
Andreafsky	469	\$28,958	84.4%	26.0%	18.6%	43.8%
Akhiok	101	\$42,500	93.5%	2.4%	18.8%	50.9%
Mentasta Lake	122	\$11,250	72.9%	44.1%	18.8%	81.9%
Ouzinkie	246	\$48,393	85.2%	10.2%	18.9%	51.9%
Marshall	318	\$28,750	92.7%	16.9%	19.0%	55.5%
Central	57	\$28,036	1.9%	13.7%	19.0%	64.6%
Unalakleet	803	\$34,531	81.8%	11.6%	19.2%	46.0%
Saint Mary's	504	\$28,542	83.0%	17.3%	19.2%	44.3%
Wales	162	\$15,000	88.8%	35.2%	19.3%	53.5%
Chignik Lagoon	74	\$56,250	56.6%	6.4%	20.0%	84.0%
Tenakee Springs	116	\$18,125	9.6%	10.8%	20.0%	74.0%
Tok	1,216	\$30,341	12.5%	8.7%	20.3%	44.4%
Levelock	115	\$12,159	82.9%	25.8%	20.9%	57.5%
Russian Mission	295	\$21,667	94.7%	45.0%	21.0%	61.1%
Lazy Mountain	1,043	\$36,250	4.3%	11.7%	21.3%	53.9%
Hydaburg	425	\$20,139	89.1%	26.3%	21.8%	60.5%
Tanana	299	\$17,000	78.3%	24.1%	21.8%	53.9%
Port Heiden	116	\$35,000	72.3%	24.3%	22.0%	45.8%
Beaver	118	\$20,313	95.1%	32.2%	22.6%	63.6%
Hyder	151	\$23,750	1.0%	14.4%	22.7%	47.4%
Napaskiak	399	\$18,750	94.8%	34.3%	22.7%	63.4%
Saint Michael	341	\$23,194	91.2%	20.9%	22.9%	60.6%
Kenny Lake	500	\$21,786	9.7%	24.8%	22.9%	50.7%
Shageluk	145	\$16,250	95.0%	34.8%	22.9%	67.5%
Togiak	762	\$15,000	87.3%	46.3%	23.1%	72.9%
Point Hope	749	\$47,788	91.9%	9.2%	23.4%	52.0%
Ekwok	124	\$10,833	87.0%	52.0%	23.5%	73.1%
Anaktuvuk Pass	301	\$37,292	84.9%	16.1%	23.6%	45.5%
Eek	277	\$21,000	95.7%	28.6%	23.9%	63.4%
Kaltag	245	\$15,500	92.5%	41.4%	24.1%	52.9%
Egegik	127	\$20,625	70.5%	34.1%	24.3%	69.6%
Polk Inlet	36	\$50,446	13.3%	4.4%	24.4%	36.3%
Ninilchik	655	\$31,518	19.5%	9.6%	24.4%	59.7%
Knik	443	\$26,250	11.4%	6.5%	24.8%	54.2%
Tetlin	68	\$15,750	95.4%	29.6%	25.0%	58.5%
Edna Bay	70	\$12,250	0.0%	63.7%	25.0%	67.2%
Twin Hills	50	\$11,667	92.4%	50.0%	25.0%	72.7%
Atmautluak	292	\$15,833	96.9%	47.6%	25.3%	55.3%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Saxman	381	\$30,481	77.0%	5.7%	25.5%	51.6%
Toksook Bay	496	\$21,875	95.5%	39.2%	25.5%	59.1%
Upper Kalskag	198	\$16,250	84.9%	39.6%	25.5%	68.5%
Kalifornsky	335	\$52,354	4.2%	12.2%	25.6%	47.8%
Happy Valley	391	\$16,250	6.1%	32.8%	25.6%	68.6%
Atka	111	\$40,625	91.8%	16.2%	25.7%	44.7%
Nulato	365	\$17,143	96.9%	35.9%	25.7%	66.7%
Moose Pass	116	\$22,083	11.1%	0.0%	25.8%	25.8%
Newtok	269	\$14,844	93.2%	50.2%	25.9%	68.2%
Northway	119	\$39,375	64.2%	11.9%	26.0%	54.9%
Copperville	196	\$47,188	26.4%	9.8%	26.6%	51.8%
Chickaloon	205	\$32,083	6.2%	31.2%	26.7%	38.2%
Stony River	42	\$5,156	88.2%	100.0%	26.7%	64.5%
Alakanuk	651	\$17,708	95.8%	29.4%	26.8%	61.5%
Nightmute	217	\$17,813	95.4%	62.0%	26.9%	68.6%
Koyukuk	126	\$13,929	97.6%	39.2%	27.0%	62.0%
Gulkana	95	\$38,750	59.2%	20.3%	27.3%	59.5%
Crooked Creek	138	\$16,250	90.6%	28.7%	27.3%	64.7%
Kiana	415	\$28,125	93.5%	24.5%	27.4%	62.1%
Fort Yukon	575	\$17,969	85.0%	32.1%	27.4%	55.4%
South Naknek	149	\$23,750	79.4%	26.3%	27.5%	58.0%
Grayling	186	\$21,641	93.3%	12.6%	29.6%	57.5%
Atkasuk	235	\$56,352	93.1%	15.2%	29.7%	45.1%
Trapper Creek	306	\$31,071	6.1%	16.2%	30.3%	60.2%
Kaktovik	222	\$46,250	84.4%	20.6%	30.7%	50.0%
Selawik	696	\$21,833	95.5%	23.1%	31.3%	67.2%
Chalkyitsik	87	\$12,750	92.2%	67.3%	31.3%	81.0%
Shaktoolik	226	\$18,438	94.4%	22.8%	31.9%	54.4%
Eagle	165	\$12,500	3.0%	43.4%	32.5%	52.5%
Nuiqsut	435	\$32,188	92.7%	13.3%	33.1%	48.2%
Napakiaik	354	\$18,125	94.3%	36.2%	33.3%	61.3%
Chitina	84	\$13,125	46.9%	40.9%	33.3%	64.7%
Circle Hot Springs	32	\$6,250	0.0%	74.1%	33.3%	54.5%
Healy Lake	60	\$5,841	85.1%	70.8%	33.3%	85.7%
Cantwell	144	\$44,000	22.4%	10.3%	34.6%	57.6%
Emmonak	820	\$25,625	92.1%	20.9%	34.6%	62.0%
Kasigluk	514	\$26,563	95.3%	20.4%	34.8%	66.3%
Kobuk	89	\$20,625	89.9%	34.7%	35.0%	66.7%
Angoon	616	\$32,083	82.3%	21.9%	35.1%	54.1%
Pilot Station	547	\$16,000	95.0%	51.3%	35.1%	62.9%
Brevig Mission	265	\$15,000	92.4%	24.7%	35.3%	54.6%
Tanacross	85	\$14,750	94.3%	23.8%	35.4%	59.7%
Nikolai	108	\$11,250	89.0%	44.5%	35.5%	73.0%
Whale Pass	79	\$49,583	2.7%	14.0%	35.7%	59.1%
Elim	301	\$16,250	91.7%	25.1%	36.1%	66.2%
White Mountain	193	\$15,893	87.8%	38.3%	36.4%	67.3%
Kotlik	543	\$20,417	97.0%	17.7%	36.6%	65.2%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Unemployment in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Mountain Village	738	\$26,750	91.1%	25.3%	36.7%	68.0%
Circle	83	\$17,083	86.3%	10.9%	36.7%	62.7%
Northway Junction	114	\$41,875	70.5%	10.0%	36.8%	73.9%
Koyuk	272	\$18,750	94.8%	30.0%	37.3%	64.6%
Venetie	241	\$14,688	94.0%	47.2%	37.5%	69.8%
Tyonek	151	\$11,591	92.2%	37.1%	37.7%	64.5%
Lower Kalskag	278	\$10,357	98.3%	61.2%	37.9%	77.5%
Hope	152	\$17,250	3.1%	33.5%	38.4%	50.8%
Huslia	245	\$13,333	90.8%	43.7%	38.5%	67.5%
Holy Cross	260	\$13,750	93.5%	48.8%	38.6%	72.3%
Port Graham	186	\$33,750	90.4%	2.1%	38.8%	62.4%
Ferry	69	\$25,625	12.5%	15.5%	39.1%	65.0%
Old Harbor	301	\$16,875	88.7%	31.5%	39.1%	75.9%
Stebbins	513	\$23,333	94.8%	32.3%	39.2%	64.0%
Ambler	333	\$22,500	89.7%	31.1%	39.3%	66.3%
Larsen Bay	120	\$39,750	84.4%	3.1%	40.0%	67.6%
Hooper Bay	1,012	\$18,125	96.0%	43.5%	41.7%	66.3%
Nondalton	221	\$21,750	89.3%	20.3%	42.6%	70.0%
Stevens Village	99	\$10,000	91.2%	73.9%	43.3%	72.6%
Slana	58	\$25,417	6.3%	19.0%	44.4%	62.5%
Noatak	401	\$36,458	96.7%	17.1%	45.1%	75.1%
Nanwalek	177	\$46,563	91.1%	11.0%	46.4%	66.7%
Northway Village	110	\$13,333	94.7%	47.0%	51.3%	72.1%
Chistochina	55	\$24,167	61.7%	17.7%	52.0%	72.1%
Kivalina	357	\$28,036	97.5%	32.2%	55.6%	71.4%
Minto	244	\$17,656	97.2%	35.0%	60.3%	81.6%
Klukwan	160	\$36,042	86.8%	3.5%	60.4%	76.1%
Kasaan	42	\$46,667	53.7%	0.0%	64.5%	73.8%
Allakaket	182	\$11,477	94.1%	46.9%	69.4%	78.4%
Port Protection	58	\$10,000	1.6%	45.6%	75.0%	95.3%
Rampart	54	\$15,000	94.1%	36.2%	78.8%	87.5%
Ugashik	5	\$37,500	85.7%	0.0%	80.0%	83.3%
Eagle Village	34	\$11,875	80.0%	17.1%	93.1%	93.8%
McCarthy	28	\$23,750	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Covenant Life	54	\$23,571	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Alatna	32	\$6,030	93.5%	83.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* % Unemployment =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment, calculated from unemployment compensation claims

** % Adults Not Working =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment and those not actively seeking employment ("discouraged workers", in school, retired, disabled, or at home raising children, for example)

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Deadhorse	24	\$102,264	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Halibut Cove	78	\$68,760	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chase	53	\$61,359	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kupreanof	24	\$55,447	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Telida	5	\$43,750	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prudhoe Bay	47	\$39,673	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bettles	32	\$38,333	22.2%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Port Clarence	24	\$12,264	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Akutan	420	\$27,813	13.6%	16.6%	0.4%	7.4%
Unalaska	4,251	\$56,215	8.4%	15.3%	1.0%	7.8%
Hobart Bay	107	\$52,377	6.4%	1.0%	0.0%	10.9%
Kodiak Station	1,638	\$34,196	1.7%	7.0%	6.3%	12.1%
Dry Creek	110	\$40,625	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	13.7%
Game Creek	67	\$12,500	0.0%	59.6%	0.0%	13.8%
Cold Bay	120	\$45,625	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.9%
Evansville	20	\$29,167	57.6%	36.1%	16.0%	16.0%
King Salmon	478	\$54,072	15.5%	3.0%	5.8%	16.2%
Pelican	187	\$27,083	29.3%	13.6%	3.4%	17.2%
Eielson AFB	4,203	\$25,924	0.9%	2.8%	13.0%	18.2%
Cube Cove	137	\$51,280	5.8%	5.7%	0.0%	21.4%
Fort Greely	740	\$25,801	1.0%	6.3%	14.4%	21.7%
Eyak	166	\$150,001	7.6%	0.0%	4.3%	22.1%
Anderson	565	\$53,413	3.7%	3.7%	11.5%	22.2%
Rowan Bay	9	\$58,295	6.8%	0.0%	9.8%	22.4%
Point Lay	207	\$49,583	81.3%	3.3%	11.5%	22.7%
Kodiak	6,749	\$46,050	12.7%	6.2%	4.4%	23.0%
Cordova	2,467	\$46,304	11.2%	4.7%	3.1%	23.8%
Whitestone Logging Camp	189	\$45,625	3.7%	7.6%	9.7%	23.8%
King Cove	773	\$53,631	39.2%	10.0%	1.8%	24.0%
Pleasant Valley	552	\$49,464	4.7%	0.0%	4.5%	24.2%
Galena	543	\$28,611	45.3%	18.2%	9.2%	24.7%
Gakona	23	\$32,500	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Juneau	30,396	\$47,924	12.9%	5.5%	4.8%	25.0%
Moose Pass	116	\$22,083	11.1%	0.0%	25.8%	25.8%
Craig	2,043	\$47,250	22.9%	3.9%	8.4%	25.9%
Valdez	4,486	\$68,570	5.9%	5.1%	8.8%	26.0%
Talkeetna	347	\$11,991	1.6%	34.3%	10.1%	26.1%
Gustavus	346	\$41,538	3.9%	3.6%	4.6%	26.2%
Womens Bay	662	\$44,861	10.5%	3.2%	6.5%	26.2%
Sitka	8,733	\$43,337	20.9%	4.8%	6.7%	26.7%
Anchorage	254,849	\$43,946	6.4%	7.0%	7.0%	26.7%
Naukatik Bay	136	\$43,333	1.1%	4.8%	9.1%	26.8%
North Pole	1,631	\$32,937	5.4%	5.0%	10.2%	26.9%
Skagway	816	\$37,500	5.5%	4.2%	10.6%	27.5%
Elfin Cove	54	\$43,125	1.8%	7.1%	0.0%	28.2%
Petersburg	3,432	\$49,318	10.4%	4.1%	4.2%	28.8%
Chiniak	74	\$44,375	5.8%	20.2%	5.1%	28.8%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Eklutna	425	\$66,946	12.6%	8.0%	3.5%	29.1%
Fairbanks	31,850	\$32,033	9.2%	10.3%	11.6%	29.6%
Coffman Cove	246	\$44,063	7.0%	4.7%	14.7%	29.8%
Paxson	34	\$31,250	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	30.0%
Barrow	4,380	\$56,688	63.9%	7.5%	11.5%	30.4%
Ridgeway	2,364	\$48,967	4.6%	6.1%	6.3%	30.6%
Glennallen	513	\$30,833	6.7%	8.0%	4.4%	30.7%
Haines	1,429	\$38,542	18.1%	4.9%	5.4%	30.9%
Ketchikan	8,552	\$41,931	15.7%	5.5%	8.6%	31.2%
Port Alexander	94	\$20,625	2.5%	18.2%	11.5%	31.3%
Jakolof Bay	35	\$21,875	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%
Kachemak	398	\$55,000	3.0%	7.3%	4.0%	32.0%
Sand Point	870	\$42,083	49.3%	12.5%	2.9%	32.1%
Mosquito Lake	92	\$28,750	1.3%	38.8%	7.3%	32.1%
Aniak	578	\$32,841	70.7%	16.4%	9.7%	32.2%
Two Rivers	623	\$53,518	7.3%	4.0%	10.5%	32.2%
College	11,663	\$43,329	8.4%	9.6%	7.8%	32.3%
Manley Hot Springs	90	\$31,250	14.6%	30.0%	12.5%	32.3%
Saint Paul	764	\$39,922	66.1%	7.1%	10.8%	32.6%
Moose Creek	683	\$25,326	2.5%	9.4%	10.5%	32.7%
Soldotna	4,092	\$38,004	4.5%	5.7%	8.7%	33.0%
Ester	236	\$44,688	4.8%	12.8%	11.5%	33.0%
Alcan	16	\$53,338	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Yakutat	833	\$36,875	55.1%	10.5%	11.8%	33.7%
Wrangell	2,543	\$37,538	20.0%	6.0%	9.0%	34.1%
Pedro Bay	37	\$38,125	90.5%	21.9%	0.0%	34.8%
Primrose	62	\$46,563	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%
Delta Junction	855	\$31,250	4.4%	8.4%	8.6%	35.4%
Hoonah	906	\$36,442	67.2%	3.8%	14.9%	35.4%
Butte	2,538	\$41,471	3.6%	7.7%	10.4%	35.5%
Homer	4,126	\$36,652	3.6%	5.0%	7.9%	35.6%
Takotna	63	\$18,750	44.7%	14.2%	0.0%	36.0%
Naknek	640	\$50,907	41.0%	1.7%	3.9%	36.0%
Nome	3,656	\$45,812	52.1%	9.9%	11.0%	36.0%
McGrath	456	\$36,250	47.0%	10.5%	9.9%	36.3%
Polk Inlet	36	\$50,446	13.3%	4.4%	24.4%	36.3%
Tazlina	297	\$45,625	23.1%	22.0%	13.2%	36.4%
Bethel	5,277	\$42,232	63.9%	12.2%	9.0%	36.6%
Wasilla	4,917	\$37,619	5.3%	10.8%	11.1%	36.6%
Lime Village	47	\$9,257	95.2%	63.8%	13.6%	36.7%
Saicha	373	\$35,903	4.2%	8.0%	14.5%	36.9%
Whittier	289	\$33,636	12.3%	13.0%	8.0%	37.0%
Dillingham	2,252	\$44,083	55.8%	9.5%	6.7%	37.7%
Crown Point	88	\$43,864	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%
Chignik	125	\$36,875	45.2%	0.0%	4.2%	38.2%
Kenai	6,971	\$42,889	8.5%	7.3%	12.1%	38.2%
Chickaloon	205	\$32,083	6.2%	31.2%	26.7%	38.2%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Thorne Bay	625	\$39,688	1.2%	5.2%	18.6%	38.4%
Igiugig	46	\$41,250	78.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%
Fritz Creek	1,972	\$45,143	3.4%	3.4%	6.1%	38.5%
Teller	265	\$20,000	86.8%	32.1%	3.3%	38.9%
Sterling	5,705	\$51,145	2.1%	7.6%	7.4%	38.9%
Healy	603	\$56,313	1.4%	3.8%	3.9%	39.4%
Karluk	48	\$31,250	91.5%	3.6%	9.1%	40.0%
Wainwright	550	\$33,333	94.3%	4.1%	10.2%	40.4%
McKinley Park	196	\$40,313	2.9%	4.0%	13.4%	40.8%
Kasilof	539	\$51,439	2.9%	2.5%	18.4%	40.8%
Sheldon Point	177	\$16,250	92.7%	56.2%	13.0%	41.2%
Kotzebue	3,232	\$42,367	75.1%	12.7%	13.1%	41.2%
Deering	158	\$15,208	94.3%	21.6%	6.7%	41.7%
Port Lions	239	\$40,938	67.6%	5.3%	14.1%	41.8%
Chenega Bay	91	\$22,083	69.1%	26.6%	14.3%	41.9%
Iliamna	103	\$41,250	66.0%	12.1%	0.0%	42.1%
Clark's Point	66	\$17,083	88.3%	16.1%	18.5%	42.1%
Nikiski	3,023	\$44,242	6.1%	7.0%	14.5%	42.2%
Port Alice	19	\$28,750	6.7%	8.3%	0.0%	42.9%
Lignite	122	\$38,125	0.0%	1.9%	15.2%	43.5%
Big Lake	2,243	\$36,583	3.7%	11.3%	12.9%	43.8%
Andreafsky	469	\$28,958	84.4%	26.0%	18.6%	43.8%
Meadow Lakes	4,693	\$33,106	2.9%	12.5%	13.3%	44.1%
Hollis	175	\$31,250	2.7%	15.2%	8.3%	44.3%
Saint Mary's	504	\$28,542	83.0%	17.3%	19.2%	44.3%
Golovin	152	\$16,146	92.9%	8.3%	15.3%	44.4%
Tok	1,216	\$30,341	12.5%	8.7%	20.3%	44.4%
Atka	111	\$40,625	91.8%	16.2%	25.7%	44.7%
Seward	2,999	\$37,049	15.2%	10.7%	9.2%	44.9%
Atkasuk	235	\$56,352	93.1%	15.2%	29.7%	45.1%
Anaktuvuk Pass	301	\$37,292	84.9%	16.1%	23.6%	45.5%
Fox River	435	\$93,848	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	45.7%
Ivanof Bay	27	\$21,500	94.3%	18.4%	0.0%	45.8%
Port Heiden	116	\$35,000	72.3%	24.3%	22.0%	45.8%
Unalakleet	803	\$34,531	81.8%	11.6%	19.2%	46.0%
Kake	767	\$35,875	73.4%	7.0%	10.9%	46.8%
Newhalen	177	\$26,250	94.4%	22.4%	5.5%	46.9%
Dot Lake	80	\$38,333	54.3%	3.2%	13.6%	47.2%
Hyder	151	\$23,750	1.0%	14.4%	22.7%	47.4%
Chuathbaluk	115	\$13,750	89.7%	47.4%	8.6%	47.5%
Sutton	431	\$23,393	5.8%	38.1%	17.2%	47.6%
Fox	321	\$28,250	7.3%	9.2%	18.0%	47.8%
Kalifonsky	335	\$52,354	4.2%	12.2%	25.6%	47.8%
Birch Creek	37	\$5,032	90.5%	92.6%	0.0%	48.0%
Nuiqsut	435	\$32,188	92.7%	13.3%	33.1%	48.2%
Lake Minchumina	45	\$75,222	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.3%
Willow	408	\$34,773	1.1%	14.7%	0.0%	48.3%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Lutak	52	\$70,485	17.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.4%
Klawock	704	\$39,583	54.3%	8.4%	17.3%	48.4%
Mellakatla	1,595	\$38,370	82.4%	9.8%	12.8%	49.2%
Cohoe	598	\$33,550	1.8%	15.9%	14.0%	49.5%
Wiseman	24	\$4,999	15.2%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Tununak	330	\$18,750	96.2%	26.3%	14.0%	50.0%
Kaktovik	222	\$46,250	84.4%	20.6%	30.7%	50.0%
Seldovia	285	\$27,500	15.2%	16.2%	11.8%	50.3%
Kenny Lake	500	\$21,786	9.7%	24.8%	22.9%	50.7%
Hope	152	\$17,250	3.1%	33.5%	38.4%	50.8%
Akhiok	101	\$42,500	93.5%	2.4%	18.8%	50.9%
Saxman	381	\$30,481	77.0%	5.7%	25.5%	51.6%
Copperville	196	\$47,188	26.4%	9.8%	26.6%	51.8%
Ouzinkie	246	\$48,393	85.2%	10.2%	18.9%	51.9%
Houston	954	\$32,344	3.6%	9.7%	15.4%	52.0%
Point Hope	749	\$47,788	91.9%	9.2%	23.4%	52.0%
Nikolai	474	\$19,688	1.3%	46.1%	0.0%	52.5%
Arctic Village	121	\$9,661	93.8%	31.5%	12.5%	52.5%
Eagle	165	\$12,500	3.0%	43.4%	32.5%	52.5%
Nenana	440	\$27,292	47.8%	10.4%	17.5%	52.8%
Ruby	217	\$15,000	74.1%	24.4%	12.8%	52.9%
Saint George	184	\$25,250	94.9%	41.9%	14.9%	52.9%
Kaltag	245	\$15,500	92.5%	41.4%	24.1%	52.9%
Anchor Point	1,157	\$42,847	3.7%	0.7%	17.5%	53.0%
False Pass	64	\$21,667	76.5%	17.9%	0.0%	53.1%
Hughes	69	\$15,833	92.6%	16.6%	15.4%	53.2%
Nikolski	43	\$13,750	82.9%	0.0%	0.0%	53.3%
Chevak	721	\$17,222	93.0%	27.0%	17.8%	53.5%
Wales	162	\$15,000	88.8%	35.2%	19.3%	53.5%
Cooper Landing	271	\$42,250	1.2%	3.6%	0.0%	53.8%
Copper Center	536	\$34,643	34.5%	12.9%	0.0%	53.8%
Palmer	4,167	\$34,940	7.7%	6.2%	16.7%	53.9%
Lazy Mountain	1,043	\$36,250	4.3%	11.7%	21.3%	53.9%
Tanana	299	\$17,000	78.3%	24.1%	21.8%	53.9%
Big Delta	508	\$32,813	4.0%	23.2%	1.6%	54.0%
Platinum	41	\$23,056	92.2%	35.8%	8.0%	54.0%
Port Alsworth	67	\$36,250	1.8%	0.0%	10.5%	54.1%
Angoon	616	\$32,083	82.3%	21.9%	35.1%	54.1%
Meyers Chuck	28	\$16,250	10.8%	33.3%	0.0%	54.2%
Knik	443	\$26,250	11.4%	6.5%	24.8%	54.2%
Shaktoolik	226	\$18,438	94.4%	22.8%	31.9%	54.4%
Akiachak	560	\$23,750	95.0%	13.0%	12.7%	54.5%
Circle Hot Springs	32	\$6,250	0.0%	74.1%	33.3%	54.5%
Brevig Mission	265	\$15,000	92.4%	24.7%	35.3%	54.6%
Northway	119	\$39,375	64.2%	11.9%	26.0%	54.9%
Pilot Point	115	\$38,750	84.9%	12.9%	0.0%	55.3%
Atmautluak	292	\$15,833	96.9%	47.6%	25.3%	55.3%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment**	% Adults Not Working**
Fort Yukon	575	\$17,969	85.0%	32.1%	27.4%	55.4%
Marshall	318	\$28,750	92.7%	16.9%	19.0%	55.5%
Oscarville	59	\$26,250	91.2%	27.2%	0.0%	56.0%
Goodnews Bay	263	\$13,523	95.9%	41.8%	3.1%	56.6%
Tuluksak	385	\$20,446	95.5%	51.2%	2.5%	56.9%
Pitka's Point	154	\$17,813	95.6%	28.2%	5.1%	57.0%
Levelock	115	\$12,159	82.9%	25.8%	20.9%	57.5%
Grayling	186	\$21,641	93.3%	12.6%	29.6%	57.5%
Cantwell	144	\$44,000	22.4%	10.3%	34.6%	57.6%
South Naknek	149	\$23,750	79.4%	26.3%	27.5%	58.0%
Manokotak	387	\$20,500	95.6%	28.6%	16.1%	58.1%
Tetlin	68	\$15,750	95.4%	29.6%	25.0%	58.5%
Kwigillingok	333	\$14,500	95.0%	43.1%	9.2%	58.6%
Mekoryuk	192	\$14,792	99.4%	31.5%	16.7%	59.1%
Toksook Bay	496	\$21,875	95.5%	39.2%	25.5%	59.1%
Whale Pass	79	\$49,583	2.7%	14.0%	35.7%	59.1%
Buckland	412	\$18,906	95.0%	32.8%	12.2%	59.4%
Tuntutuliak	351	\$14,444	96.7%	46.0%	6.4%	59.5%
Gulkana	95	\$38,750	59.2%	20.3%	27.3%	59.5%
Ninilchik	655	\$31,518	19.5%	9.6%	24.4%	59.7%
Tanacross	85	\$14,750	94.3%	23.8%	35.4%	59.7%
Mendeltna	72	\$18,750	5.4%	5.7%	0.0%	60.0%
Kongiganak	349	\$33,250	97.3%	30.3%	16.3%	60.0%
Scammon Bay	459	\$15,179	96.5%	40.7%	18.4%	60.1%
Akiak	327	\$13,571	97.2%	33.9%	16.0%	60.2%
Trapper Creek	306	\$31,071	6.1%	16.2%	30.3%	60.2%
Diomedea	174	\$14,375	93.8%	63.0%	0.0%	60.4%
Anvik	85	\$10,694	91.5%	45.0%	13.6%	60.4%
Hydaburg	425	\$20,139	89.1%	26.3%	21.8%	60.5%
Quinhagak	567	\$17,500	93.8%	37.2%	5.9%	60.6%
Saint Michael	341	\$23,194	91.2%	20.9%	22.9%	60.6%
Noorvik	631	\$32,969	93.8%	16.6%	17.5%	60.7%
Nunapitchuk	489	\$17,083	97.1%	40.0%	12.3%	60.8%
Russian Mission	295	\$21,667	94.7%	45.0%	21.0%	61.1%
Clam Gulch	100	\$60,233	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	61.3%
Napakiak	354	\$18,125	94.3%	36.2%	33.3%	61.3%
Alakanuk	651	\$17,708	95.8%	29.4%	26.8%	61.5%
Koyukuk	126	\$13,929	97.6%	39.2%	27.0%	62.0%
Emmonak	820	\$25,625	92.1%	20.9%	34.6%	62.0%
Kiana	415	\$28,125	93.5%	24.5%	27.4%	62.1%
Aleknagik	226	\$21,875	83.2%	28.8%	14.3%	62.2%
Port Graham	186	\$33,750	90.4%	2.1%	38.8%	62.4%
Slana	58	\$25,417	6.3%	19.0%	44.4%	62.5%
Circle	83	\$17,083	86.3%	10.9%	36.7%	62.7%
Pilot Station	547	\$16,000	95.0%	51.3%	35.1%	62.9%
Napaskiak	399	\$18,750	94.8%	34.3%	22.7%	63.4%
Eek	277	\$21,000	95.7%	28.6%	23.9%	63.4%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Red Devil	49	\$25,000	50.9%	30.7%	14.3%	63.6%
Beaver	118	\$20,313	95.1%	32.2%	22.6%	63.6%
Stebbins	513	\$23,333	94.8%	32.3%	39.2%	64.0%
Stony River	42	\$5,156	88.2%	100.0%	26.7%	64.5%
Tyonek	151	\$11,591	92.2%	37.1%	37.7%	64.5%
Central	57	\$28,036	1.9%	13.7%	19.0%	64.6%
Koyuk	272	\$18,750	94.8%	30.0%	37.3%	64.6%
Crooked Creek	138	\$16,250	90.6%	28.7%	27.3%	64.7%
Chitina	84	\$13,125	46.9%	40.9%	33.3%	64.7%
Shungnak	252	\$29,583	94.6%	5.7%	14.0%	64.9%
Salamatof	1,134	\$38,203	10.4%	9.8%	14.6%	64.9%
Ferry	69	\$25,625	12.5%	15.5%	39.1%	65.0%
Shishmaref	542	\$15,625	94.5%	27.3%	18.0%	65.1%
Kotlik	543	\$20,417	97.0%	17.7%	36.6%	65.2%
Kokhanok	168	\$14,286	90.1%	53.4%	7.7%	65.4%
Elim	301	\$16,250	91.7%	25.1%	36.1%	66.2%
Kasigluk	514	\$26,563	95.3%	20.4%	34.8%	66.3%
Ambler	333	\$22,500	89.7%	31.1%	39.3%	66.3%
Hooper Bay	1,012	\$18,125	96.0%	43.5%	41.7%	66.3%
Skwentna	77	\$17,692	1.2%	24.2%	0.0%	66.7%
Tonsina	46	\$16,250	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Nulato	365	\$17,143	96.9%	35.9%	25.7%	66.7%
Kobuk	89	\$20,625	89.9%	34.7%	35.0%	66.7%
Nanwalek	177	\$46,563	91.1%	11.0%	46.4%	66.7%
Chefornak	405	\$20,278	97.5%	35.4%	6.2%	66.8%
Edna Bay	70	\$12,250	0.0%	63.7%	25.0%	67.2%
Selawik	696	\$21,833	95.5%	23.1%	31.3%	67.2%
White Mountain	193	\$15,893	87.8%	38.3%	36.4%	67.3%
Sleetmute	102	\$10,000	86.8%	62.6%	12.9%	67.5%
Shageluk	145	\$16,250	95.0%	34.8%	22.9%	67.5%
Huslia	245	\$13,333	90.8%	43.7%	38.5%	67.5%
Larsen Bay	120	\$39,750	84.4%	3.1%	40.0%	67.6%
Mountain Village	738	\$26,750	91.1%	25.3%	36.7%	68.0%
Chignik Lake	127	\$19,167	91.7%	42.0%	15.2%	68.2%
Newtok	269	\$14,844	93.2%	50.2%	25.9%	68.2%
Upper Kalskag	198	\$16,250	84.9%	39.6%	25.5%	68.5%
Happy Valley	391	\$16,250	6.1%	32.8%	25.6%	68.6%
Nightmute	217	\$17,813	95.4%	62.0%	26.9%	68.6%
Egegik	127	\$20,625	70.5%	34.1%	24.3%	69.6%
Venetie	241	\$14,688	94.0%	47.2%	37.5%	69.8%
Nondalton	221	\$21,750	89.3%	20.3%	42.6%	70.0%
Gambell	653	\$15,938	96.2%	46.4%	16.8%	71.1%
Kivalina	357	\$28,036	97.5%	32.2%	55.6%	71.4%
Kwethluk	672	\$16,000	96.4%	38.7%	11.8%	72.0%
Northway Village	110	\$13,333	94.7%	47.0%	51.3%	72.1%
Chistochina	55	\$24,167	61.7%	17.7%	52.0%	72.1%
Savoonga	622	\$11,339	95.2%	50.9%	14.7%	72.2%

**Alaska Communities, by Percent Adults Not Working in Ascending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Holy Cross	260	\$13,750	93.5%	48.8%	38.6%	72.3%
Koliganek	194	\$18,125	96.1%	35.6%	11.1%	72.4%
Stevens Village	99	\$10,000	91.2%	73.9%	43.3%	72.6%
Twin Hills	59	\$11,667	92.4%	50.0%	25.0%	72.7%
Perryville	107	\$25,000	94.4%	25.4%	13.6%	72.9%
Togiak	762	\$15,000	87.3%	46.3%	23.1%	72.9%
Point Baker	57	\$12,083	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.0%
Nikolai	108	\$11,250	89.0%	44.5%	35.5%	73.0%
Ekwok	124	\$10,833	87.0%	52.0%	23.5%	73.1%
Kasaan	42	\$46,667	53.7%	0.0%	64.5%	73.8%
Northway Junction	114	\$41,875	70.5%	10.0%	36.8%	73.9%
Tenakee Springs	116	\$18,125	9.6%	10.8%	20.0%	74.0%
New Stuyahok	452	\$12,383	95.9%	51.0%	17.7%	74.9%
Noatak	401	\$36,458	96.7%	17.1%	45.1%	75.1%
Tatitlek	99	\$27,188	86.6%	19.8%	0.0%	75.8%
Old Harbor	301	\$16,875	88.7%	31.5%	39.1%	75.9%
Harding Lake	29	\$52,126	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.0%
Klukwan	160	\$36,042	86.8%	3.5%	60.4%	76.1%
Lower Kalskag	278	\$10,357	98.3%	61.2%	37.9%	77.5%
Ikroavik	182	\$11,477	94.1%	46.9%	69.4%	78.4%
Umanuk	567	\$4,999	97.4%	76.6%	12.9%	78.7%
Nelson Lagoon	90	\$44,583	80.7%	26.0%	0.0%	80.8%
Chalkyitsik	87	\$12,750	92.2%	67.3%	31.3%	81.0%
Minto	244	\$17,656	97.2%	35.0%	60.3%	81.6%
Mentasta Lake	122	\$11,250	72.9%	44.1%	18.8%	81.9%
Ugashik	5	\$37,500	85.7%	0.0%	80.0%	83.3%
Chignik Lagoon	74	\$56,250	56.6%	6.4%	20.0%	84.0%
Healy Lake	60	\$5,841	85.1%	70.8%	33.3%	85.7%
Rampart	54	\$15,000	94.1%	36.2%	78.8%	87.5%
Eagle Village	34	\$11,875	80.0%	17.1%	93.1%	93.8%
Port Protection	58	\$10,000	1.6%	45.6%	75.0%	95.3%
Alexander Creek	38	\$8,166	25.0%	38.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Portage Creek	14	\$5,350	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
McCarthy	28	\$23,750	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Covenant Life	54	\$23,571	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Alatna	32	\$6,030	93.5%	83.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* % Unemployment =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment, calculated from unemployment compensation claims

** % Adults Not Working =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment and those not actively seeking employment ("discouraged workers", in school, retired, disabled, or at home raising children, for example)

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population In Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Anchorage	254,849	226,338	14,569	211,769	6.4%
Fairbanks	31,850	30,843	2,830	28,013	9.2%
Juneau	30,396	26,751	3,462	23,289	12.9%
College	11,663	11,249	950	10,299	8.4%
Sitka	8,733	8,588	1,797	6,791	20.9%
Ketchikan	8,552	8,263	1,296	6,967	15.7%
Kenai	6,971	6,327	535	5,792	8.5%
Kodiak	6,749	6,365	811	5,554	12.7%
Sterling	5,705	3,802	79	3,723	2.1%
Bethel	5,277	4,674	2,986	1,688	63.9%
Wasilla	4,917	4,028	212	3,816	5.3%
Meadow Lakes	4,693	2,374	69	2,305	2.9%
Valdez	4,486	4,068	239	3,829	5.9%
Barrow	4,380	3,469	2,217	1,252	63.9%
Unalaska	4,251	3,089	259	2,830	8.4%
Eielson AFB	4,203	5,251	48	5,203	0.9%
Palmer	4,167	2,866	220	2,646	7.7%
Homer	4,126	3,660	130	3,530	3.6%
Soldotna	4,092	3,482	158	3,324	4.5%
Nome	3,656	3,500	1,824	1,676	52.1%
Petersburg	3,432	3,207	334	2,873	10.4%
Kotzebue	3,232	2,751	2,067	684	75.1%
Nikiski	3,023	2,743	168	2,575	6.1%
Seward	2,999	2,699	410	2,289	15.2%
Wrangell	2,543	2,479	496	1,983	20.0%
Butte	2,538	2,039	73	1,966	3.6%
Cordova	2,467	2,110	237	1,873	11.2%
Ridgeway	2,364	2,018	93	1,925	4.6%
Dillingham	2,252	2,017	1,125	892	55.8%
Big Lake	2,243	1,477	54	1,423	3.7%
Craig	2,043	1,260	288	972	22.9%
Fritz Creek	1,972	1,426	48	1,378	3.4%
Kodiak Station	1,638	2,025	34	1,991	1.7%
North Pole	1,631	1,456	78	1,378	5.4%
Metlakatla	1,595	1,464	1,206	258	82.4%
Haines	1,429	1,238	224	1,014	18.1%
Tok	1,216	935	117	818	12.5%
Anchor Point	1,157	866	32	834	3.7%
Salamatof	1,134	999	104	895	10.4%
Lazy Mountain	1,043	838	36	802	4.3%
Hooper Bay	1,012	845	811	34	96.0%
Houston	994	697	25	672	3.6%
Hoonah	906	795	534	261	67.2%
Sand Point	870	878	433	445	49.3%
Delta Junction	855	652	29	623	4.4%
Yakutat	833	534	294	240	55.1%
Emmonak	820	642	591	51	92.1%
Skagway	816	692	38	654	5.5%

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population in Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Unalakleet	803	714	584	130	81.8%
King Cove	773	451	177	274	39.2%
Kake	767	700	514	186	73.4%
Saint Paul	764	763	504	259	66.1%
Togiak	762	613	535	78	87.3%
Point Hope	749	639	587	52	91.9%
Fort Greely	740	1,299	11	1,136	1.0%
Mountain Village	738	674	614	60	91.1%
Chevak	721	598	556	42	93.0%
Klawock	704	722	392	330	54.3%
Selawik	696	596	569	27	95.5%
Moose Creek	683	610	15	595	2.5%
Kwethluk	672	558	538	20	96.4%
Womens Bay	662	620	65	555	10.5%
Ninilchik	655	456	89	367	19.5%
Gambell	653	525	505	20	96.2%
Alakanuk	651	544	521	23	95.8%
Naknek	640	575	236	339	41.0%
Noorvik	631	531	498	33	93.8%
Thorne Bay	625	569	7	562	1.2%
Two Rivers	623	453	33	420	7.3%
Savoonga	622	519	494	25	95.2%
Angoon	616	638	525	113	82.3%
Healy	603	487	7	480	1.4%
Cohoe	598	508	9	499	1.8%
Aniak	578	540	382	158	70.7%
Fort Yukon	575	580	493	87	85.0%
Quinhagak	567	501	470	31	93.8%
Kipnuk	567	470	458	12	97.4%
Anderson	565	628	23	605	3.7%
Akiachak	560	481	457	24	95.0%
Pleasant Valley	552	401	19	382	4.7%
Wainwright	550	492	454	28	94.3%
Pilot Station	547	463	440	23	95.0%
Kotlik	543	461	447	14	97.0%
Galena	543	833	377	456	45.3%
Shishmaref	542	456	431	25	94.5%
Kasilof	539	383	11	372	2.9%
Copper Center	536	449	155	294	34.5%
Kasigluk	514	425	405	20	95.3%
Stebbins	513	400	379	21	94.8%
Glennallen	513	451	30	421	6.7%
Big Delta	508	400	16	384	4.0%
Saint Mary's	504	441	366	75	83.0%
Kenny Lake	500	423	41	382	9.7%
Toksook Bay	496	420	401	19	95.5%
Nunapitchuk	489	378	367	11	97.1%
King Salmon	478	696	108	588	15.5%

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population in Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Nikolaevsk	474	371	5	366	1.3%
Andreafsky	469	410	346	62	84.4%
Scammon Bay	459	343	331	12	96.5%
McGrath	456	528	248	280	47.0%
New Stuyahok	452	391	375	16	95.9%
Knik	443	272	31	241	11.4%
Nenana	440	393	188	205	47.8%
Nuiqsut	435	354	328	26	92.7%
Fox River	435	382	0	382	0.0%
Sutton	431	308	18	290	5.8%
Hydaburg	425	384	342	42	89.1%
Eklutna	425	381	48	333	12.6%
Akutan	420	589	80	509	13.6%
Kiana	415	385	360	25	93.5%
Buckland	412	318	302	16	95.0%
Willow	408	285	3	282	1.1%
Cheformak	405	320	312	8	97.5%
Noatak	401	333	322	11	96.7%
Napaskiak	399	328	311	17	94.8%
Kachemak	398	365	11	354	3.0%
Happy Valley	391	309	19	290	6.1%
Marokctak	387	385	368	17	95.6%
Tuluksak	385	358	342	16	95.5%
Saxman	381	369	284	85	77.0%
Salcha	373	354	15	339	4.2%
Nulato	365	359	348	11	96.9%
Kivalina	357	317	309	8	97.5%
Napakiak	354	318	300	18	94.3%
Tuntutuliak	351	300	290	10	96.7%
Kongiganak	349	294	286	8	97.3%
Talkeetna	347	250	4	246	1.6%
Gustavus	346	258	10	248	3.9%
Saint Michael	341	295	269	26	91.2%
Kalifornsky	335	285	12	273	4.2%
Arbiter	333	311	279	32	89.7%
Kwigillingok	333	278	264	14	95.0%
Tununak	330	316	304	12	96.2%
Akiak	327	285	277	8	97.2%
Fox	321	275	20	255	7.3%
Marshall	318	273	253	20	92.7%
Trapper Creek	306	296	18	278	6.1%
Old Harbor	301	284	252	32	88.7%
Elim	301	264	242	22	91.7%
Anaktuvuk Pass	301	259	220	39	84.9%
Tanana	299	345	270	75	78.3%
Tazlina	297	247	57	190	23.1%
Russian Mission	295	246	233	13	94.7%
Atmautluak	292	258	250	8	96.9%

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population in Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Whittier	289	243	30	213	12.3%
Seldovia	285	316	48	268	15.2%
Lower Kalskag	278	291	286	5	98.3%
Eek	277	254	243	11	95.7%
Koyuk	272	231	219	12	94.8%
Cooper Landing	271	243	3	240	1.2%
Newtok	269	207	193	14	93.2%
Brevig Mission	265	198	183	15	92.4%
Teller	265	151	131	20	86.8%
Goodnews Bay	263	241	231	10	95.9%
Holy Cross	260	277	259	18	93.5%
Shungnak	252	223	211	12	94.6%
Ouzinkie	246	209	178	31	85.2%
Coffman Cove	246	186	13	173	7.0%
Kaltag	245	240	222	18	92.5%
Huslia	245	207	188	19	90.8%
Minto	244	218	212	6	97.2%
Venetie	241	182	171	11	94.0%
Port Lions	239	222	150	72	67.6%
Ester	236	147	7	140	4.8%
Atkasuk	235	216	201	15	93.1%
Shaktolik	226	178	168	10	94.4%
Aleknagik	226	185	154	31	83.2%
Kaktovik	222	224	189	35	84.4%
Nondalton	221	178	159	19	89.3%
Nightmute	217	153	146	7	95.4%
Ruby	217	170	126	44	74.1%
Point Lay	207	139	113	26	81.3%
Chickaloon	205	145	9	136	6.2%
Upper Kalskag	198	172	146	26	84.9%
Copperville	196	163	43	120	26.4%
McKinley Park	196	171	5	166	2.9%
Koliganek	194	181	174	7	96.1%
White Mountain	193	180	158	22	87.8%
Mekoryuk	192	177	176	1	99.4%
Whitestone Logging Camp	189	164	6	158	3.7%
Pelican	187	222	65	157	29.3%
Grayling	186	208	194	14	93.3%
Port Graham	186	166	150	16	90.4%
Saint George	184	138	131	7	94.9%
Allakaket	182	170	160	10	94.1%
Newhalen	177	160	151	9	94.4%
Nanwalek	177	158	144	14	91.1%
Sheldon Point	177	109	101	8	92.7%
Hollis	175	111	3	108	2.7%
Diomedes	174	178	167	11	93.8%
Kokhanok	168	152	137	15	90.1%
Eyak	166	172	13	159	7.6%

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population in Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Eagle	165	168	5	163	3.0%
Wales	162	161	143	18	88.8%
Klukwan	160	129	112	17	86.8%
Deering	158	157	148	9	94.3%
Pitka's Point	154	135	129	6	95.6%
Golovin	152	127	118	9	92.9%
Hope	152	161	5	156	3.1%
Tyonek	151	154	142	12	92.2%
Hyder	151	99	1	98	1.0%
South Naknek	149	136	108	28	79.4%
Shageluk	145	139	132	7	95.0%
Cantwell	144	147	33	114	22.4%
Crooked Creek	138	106	96	10	90.6%
Cube Cove	137	156	9	147	5.8%
Naukati Bay	136	93	1	92	1.1%
Chignik Lake	127	133	122	11	91.7%
Egegik	127	122	86	36	70.5%
Koyukuk	126	126	123	3	97.6%
Chignik	125	188	85	103	45.2%
Ekwok	124	77	67	10	87.0%
Mentasta Lake	122	96	70	26	72.9%
Lignite	122	99	0	99	0.0%
Arctic Village	121	96	90	6	93.8%
Larsen Bay	120	147	124	23	84.4%
Cold Bay	120	148	8	140	5.4%
Northway	119	123	79	44	64.2%
Beaver	118	103	98	5	95.1%
Port Heiden	116	119	86	33	72.3%
Moose Pass	116	81	9	72	11.1%
Tenakee Springs	116	94	9	85	9.6%
Chuathbaluk	115	97	87	10	89.7%
Levelock	115	105	87	18	82.9%
Pilot Point	115	53	45	8	84.9%
Northway Junction	114	88	62	26	70.5%
Atka	111	73	67	6	91.8%
Northway Village	110	113	107	6	94.7%
Dry Creek	110	106	0	106	0.0%
Nikolai	108	109	97	12	89.0%
Perryville	107	108	102	6	94.4%
Hobart Bay	107	187	12	175	6.4%
Iliamna	103	94	62	32	66.0%
Sleetmute	102	106	92	14	86.8%
Akhiok	101	77	72	5	93.5%
Clam Gulch	100	79	10	69	12.7%
Tatitlek	99	119	103	16	86.6%
Stevens Village	99	102	93	9	91.2%
Gulkana	95	103	61	42	59.2%
Port Alexander	94	119	3	116	2.5%

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population in Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			% Native
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	
Mosquito Lake	92	80	1	79	1.3%
Chenega Bay	91	94	65	29	69.1%
Nelson Lagoon	90	83	67	16	80.7%
Manley Hot Springs	90	96	14	82	14.6%
Kobuk	89	69	62	7	89.9%
Crown Point	88	62	3	59	4.8%
Chalkyitsik	87	90	83	7	92.2%
Tanacross	85	106	100	6	94.3%
Chitina	84	49	23	26	46.9%
Anvik	83	82	75	7	91.5%
Circle	83	73	63	10	86.3%
Dot Lake	80	70	38	32	54.3%
Whale Pass	79	75	2	73	2.7%
Halibut Cove	78	78	3	75	3.8%
Skwentna	77	85	1	84	1.2%
Chignik Lagoon	74	53	30	23	56.6%
Chiniak	74	69	4	65	5.8%
Mendeltna	72	37	2	35	5.4%
Edna Bay	70	86	0	86	0.0%
Hughes	69	54	50	4	92.6%
Ferry	69	56	7	49	12.5%
Tetlin	68	87	83	4	95.4%
Port Alsworth	67	55	1	54	1.8%
Game Creek	67	61	0	61	0.0%
Clark's Point	66	60	53	7	88.3%
False Pass	64	68	52	16	76.5%
Takotna	63	38	17	21	44.7%
Primrose	62	63	0	63	0.0%
Healy Lake	60	47	40	7	85.1%
Twin Hills	59	66	61	5	92.4%
Oscarville	59	57	52	5	91.2%
Slana	58	63	4	59	6.3%
Port Protection	58	62	1	61	1.6%
Central	57	52	1	51	1.9%
Point Baker	57	39	0	39	0.0%
Chistochina	55	60	37	23	61.7%
Rampart	54	68	64	4	94.1%
Elfin Cove	54	57	1	56	1.8%
Covenant Life	54	47	0	47	0.0%
Chase	53	38	0	38	0.0%
Lutak	52	45	8	37	17.8%
Red Devil	49	53	27	26	50.9%
Karluk	48	71	65	6	91.5%
Lime Village	47	42	40	2	95.2%
Prudhoe Bay	47	47	4	43	8.5%
Igiugig	46	33	26	7	78.8%
Tonsina	46	38	7	31	18.4%
Lake Minchumina	45	32	6	26	18.8%

Alaska Communities, by 1997 Population in Descending Order

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			% Native
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	
Nikolski	43	35	29	6	82.9%
Stony River	42	51	45	6	88.2%
Kasaan	42	54	29	25	53.7%
Platinum	41	64	59	5	92.2%
Alexander Creek	38	40	10	30	25.0%
Birch Creek	37	42	38	4	90.5%
Pedro Bay	37	42	38	4	90.5%
Polk Inlet	36	135	18	117	13.3%
Jakolof Bay	35	28	0	28	0.0%
Eagle Village	34	35	28	7	80.0%
Paxson	34	30	0	30	0.0%
Alatna	32	31	29	2	93.5%
Bettles	32	36	8	28	22.2%
Circle Hot Springs	32	29	0	29	0.0%
Harding Lake	29	27	0	27	0.0%
Meyers Chuck	28	37	4	33	10.8%
McCarthy	28	25	1	24	4.0%
Ivanof Bay	27	35	33	2	94.3%
Wiseman	24	33	5	28	15.2%
Deadhorse	24	26	3	23	11.5%
Kupreanof	24	23	0	23	0.0%
Port Clarence	24	26	0	26	0.0%
Gakona	23	25	0	25	0.0%
Evansville	20	33	19	14	57.6%
Port Alice	19	30	2	28	6.7%
Alcan	16	27	0	27	0.0%
Portage Creek	14	5	3	2	60.0%
Rowan Bay	9	133	9	124	6.8%
Telida	5	11	10	1	90.9%
Ugashik	5	7	6	1	85.7%
Napaimute	3	3	3	0	100.0%
Ekuk	2	3	2	1	33.3%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Anchorage	254,849	226,338	14,569	211,769	6.4%
Juneau	30,396	26,751	3,462	23,289	12.9%
Bethel	5,277	4,674	2,986	1,688	63.9%
Fairbanks	31,850	30,843	2,830	28,013	9.2%
Barrow	4,380	3,469	2,217	1,252	63.9%
Kotzebue	3,232	2,751	2,067	684	75.1%
Nome	3,656	3,500	1,824	1,676	52.1%
Sitka	8,733	8,588	1,797	6,791	20.9%
Ketchikan	8,552	8,263	1,296	6,967	15.7%
Metlakatla	1,595	1,464	1,206	258	82.4%
Dillingham	2,252	2,017	1,125	892	55.8%
College	11,663	11,249	950	10,299	8.4%
Hooper Bay	1,012	845	811	34	96.0%
Kodiak	6,749	6,365	811	5,554	12.7%
Mountain Village	738	674	614	60	91.1%
Emmonak	820	642	591	51	92.1%
Point Hope	749	639	587	52	91.9%
Unalakleet	803	714	584	130	81.8%
Selawik	696	596	569	27	95.5%
Chevak	721	598	556	42	93.0%
Kwethluk	672	558	538	20	96.4%
Kenai	6,971	6,327	535	5,792	8.5%
Togiak	762	613	535	78	87.3%
Hoonah	906	795	534	261	67.1%
Angoon	616	638	525	113	82.3%
Alakanuk	651	544	521	23	95.8%
Kake	767	700	514	186	73.4%
Gambell	653	525	505	20	96.2%
Saint Paul	764	763	504	259	66.1%
Noorvik	631	531	498	33	93.8%
Wrangell	2,543	2,479	496	1,983	20.0%
Savoonga	622	519	494	25	95.2%
Fort Yukon	575	580	493	87	85.0%
Quinhagak	567	501	470	31	93.8%
Wainwright	550	492	464	28	94.3%
Kipnuk	567	470	458	12	97.4%
Akiachak	560	481	457	24	95.0%
Kotlik	543	461	447	14	97.0%
Pilot Station	547	463	440	23	95.0%
Sand Point	870	878	433	445	49.3%
Shishmaref	542	456	431	25	94.5%
Seward	2,999	2,699	410	2,289	15.2%
Kasigiuk	514	425	405	20	95.3%
Toksook Bay	496	420	401	19	95.5%
Klawock	704	722	392	330	54.3%
Aniak	578	540	382	158	70.7%
Stebbins	513	400	379	21	94.8%
Galena	543	833	377	456	45.3%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
New Stuyahok	452	391	375	16	95.9%
Manokotak	387	385	368	17	95.6%
Nunapitchuk	489	378	367	11	97.1%
Saint Mary's	504	441	366	75	83.0%
Kiana	415	385	360	25	93.5%
Nulato	365	359	348	11	96.9%
Andreafsky	469	410	346	62	84.4%
Hydaburg	425	384	342	42	89.1%
Tuluksak	385	358	342	16	95.5%
Petersburg	3,432	3,207	334	2,873	10.4%
Scammon Bay	459	343	331	12	96.5%
Nuiqsut	435	354	328	26	92.7%
Noatak	401	333	322	11	96.7%
Chefornak	405	320	312	8	97.5%
Napaskiak	399	328	311	17	94.8%
Kivalina	357	317	309	8	97.5%
Tununak	330	316	304	12	96.2%
Buckland	412	318	302	16	95.0%
Napakiak	354	318	300	18	94.3%
Yakutat	833	534	294	240	55.1%
Tuntutuliak	351	300	290	10	96.7%
Craig	2,043	1,260	288	972	22.9%
Kongiganak	349	294	286	8	97.3%
Lower Kalskag	278	291	286	5	98.3%
Saxman	381	369	284	85	77.0%
Ambler	333	311	279	32	89.7%
Akiak	327	285	277	8	97.2%
Tanana	299	345	270	75	78.3%
Saint Michael	341	295	269	26	91.2%
Kwigillingok	333	278	264	14	95.0%
Holy Cross	260	277	259	18	93.5%
Unalaska	4,251	3,089	259	2,830	8.4%
Marshall	318	273	253	20	92.7%
Old Harbor	301	284	252	32	88.7%
Atmautluak	292	258	250	8	96.9%
McGrath	456	528	248	280	47.0%
Eek	277	254	243	11	95.7%
Elim	301	264	242	22	91.7%
Valdez	4,486	4,068	239	3,829	5.9%
Cordova	2,467	2,110	237	1,873	11.2%
Naknek	640	575	236	339	41.0%
Russian Mission	295	246	233	13	94.7%
Goodnews Bay	263	241	231	10	95.9%
Haines	1,429	1,238	224	1,014	18.1%
Kaltag	245	240	222	18	92.5%
Anaktuvuk Pass	301	259	220	39	84.9%
Palmer	4,167	2,866	220	2,646	7.7%
Koyuk	272	231	219	12	94.8%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			% Native
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	
Minto	244	218	212	6	97.2%
Wasilla	4,917	4,028	212	3,816	5.3%
Shungnak	252	223	211	12	94.6%
Atkasuk	235	216	201	15	93.1%
Grayling	186	208	194	14	93.3%
Newtok	269	207	193	14	93.2%
Kaktovik	222	224	189	35	84.4%
Huslia	245	207	188	19	90.8%
Nenana	440	393	188	205	47.8%
Brevig Mission	265	198	183	15	92.4%
Ouzinkie	246	209	178	31	85.2%
King Cove	773	451	177	274	39.2%
Mekoryuk	192	177	176	1	99.4%
Koliganek	194	181	174	7	96.1%
Venetie	241	182	171	11	94.0%
Nikiski	3,023	2,743	168	2,575	6.1%
Shaktoolik	226	178	168	10	94.4%
Diomede	174	178	167	11	93.8%
Allakaket	182	170	160	10	94.1%
Nondalton	221	178	159	19	89.3%
Soldotna	4,092	3,482	158	3,324	4.5%
White Mountain	193	180	158	22	87.8%
Copper Center	536	449	155	294	34.5%
Aleknagik	226	185	154	31	83.2%
Newhalen	177	160	151	9	94.4%
Port Graham	186	166	150	16	90.4%
Port Lions	239	222	150	72	67.6%
Deering	158	157	148	9	94.3%
Nightmute	217	153	146	7	95.4%
Upper Kalskag	198	172	146	26	84.9%
Nanwalek	177	158	144	14	91.1%
Wales	162	161	143	18	88.8%
Tyonek	151	154	142	12	92.2%
Kokhanok	168	152	137	15	90.1%
Shageluk	145	139	132	7	95.0%
Saint George	184	138	131	7	94.9%
Teller	265	151	131	20	86.8%
Homer	4,126	3,660	130	3,530	3.6%
Pitka's Point	154	135	129	6	95.6%
Ruby	217	170	126	44	74.1%
Larsen Bay	120	147	124	23	84.4%
Koyukuk	126	126	123	3	97.6%
Chignik Lake	127	133	122	11	91.7%
Golovin	152	127	118	9	92.9%
Tok	1,216	935	117	818	12.5%
Point Lay	207	139	113	26	81.3%
Klukwan	160	129	112	17	86.8%
King Salmon	478	696	108	588	15.5%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
South Naknek	149	136	108	28	79.4%
Northway Village	110	113	107	6	94.7%
Salamatof	1,134	999	104	895	10.4%
Tatitlek	99	119	103	16	86.6%
Perryville	107	108	102	6	94.4%
Sheldon Point	177	109	101	8	92.7%
Tanacross	85	106	100	6	94.3%
Beaver	118	103	98	5	95.1%
Nikolai	108	109	97	12	89.0%
Crooked Creek	138	106	96	10	90.6%
Ridgeway	2,364	2,018	93	1,925	4.6%
Stevens Village	99	102	93	9	91.2%
Sleetmute	102	106	92	14	86.8%
Arctic Village	121	96	90	6	93.8%
Ninilchik	655	456	89	367	19.5%
Chuathbaluk	115	97	87	10	89.7%
Levelock	115	105	87	18	82.9%
Egegik	127	122	86	36	70.5%
Port Heiden	116	119	86	33	72.3%
Chignik	125	188	85	103	45.2%
Chalkyitsik	87	90	83	7	92.2%
Tetlin	68	87	83	4	95.4%
Akutan	420	599	80	509	13.6%
Northway	119	123	79	44	64.2%
Sterling	5,705	3,802	79	3,723	2.1%
North Pole	1,631	1,456	78	1,378	5.4%
Anvik	83	82	75	7	91.5%
Butte	2,538	2,039	73	1,966	3.6%
Akhiok	101	77	72	5	93.5%
Mentasta Lake	122	96	70	26	72.9%
Meadow Lakes	4,693	2,374	69	2,305	2.9%
Atka	111	73	67	6	91.8%
Ekwok	124	77	67	10	87.0%
Nelson Lagoon	90	83	67	16	80.7%
Chenega Bay	91	94	65	29	69.1%
Karluk	48	71	65	6	91.5%
Pelican	187	222	65	157	29.3%
Womens Bay	662	620	65	555	10.5%
Rampart	54	68	64	4	94.1%
Circle	83	73	63	10	86.3%
Iliamna	103	94	62	32	66.0%
Kobuk	89	69	62	7	89.9%
Northway Junction	114	88	62	26	70.5%
Gulkana	95	103	61	42	59.2%
Twin Hills	59	66	61	5	92.4%
Platinum	41	64	59	5	92.2%
Tazlina	297	247	57	190	23.1%
Big Lake	2,243	1,477	54	1,423	3.7%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Clark's Point	66	60	53	7	88.3%
Faise Pass	64	68	52	16	76.5%
Oscarville	59	57	52	5	91.2%
Hughes	69	54	50	4	92.6%
Eielson AFB	4,203	5,251	48	5,203	0.9%
Eklutna	425	381	48	333	12.6%
Fritz Creek	1,972	1,426	48	1,378	3.4%
Seldovia	285	316	48	268	15.2%
Pilot Point	115	53	45	8	84.9%
Stony River	42	51	45	6	88.2%
Copperville	196	163	43	120	26.4%
Kenny Lake	500	423	41	382	9.7%
Healy Lake	60	47	40	7	85.1%
Lime Village	47	42	40	2	95.2%
Birch Creek	37	42	38	4	90.5%
Dot Lake	80	70	38	32	54.3%
Pedro Bay	37	42	38	4	90.5%
Skagway	816	692	38	654	5.5%
Chistochina	55	60	37	23	61.7%
Lazy Mountain	1,043	838	36	802	4.3%
Kodiak Station	1,638	2,025	34	1,991	1.7%
Cantwell	144	147	33	114	22.4%
Ivanof Bay	27	35	33	2	94.3%
Two Rivers	623	453	33	420	7.3%
Anchor Point	1,157	866	32	834	3.7%
Knik	443	272	31	241	11.4%
Chignik Lagoon	74	53	30	23	56.6%
Glennallen	513	451	30	421	6.7%
Whittier	289	243	30	213	12.3%
Alatna	32	31	29	2	93.5%
Delta Junction	855	652	29	623	4.4%
Kasaan	42	54	29	25	53.7%
Nikolski	43	35	29	6	82.9%
Eagle Village	34	35	28	7	80.0%
Red Devil	49	53	27	26	50.9%
Igiugig	46	33	26	7	78.8%
Houston	994	697	25	672	3.6%
Anderson	565	628	23	605	3.7%
Chitina	84	49	23	26	46.9%
Fox	321	275	20	255	7.3%
Evansville	20	33	19	14	57.6%
Happy Valley	391	309	19	290	6.1%
Pleasant Valley	552	401	19	382	4.7%
Polk Inlet	36	135	18	117	13.3%
Sutton	431	308	18	290	5.8%
Trapper Creek	306	296	18	278	6.1%
Takotna	63	38	17	21	44.7%
Big Delta	508	400	16	384	4.0%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Moose Creek	683	610	15	595	2.5%
Salcha	373	354	15	339	4.2%
Manley Hot Springs	90	96	14	82	14.6%
Coffman Cove	246	186	13	173	7.0%
Eyak	166	172	13	159	7.6%
Hobart Bay	107	187	12	175	6.4%
Kalifornsky	335	285	12	273	4.2%
Fort Greely	740	1,299	11	1,136	1.0%
Kachemak	398	365	11	354	3.0%
Kasilof	539	383	11	372	2.9%
Alexander Creek	38	40	10	30	25.0%
Clam Gulch	100	79	10	69	12.7%
Gustavus	346	258	10	248	3.9%
Telida	5	11	10	1	90.9%
Chickaloon	205	145	9	136	6.2%
Cohoe	598	508	9	499	1.8%
Cube Cove	137	156	9	147	5.8%
Moose Pass	116	81	9	72	11.1%
Rowan Bay	9	133	9	124	6.8%
Tenakee Springs	116	94	9	85	9.6%
Betties	32	36	8	28	22.2%
Cold Bay	120	148	8	140	5.4%
Lutak	52	45	8	37	17.8%
Ester	236	147	7	140	4.8%
Ferry	69	56	7	49	12.5%
Healy	603	487	7	480	1.4%
Thorne Bay	625	569	7	562	1.2%
Tonsina	46	38	7	31	18.4%
Lake Minchumina	45	32	6	26	18.8%
Ugashik	5	7	6	1	85.7%
Whitestone Logging Camp	189	164	6	158	3.7%
Eagle	165	168	5	163	3.0%
Hope	152	161	5	156	3.1%
McKinley Park	196	171	5	166	2.9%
Nikolaevsk	474	371	5	366	1.3%
Wiseman	24	33	5	28	15.2%
Chiniak	74	69	4	65	5.8%
Meyers Chuck	28	37	4	33	10.8%
Prudhoe Bay	47	47	4	43	8.5%
Slana	58	63	4	59	6.3%
Talkeetna	347	250	4	246	1.6%
Cooper Landing	271	243	3	240	1.2%
Crown Point	88	62	3	59	4.8%
Deadhorse	24	26	3	23	11.5%
Halibut Cove	78	78	3	75	3.8%
Hollis	175	111	3	108	2.7%
Napaimute	3	3	3	0	100.0%
Port Alexander	94	119	3	116	2.5%

**Alaska Communities, by Population of Natives in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census			
		1990 Pop.	Natives	Non-Natives	% Native
Portage Creek	14	5	3	2	60.0%
Willow	408	285	3	282	1.1%
Ekuk	2	3	2	1	33.3%
Mendeltna	72	37	2	35	5.4%
Port Alice	19	30	2	28	6.7%
Whale Pass	79	75	2	73	2.7%
Central	57	52	1	51	1.9%
Elfin Cove	54	57	1	56	1.8%
Hyder	151	99	1	98	1.0%
McCarthy	28	25	1	24	4.0%
Mosquito Lake	92	80	1	79	1.3%
Naukati Bay	136	93	1	92	1.1%
Port Alsworth	67	55	1	54	1.8%
Port Protection	58	62	1	61	1.6%
Skwentna	77	85	1	84	1.2%
Alcan	16	27	0	27	0.0%
Chase	53	38	0	38	0.0%
Circle Hot Springs	32	29	0	29	0.0%
Coldfoot	26	0	0	0	0.0%
Covenant Life	54	47	0	47	0.0%
Dry Creek	110	106	0	106	0.0%
Edna Bay	70	86	0	86	0.0%
Fox River	435	382	0	382	0.0%
Gakona	23	25	0	25	0.0%
Game Creek	67	61	0	61	0.0%
Harding Lake	29	27	0	27	0.0%
Jakolof Bay	35	28	0	28	0.0%
Kupreanof	24	23	0	23	0.0%
Lignite	122	99	0	99	0.0%
Paxson	34	30	0	30	0.0%
Point Baker	57	39	0	39	0.0%
Port Clarence	24	26	0	26	0.0%
Primrose	62	63	0	63	0.0%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Eyak	166	\$150,001	7.6%	0.0%	4.3%	22.1%
Deadhorse	24	\$102,264	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fox River	435	\$93,848	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	45.7%
Lake Minchumina	45	\$75,222	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.3%
Lutak	52	\$70,485	17.8%	0.0%	0.0%	48.4%
Halibut Cove	78	\$68,760	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Valdez	4,486	\$68,570	5.9%	5.1%	8.8%	26.0%
Eklutna	425	\$66,946	12.6%	8.0%	3.5%	29.1%
Chase	53	\$61,359	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clam Gulch	100	\$60,233	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	61.3%
Rowan Bay	9	\$58,295	6.8%	0.0%	9.8%	22.4%
Barrow	4,380	\$56,688	63.9%	7.5%	11.5%	30.4%
Atkasuk	235	\$56,352	93.1%	15.2%	29.7%	45.1%
Healy	603	\$56,313	1.4%	3.8%	3.9%	39.4%
Chignik Lagoon	74	\$56,250	56.6%	6.4%	20.0%	84.0%
Unalaska	4,251	\$56,215	8.4%	15.3%	1.0%	7.8%
Kupreanof	24	\$55,447	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kachemak	398	\$55,000	3.0%	7.3%	4.0%	32.0%
King Salmon	478	\$54,072	15.5%	3.0%	5.8%	16.2%
King Cove	773	\$53,631	39.2%	10.0%	1.8%	24.0%
Two Rivers	623	\$53,518	7.3%	4.0%	10.5%	32.2%
Anderson	565	\$53,413	3.7%	3.7%	11.5%	22.2%
Alcan	16	\$53,338	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Hobart Bay	107	\$52,377	6.4%	1.0%	0.0%	10.9%
Kalifornsky	335	\$52,354	4.2%	12.2%	25.6%	47.8%
Harding Lake	29	\$52,126	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.0%
Kasilof	539	\$51,439	2.9%	2.5%	18.4%	40.8%
Cube Cove	137	\$51,280	5.8%	5.7%	0.0%	21.4%
Sterling	5,705	\$51,145	2.1%	7.6%	7.4%	38.9%
Naknek	640	\$50,907	41.0%	1.7%	3.9%	36.0%
Polk Inlet	36	\$50,446	13.3%	4.4%	24.4%	36.3%
Point Lay	207	\$49,583	81.3%	3.3%	11.5%	22.7%
Whale Pass	79	\$49,583	2.7%	14.0%	35.7%	59.1%
Pleasant Valley	552	\$49,464	4.7%	0.0%	4.5%	24.2%
Petersburg	3,432	\$49,318	10.4%	4.1%	4.2%	28.8%
Ridgeway	2,364	\$48,967	4.6%	6.1%	6.3%	30.6%
Ouzinkie	246	\$48,393	85.2%	10.2%	18.9%	51.9%
Juneau	30,396	\$47,924	12.9%	5.5%	4.8%	25.0%
Point Hope	749	\$47,788	91.9%	9.2%	23.4%	52.0%
Craig	2,043	\$47,250	22.9%	3.9%	8.4%	25.9%
Copperville	196	\$47,188	26.4%	9.8%	26.6%	51.8%
Kasaan	42	\$46,667	53.7%	0.0%	64.5%	73.8%
Nanwalek	177	\$46,563	91.1%	11.0%	46.4%	66.7%
Primrose	62	\$46,563	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%
Cordova	2,467	\$46,304	11.2%	4.7%	3.1%	23.8%
Kaktovik	222	\$46,250	84.4%	20.6%	30.7%	50.0%
Kodiak	6,749	\$46,050	12.7%	6.2%	4.4%	23.0%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unemployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Nome	3,656	\$45,812	52.1%	9.9%	11.0%	36.0%
Cold Bay	120	\$45,625	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.9%
Tazlina	297	\$45,625	23.1%	22.0%	13.2%	36.4%
Whitestone Logging Camp	189	\$45,625	3.7%	7.6%	9.7%	23.8%
Fritz Creek	1,972	\$45,143	3.4%	3.4%	6.1%	38.5%
Womens Bay	662	\$44,861	10.5%	3.2%	6.5%	26.2%
Ester	236	\$44,688	4.8%	12.8%	11.5%	33.0%
Nelson Lagoon	90	\$44,583	80.7%	26.0%	0.0%	80.8%
Chiniak	74	\$44,375	5.8%	20.2%	5.1%	28.8%
Nikiski	3,023	\$44,242	6.1%	7.0%	14.5%	42.2%
Dillingham	2,252	\$44,083	55.8%	9.5%	6.7%	37.7%
Coffman Cove	246	\$44,063	7.0%	4.7%	14.7%	29.8%
Cantwell	144	\$44,000	22.4%	10.3%	34.6%	57.6%
Anchorage	254,849	\$43,946	6.4%	7.0%	7.0%	26.7%
Crown Point	88	\$43,864	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%
Telida	5	\$43,750	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sitka	8,733	\$43,337	20.9%	4.8%	6.7%	26.7%
Naukati Bay	136	\$43,333	1.1%	4.8%	9.1%	26.8%
College	11,663	\$43,329	8.4%	9.6%	7.8%	32.3%
Elfin Cove	54	\$43,125	1.8%	7.1%	0.0%	28.2%
Kenai	6,971	\$42,889	8.5%	7.3%	12.1%	38.2%
Anchor Point	1,157	\$42,847	3.7%	0.7%	17.5%	53.0%
Akhiok	101	\$42,500	93.5%	2.4%	18.8%	50.9%
Kotzebue	3,232	\$42,367	75.1%	12.7%	13.1%	41.2%
Cooper Landing	271	\$42,250	1.2%	3.6%	0.0%	53.8%
Bethel	5,277	\$42,232	63.9%	12.2%	9.0%	36.6%
Sand Point	870	\$42,083	49.3%	12.5%	2.9%	32.1%
Ketchikan	8,552	\$41,931	15.7%	5.5%	8.6%	31.2%
Northway Junction	114	\$41,875	70.5%	10.0%	36.8%	73.9%
Gustavus	346	\$41,538	3.9%	3.6%	4.6%	26.2%
Butte	2,538	\$41,471	3.6%	7.7%	10.4%	35.5%
Igiugig	46	\$41,250	78.8%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%
Iliamna	103	\$41,250	66.0%	12.1%	0.0%	42.1%
Port Lions	239	\$40,938	67.6%	5.3%	14.1%	41.8%
Atka	111	\$40,625	91.8%	16.2%	25.7%	44.7%
Dry Creek	110	\$40,625	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	13.7%
McKinley Park	196	\$40,313	2.9%	4.0%	13.4%	40.8%
Saint Paul	764	\$39,922	66.1%	7.1%	10.8%	32.6%
Larsen Bay	120	\$39,750	84.4%	3.1%	40.0%	67.6%
Thorne Bay	625	\$39,688	1.2%	5.2%	18.6%	38.4%
Prudhoe Bay	47	\$39,673	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Klawock	704	\$39,583	54.3%	8.4%	17.3%	48.4%
Northway	119	\$39,375	64.2%	11.9%	26.0%	54.9%
Gulkana	95	\$38,750	59.2%	20.3%	27.3%	59.5%
Pilot Point	115	\$38,750	84.9%	12.9%	0.0%	55.3%
Haines	1,429	\$38,542	18.1%	4.9%	5.4%	30.9%
Mellakalla	1,595	\$38,370	82.4%	9.8%	12.8%	49.2%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Bettles	32	\$38,333	22.2%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Dot Lake	80	\$38,333	54.3%	3.2%	13.6%	47.2%
Salamatof	1,134	\$38,203	10.4%	9.8%	14.6%	64.9%
Lignite	122	\$38,125	0.0%	1.9%	15.2%	43.5%
Pedro Bay	37	\$38,125	90.5%	21.9%	0.0%	34.8%
Soldotna	4,092	\$38,004	4.5%	5.7%	8.7%	33.0%
Wasilla	4,917	\$37,619	5.3%	10.8%	11.1%	36.6%
Wrangell	2,543	\$37,538	20.0%	6.0%	9.0%	34.1%
Skagway	816	\$37,500	5.5%	4.2%	10.6%	27.5%
Ugashik	5	\$37,500	85.7%	0.0%	80.0%	83.3%
Anaktuvuk Pass	301	\$37,292	84.9%	16.1%	23.6%	45.5%
Seward	2,999	\$37,049	15.2%	10.7%	9.2%	44.9%
Chignik	125	\$36,875	45.2%	0.0%	4.2%	38.2%
Yakutat	833	\$36,875	55.1%	10.5%	11.8%	33.7%
Homer	4,126	\$36,652	3.6%	5.0%	7.9%	35.6%
Big Lake	2,243	\$36,583	3.7%	11.3%	12.9%	43.8%
Noatak	401	\$36,458	96.7%	17.1%	45.1%	75.1%
Hoonah	906	\$36,442	67.2%	3.8%	14.9%	35.4%
Lazy Mountain	1,043	\$36,250	4.3%	11.7%	21.3%	53.9%
McGrath	456	\$36,250	47.0%	10.5%	9.9%	36.3%
Port Alsworth	67	\$36,250	1.8%	0.0%	10.5%	54.1%
Klukwan	160	\$36,042	86.8%	3.5%	60.4%	76.1%
Salcha	373	\$35,909	4.2%	8.0%	14.5%	36.9%
Kake	767	\$35,875	73.4%	7.0%	10.9%	46.8%
Port Heiden	116	\$35,000	72.3%	24.3%	22.0%	45.8%
Palmer	4,167	\$34,940	7.7%	6.2%	16.7%	53.9%
Willow	408	\$34,773	1.1%	14.7%	0.0%	48.3%
Copper Center	536	\$34,643	34.5%	12.9%	0.0%	53.8%
Unalakleet	803	\$34,531	81.8%	11.6%	19.2%	46.0%
Kodiak Station	1,638	\$34,196	1.7%	7.0%	6.3%	12.1%
Port Graham	186	\$33,750	90.4%	2.1%	38.8%	62.4%
Whittier	289	\$33,636	12.3%	13.0%	8.0%	37.0%
Cohoe	598	\$33,550	1.8%	15.9%	14.0%	49.5%
Wainwright	550	\$33,333	94.3%	4.1%	10.2%	40.4%
Kongiganak	349	\$33,250	97.3%	30.3%	16.3%	60.0%
Meadow Lakes	4,693	\$33,106	2.9%	12.5%	13.3%	44.1%
Noorvik	631	\$32,969	93.8%	16.6%	17.5%	60.7%
North Pole	1,631	\$32,937	5.4%	5.0%	10.2%	26.9%
Aniak	578	\$32,841	70.7%	16.4%	9.7%	32.2%
Big Delta	508	\$32,813	4.0%	23.2%	1.6%	54.0%
Gakona	23	\$32,500	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Houston	994	\$32,344	3.6%	9.7%	15.4%	52.0%
Nuiqsut	435	\$32,188	92.7%	13.3%	33.1%	48.2%
Angoon	616	\$32,083	82.3%	21.9%	35.1%	54.1%
Chickaloon	205	\$32,083	6.2%	31.2%	26.7%	38.2%
Fairbanks	31,850	\$32,033	9.2%	10.3%	11.6%	29.6%
Ninilchik	655	\$31,518	19.5%	9.6%	24.4%	59.7%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Delta Junction	855	\$31,250	4.4%	8.4%	8.6%	35.4%
Hollis	175	\$31,250	2.7%	15.2%	8.3%	44.3%
Karluk	48	\$31,250	91.5%	3.6%	9.1%	40.0%
Manley Hot Springs	90	\$31,250	14.6%	30.0%	12.5%	32.3%
Paxson	34	\$31,250	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	30.0%
Trapper Creek	306	\$31,071	6.1%	16.2%	30.3%	60.2%
Glennallen	513	\$30,833	6.7%	8.0%	4.4%	30.7%
Saxman	381	\$30,481	77.0%	5.7%	25.5%	51.6%
Tok	1,216	\$30,341	12.5%	8.7%	20.3%	44.4%
Shungnak	252	\$29,583	94.6%	5.7%	14.0%	64.9%
Evansville	20	\$29,167	57.6%	36.1%	16.0%	16.0%
Andreafsky	469	\$28,958	84.4%	26.0%	18.6%	43.8%
Marshall	318	\$28,750	92.7%	16.9%	19.0%	55.5%
Mosquito Lake	92	\$28,750	1.3%	38.8%	7.3%	32.1%
Port Alice	19	\$28,750	6.7%	8.3%	0.0%	42.9%
Galena	543	\$28,611	45.3%	18.2%	9.2%	24.7%
Saint Mary's	504	\$28,542	83.0%	17.3%	19.2%	44.3%
Fox	321	\$28,250	7.3%	9.2%	18.0%	47.8%
Kiana	415	\$28,125	93.5%	24.5%	27.4%	62.1%
Central	57	\$28,036	1.9%	13.7%	19.0%	64.6%
Kivalina	357	\$28,036	97.5%	32.2%	55.6%	71.4%
Akutan	420	\$27,813	13.6%	16.6%	0.4%	7.4%
Seldovia	285	\$27,500	15.2%	16.2%	11.8%	50.3%
Nenana	440	\$27,292	47.8%	10.4%	17.5%	52.8%
Tatitlek	99	\$27,188	86.6%	19.8%	0.0%	75.8%
Pelican	187	\$27,083	29.3%	13.6%	3.4%	17.2%
Mountain Village	738	\$26,750	91.1%	25.3%	36.7%	68.0%
Kasigluk	514	\$26,563	95.3%	20.4%	34.8%	66.3%
Knik	443	\$26,250	11.4%	6.5%	24.8%	54.2%
Newhalen	177	\$26,250	94.4%	22.4%	5.5%	46.9%
Oscarville	59	\$26,250	91.2%	27.2%	0.0%	56.0%
Eielson AFB	4,203	\$25,924	0.9%	2.8%	13.0%	18.2%
Fort Greely	740	\$25,801	1.0%	6.3%	14.4%	21.7%
Emmonak	820	\$25,625	92.1%	20.9%	34.6%	62.0%
Ferry	69	\$25,625	12.5%	15.5%	39.1%	65.0%
Slana	58	\$25,417	6.3%	19.0%	44.4%	62.5%
Moose Creek	683	\$25,326	2.5%	9.4%	10.5%	32.7%
Saint George	184	\$25,250	94.9%	41.9%	14.9%	52.9%
Perryville	107	\$25,000	94.4%	25.4%	13.6%	72.9%
Red Devil	49	\$25,000	50.9%	30.7%	14.3%	63.6%
Chistochina	55	\$24,167	61.7%	17.7%	52.0%	72.1%
Akiachak	560	\$23,750	95.0%	13.0%	12.7%	54.5%
Hyder	151	\$23,750	1.0%	14.4%	22.7%	47.4%
McCarthy	28	\$23,750	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
South Naknek	149	\$23,750	79.4%	26.3%	27.5%	58.0%
Covenant Life	54	\$23,571	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sutton	431	\$23,393	5.8%	38.1%	17.2%	47.6%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Stebbins	513	\$23,333	94.8%	32.3%	39.2%	64.0%
Saint Michael	341	\$23,194	91.2%	20.9%	22.9%	60.6%
Platinum	41	\$23,056	92.2%	35.8%	8.0%	54.0%
Ambler	333	\$22,500	89.7%	31.1%	39.3%	66.3%
Chenega Bay	91	\$22,083	69.1%	26.6%	14.3%	41.9%
Moose Pass	116	\$22,083	11.1%	0.0%	25.8%	25.8%
Aleknagik	226	\$21,875	83.2%	28.8%	14.3%	62.2%
Jakolof Bay	35	\$21,875	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%
Toksook Bay	496	\$21,875	95.5%	39.2%	25.5%	59.1%
Selawik	696	\$21,833	95.5%	23.1%	31.3%	67.2%
Kenny Lake	500	\$21,786	9.7%	24.8%	22.9%	50.7%
Nondalton	221	\$21,750	89.3%	20.3%	42.6%	70.0%
False Pass	64	\$21,667	76.5%	17.9%	0.0%	53.1%
Russian Mission	295	\$21,667	94.7%	45.0%	21.0%	61.1%
Grayling	186	\$21,641	93.3%	12.6%	29.6%	57.5%
Ivanof Bay	27	\$21,500	94.3%	18.4%	0.0%	45.8%
Eek	277	\$21,000	95.7%	28.6%	23.9%	63.4%
Egegik	127	\$20,625	70.5%	34.1%	24.3%	69.6%
Kobuk	89	\$20,625	89.9%	34.7%	35.0%	66.7%
Port Alexander	94	\$20,625	2.5%	18.2%	11.5%	31.3%
Manokotak	387	\$20,500	95.6%	28.6%	16.1%	58.1%
Tuluksak	385	\$20,446	95.5%	51.2%	2.5%	56.9%
Kotlik	543	\$20,417	97.0%	17.7%	36.6%	65.2%
Beaver	118	\$20,313	95.1%	32.2%	22.6%	63.6%
Chefornak	405	\$20,278	97.5%	35.4%	6.2%	66.8%
Hydaburg	425	\$20,139	89.1%	26.3%	21.8%	60.5%
Teller	265	\$20,000	86.8%	32.1%	3.3%	38.9%
Nikolaevsk	474	\$19,688	1.3%	46.1%	0.0%	52.5%
Chignik Lake	127	\$19,167	91.7%	42.0%	15.2%	68.2%
Buckland	412	\$18,906	95.0%	32.8%	12.2%	59.4%
Koyuk	272	\$18,750	94.8%	30.0%	37.3%	64.6%
Mendeltna	72	\$18,750	5.4%	5.7%	0.0%	60.0%
Napaskiak	399	\$18,750	94.8%	34.3%	22.7%	63.4%
Takotna	63	\$18,750	44.7%	14.2%	0.0%	36.0%
Tununak	330	\$18,750	96.2%	26.3%	14.0%	50.0%
Shaktolik	226	\$18,438	94.4%	22.8%	31.9%	54.4%
Hooper Bay	1,012	\$18,125	96.0%	43.5%	41.7%	66.3%
Koliganek	194	\$18,125	96.1%	35.6%	11.1%	72.4%
Napakiak	354	\$18,125	94.3%	36.2%	33.3%	61.3%
Tenakee Springs	116	\$18,125	9.6%	10.8%	20.0%	74.0%
Fort Yukon	575	\$17,969	85.0%	32.1%	27.4%	55.4%
Nightmute	217	\$17,813	95.4%	62.0%	26.9%	68.6%
Pitka's Point	154	\$17,813	95.6%	28.2%	5.1%	57.0%
Alakanuk	651	\$17,708	95.8%	29.4%	26.8%	61.5%
Skwentna	77	\$17,692	1.2%	24.2%	0.0%	66.7%
Minto	244	\$17,656	97.2%	35.0%	60.3%	81.6%
Quinhagak	567	\$17,500	93.8%	37.2%	5.9%	60.6%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Hope	152	\$17,250	3.1%	33.5%	38.4%	50.8%
Chevak	721	\$17,222	93.0%	27.0%	17.8%	53.5%
Nulato	365	\$17,143	96.9%	35.9%	25.7%	66.7%
Circle	83	\$17,083	86.3%	10.9%	36.7%	62.7%
Clark's Point	66	\$17,083	88.3%	16.1%	18.5%	42.1%
Nunapitchuk	489	\$17,083	97.1%	40.0%	12.3%	60.8%
Tanana	299	\$17,000	78.3%	24.1%	21.8%	53.9%
Old Harbor	301	\$16,875	88.7%	31.5%	39.1%	75.9%
Crooked Creek	138	\$16,250	90.6%	28.7%	27.3%	64.7%
Elim	301	\$16,250	91.7%	25.1%	36.1%	66.2%
Happy Valley	391	\$16,250	6.1%	32.8%	25.6%	68.6%
Meyers Chuck	28	\$16,250	10.8%	33.3%	0.0%	54.2%
Shageluk	145	\$16,250	95.0%	34.8%	22.9%	67.5%
Sheldon Point	177	\$16,250	92.7%	56.2%	13.0%	41.2%
Tonsina	46	\$16,250	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
Upper Kalskag	198	\$16,250	84.9%	39.6%	25.5%	68.5%
Golovin	152	\$16,146	92.9%	8.3%	15.3%	44.4%
Kwethluk	672	\$16,000	96.4%	38.7%	11.8%	72.0%
Pilot Station	547	\$16,000	95.0%	51.3%	35.1%	62.9%
Gambell	653	\$15,938	96.2%	46.4%	16.8%	71.1%
White Mountain	193	\$15,893	87.8%	38.3%	36.4%	67.3%
Atmautluak	292	\$15,833	96.9%	47.6%	25.3%	55.3%
Hughes	69	\$15,833	92.6%	16.6%	15.4%	53.2%
Tellin	68	\$15,750	95.4%	29.6%	25.0%	58.5%
Shishmaref	542	\$15,625	94.5%	27.3%	18.0%	65.1%
Kaltag	245	\$15,500	92.5%	41.4%	24.1%	52.9%
Deering	158	\$15,208	94.3%	21.6%	6.7%	41.7%
Scammon Bay	459	\$15,179	96.5%	40.7%	18.4%	60.1%
Brevig Mission	265	\$15,000	92.4%	24.7%	35.3%	54.6%
Rampart	54	\$15,000	94.1%	36.2%	78.8%	87.5%
Ruby	217	\$15,000	74.1%	24.4%	12.8%	52.9%
Togiak	762	\$15,000	87.3%	46.3%	23.1%	72.9%
Wales	162	\$15,000	88.8%	35.2%	19.3%	53.5%
Newtok	269	\$14,844	93.2%	50.2%	25.9%	68.2%
Mekoryuk	192	\$14,792	99.4%	31.5%	16.7%	59.1%
Tanacross	85	\$14,750	94.3%	23.8%	35.4%	59.7%
Venette	241	\$14,688	94.0%	47.2%	37.5%	69.8%
Kwigillingok	333	\$14,500	95.0%	43.1%	9.2%	58.6%
Tuntutuliak	351	\$14,444	96.7%	46.0%	6.4%	59.5%
Diomedea	174	\$14,375	93.8%	63.0%	0.0%	60.4%
Kokhanok	168	\$14,286	90.1%	53.4%	7.7%	65.4%
Koyukuk	126	\$13,929	97.6%	39.2%	27.0%	62.0%
Chuathbaluk	115	\$13,750	89.7%	47.4%	8.6%	47.5%
Holy Cross	260	\$13,750	93.5%	48.8%	38.6%	72.3%
Nikolski	43	\$13,750	82.9%	0.0%	0.0%	53.3%
Akiak	327	\$13,571	97.2%	33.9%	16.0%	60.2%
Goodnews Bay	263	\$13,523	95.9%	41.8%	3.1%	56.6%

**Alaska Communities, by Median Household Income in Descending Order
From 1990 U.S. Census Data**

Community	1997 Pop.	1990 U.S. Census				
		Median HH Income	% Native Pop	% Below Poverty	% Unem- ployment*	% Adults Not Working**
Huslia	245	\$13,333	90.8%	43.7%	38.5%	67.5%
Northway Village	110	\$13,333	94.7%	47.0%	51.3%	72.1%
Chitina	84	\$13,125	46.9%	40.9%	33.3%	64.7%
Chalkyitsik	87	\$12,750	92.2%	67.3%	31.3%	81.0%
Eagle	165	\$12,500	3.0%	43.4%	32.5%	52.5%
Game Creek	67	\$12,500	0.0%	59.6%	0.0%	13.8%
Port Clarence	24	\$12,264	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Edna Bay	70	\$12,250	0.0%	63.7%	25.0%	67.2%
Levelock	115	\$12,159	82.9%	25.8%	20.9%	57.5%
New Stuyahok	452	\$12,083	95.9%	51.0%	17.7%	74.9%
Point Baker	57	\$12,083	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.0%
Talkeetna	347	\$11,991	1.6%	34.3%	10.1%	26.1%
Eagle Village	34	\$11,875	80.0%	17.1%	93.1%	93.8%
Twin Hills	59	\$11,667	92.4%	50.0%	25.0%	72.7%
Tyonek	151	\$11,591	92.2%	37.1%	37.7%	64.5%
Allakaket	182	\$11,477	94.1%	46.9%	69.4%	78.4%
Savoonga	622	\$11,339	95.2%	50.9%	14.7%	72.2%
Mentasta Lake	122	\$11,250	72.9%	44.1%	18.8%	81.9%
Nikolai	108	\$11,250	89.0%	44.5%	35.5%	73.0%
Ekwok	124	\$10,833	87.0%	52.0%	23.5%	73.1%
Anvik	83	\$10,694	91.5%	45.0%	13.6%	60.4%
Lower Kalskag	278	\$10,357	98.3%	61.2%	37.9%	77.5%
Port Protection	58	\$10,000	1.6%	45.6%	75.0%	95.3%
Sleetmute	102	\$10,000	86.8%	62.6%	12.9%	67.5%
Stevens Village	99	\$10,000	91.2%	73.9%	43.3%	72.6%
Arctic Village	121	\$9,661	93.8%	31.5%	12.5%	52.5%
Lime Village	47	\$9,257	95.2%	63.8%	13.6%	36.7%
Alexander Creek	38	\$8,166	25.0%	38.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Circle Hot Springs	32	\$6,250	0.0%	74.1%	33.3%	54.5%
Alatna	32	\$6,030	93.5%	83.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Healy Lake	60	\$5,841	85.1%	70.8%	33.3%	85.7%
Portage Creek	14	\$5,360	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Stony River	42	\$5,156	88.2%	100.0%	26.7%	64.5%
Birch Creek	37	\$5,032	90.5%	92.6%	0.0%	48.0%
Kipnuk	567	\$4,999	97.4%	76.6%	12.9%	78.7%
Wiseman	24	\$4,999	15.2%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%

* % Unemployment =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment, calculated from unemployment compensation claims

** % Adults Not Working =

Percent of persons age 16+ actively seeking employment and those not actively seeking employment ("discouraged workers", in school, retired, disabled, or at home raising children, for example)

ALASKA LAW REVIEW

"Equal Access" to Alaska's Fish and Wildlife

STEPHEN M. WHITE

December 1994 • Volume XI • Number II
Duke University School of Law

resource uses. The court is presently faced with these issues in another appeal involving access to fish and wildlife.² Thus, the court has an immediate opportunity to more clearly define the meaning of "access" to fish and wildlife, and to concretely establish the scope and limitations of the equal access clauses.

This article will analyze the court's treatment of equal access in the fish and wildlife context to date. First, part II considers the court's "common use clause"³ jurisprudence. Part III then discusses decisions under the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause.⁴ Part IV analyzes the law under the "uniform application clause."⁵ Part V then examines some of the unifying principles and themes of the equal access clauses. Part VI discusses the relationship between the equal access clauses and other constitutional provisions, such as the "preferences among beneficial uses" clause and the equal protection clause. Finally, this note concludes that the court should take the next available opportunity to further clarify the meaning of "equal access."

II. THE "COMMON USE" CLAUSE

A. Public Trust Principles

Article VIII, section 3 of the Alaska Constitution, often referred to as the "common use" clause, provides that "[w]herever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use."⁶ The Alaska Supreme Court has called the common use clause "a unique provision, not modeled on any other state constitution."⁷ The clause embodies public trust principles that arise from a long history in this country of state managed wildlife resources.⁸ The United States Supreme

2. In *State v. Kenaitze Indian Tribe*, No. S-6162, the state is appealing a decision holding that the provision in Alaska Statutes section 16.05.258, authorizing the establishment of nonsubsistence use areas, violates the equal access clauses. The lower court decision was issued in *Kenaitze Indian Tribe v. State*, No. 3AN-91-4569 Civil (Alaska Super., Nov. 26, 1993) (final judgment).

3. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 3.

4. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 15.

5. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 17.

6. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 3.

7. *Owsichek v. State*, 763 P.2d 488, 493 (Alaska 1988).

8. The anti-monopoly purpose of the clause "was achieved by constitutionalizing common law principles imposing upon the state a public trust duty with regard to the management of fish, wildlife and waters. The constitutional framers'

Court has traced this history and concluded that the states have a trust responsibility to manage wildlife for the benefit of the public, not for the benefit of individuals or the government itself.⁹

Although the common use clause was intended to constitutionalize public trust principles,¹⁰ the Alaska Supreme Court has not yet decided whether the clause grants greater protection over public access to natural resources than the public trust doctrine does toward tidelands and submerged lands.¹¹ To date, the court has held only that the "common law principles incorporated in the common use clause impose upon the state a trust duty to manage the fish, wildlife and water resources of the state for the benefit of all the people."¹²

reliance on historic principles regarding state management of wildlife and water resources is evident from a written explanation in the committee materials for the term "reserved to the people for common use." *Id.* The framers spoke of "[a]ncient traditions in property rights" which recognize that title to uncaptured wildlife "is reserved to the people or the state on behalf of the people." *Id.* (citing Alaska Constitutional Convention Papers, Folder 210, a paper prepared by Committee on Resources entitled "Terms").

9. *Geer v. Connecticut*, 161 U.S. 519 (1896). Specifically, the Court said that the state's power over wildlife "is to be exercised, like all other powers of government, as a trust for the benefit of the people, and not as a prerogative for the advantage of the government, as distinct from the people, or for the benefit of private individuals as distinguished from the public good." *Id.* at 529. The Alaska Supreme Court surmised that the framers of the constitution relied heavily on *Geer* when they drafted the common use clause. *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 495.

10. *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 496. Alaska's public trust responsibility to manage wildlife is comparable to its obligations under the "public trust doctrine," where the state has a trust duty to protect the public's right of access to certain lands and navigable waters for certain purposes. See *Illinois Central Railroad Co. v. Illinois*, 146 U.S. 387 (1892) (generally stating the public trust doctrine). In Alaska, the public has continuing access to privately held tidelands and submerged lands for navigation, commerce and fishing. *CWC Fisheries*, 755 P.2d at 1118.

11. In *CWC Fisheries*, the court examined whether a state tideland conveyance was subject to continuing public easements for navigation, commerce, and fisheries. Analyzing the conveyance under requirements of *Illinois Cent. R.R. Co.*, the court concluded that "[w]e need not decide at this time whether a fee simple tideland conveyance which satisfied the structures of *Illinois Central* would nonetheless run afoul of article VIII, section 3." *CWC Fisheries*, 755 P.2d at 1120 n.10.

12. *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 495.

B. Broad Public Access to Resources

The Alaska Supreme Court's principal interpretation of the common use clause regarding access to fish and wildlife can be found in *Owsichek v. State*.¹³ There the court examined the state's system for assigning exclusive guiding areas to the big game guide industry. Under that system, the Alaska Guide Licensing and Control Board designated geographic areas in which only certain guides could lead hunts. Although persons could hunt recreationally in an "exclusive guide area" ("EGA"), only the Board-assigned guide could lead hunts professionally within the designated area.¹⁴ The court concluded that the EGA system could not be justified as a wildlife management tool because the EGAs were endowed with many of the characteristics of private property.¹⁵ Thus, the court reasoned that the EGAs "resemble[d] the types of royal grants the common use clause expressly intended to prohibit."¹⁶ Although the court noted that the EGAs may have also violated the uniform application clause of the Alaska Constitution,¹⁷ it struck down EGAs solely because they violated the common use clause.¹⁸ In so doing, the court expressed a simple purpose for the common use clause, namely that it "was intended to guarantee broad public access to natural resources."¹⁹

The principle of broad access was reaffirmed and elaborated upon two years later. In *State v. Hebert*,²⁰ the court examined a regulation that established two "superexclusive" use fisheries. Under this type of fishery management, fishermen²¹ must choose among several geographic areas where a fish species occurs. If a

13. 763 P.2d 488 (Alaska 1988).

14. *Id.* at 489. In practice, there were two types of EGA's: truly "exclusive guide areas," which had only one designated guide in each, and "joint use areas," which had several designated guides in each. *Id.* The court referred to both types as "EGA's." *Id.* n.1.

15. *Id.* at 498.

16. *Id.* at 497-98.

17. *Id.* at 498 n.17. The court did not consider this issue in full because the parties did not include it in their arguments and because the case could be decided upon other grounds. *Id.*

18. *Id.* at 498.

19. *Id.* at 493.

20. 803 P.2d 863 (Alaska 1990).

21. The term "fishermen" is used for the sake of convenience. The regulation applied equally to male and females engaged in fishing activities.

person registers to fish an area designated as "superexclusive," he or she may not harvest that type of fish in any other area. On the other hand, if the fisherman registers to fish in an area that is not "superexclusive," he or she may not fish for the same species in a "superexclusive" area.²² The *Hebert* court cited evidence that the number of fishermen would probably increase under this type of registration-choice system, and thus, it would be possible for more rather than fewer persons to participate in the fishery. Therefore, the court upheld the superexclusive use regulation and noted that "if anything, [it] furthers the interests underlying section 3's common use mandate."²³ Thus, "broad public access" is a principle that favors maximizing the number of persons able to participate in a hunt or fishery rather than maximizing an individual's opportunities to catch as much fish or harvest as much game in as many areas as possible.²⁴

C. Common Use Clause Prohibitions

The court held in *Owsichek* that the common use clause implicitly prohibits what another equal access clause, the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause,²⁵ prohibits on its face, namely "special privileges" and "exclusive grants" to fish and wildlife.²⁶ Although the other two article VIII clauses share these prohibitions, the purposes underlying the common use clause are "wholly apart from the limits imposed by other constitutional provisions."²⁷ Specifically, the common use clause was enacted with the intent to prevent monopolization of natural resources.²⁸

The common use clause's prohibition against "special privileges" is best examined by its application in resolving the constitutionality of the EGA system. When an area was reassigned, the EGA

22. *Hebert*, 803 P.2d at 864.

23. *Id.* at 867.

24. This principle was followed by the state when it adopted a replacement for the EGA system struck down in *Owsichek*. The new system allows big game guides to select and register for up to three guiding areas in the state. ALASKA ADMIN. CODE tit. 12, § 38.820 (April 1994).

25. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 15.

26. See *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 496. In an earlier decision, the court stated that the state's system for limiting entry into commercial fisheries is inconsistent with the common use clause because it grants an exclusive right to a select few. *State v. Ostrosky*, 667 P.2d 1184 (Alaska 1983).

27. *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 496.

28. *Id.*

system favored an applicant who had already used, occupied or invested in the area. Thus, this procedure worked like a seniority system that favored established guides over new entrants to the profession. The court found that such a system created a "special privilege" in violation of the common use clause.²⁹

The EGA system was also found to be in violation of the "no exclusive grants" purpose of the common use clause. The prohibition against "exclusive grants" is another expression of the anti-monopoly principle against the granting of private rights in a public resource. Although the EGA system was unique in wildlife management, the court found it worthwhile to recognize features that gave it private property status. These features included their unlimited duration and the fact that guides could transfer them for profit without providing compensation to the state.³⁰

The court found that the EGAs constituted an exclusive grant because they were unlimited in duration. The Alaska Supreme Court contrasted them with leases and concessions on state lands, which are limited in time, and therefore do not violate the common use clause.³¹ The court noted that limiting entry into guide areas was inconsistent with the common use clause because it resulted in an exclusive right that could be exercised season after season.³²

The *Owsichek* court also found that EGAs violated the public trust rationale underlying the common use clause because their sale generated no meaningful compensation to the public. The court again contrasted EGAs with leases and concessions, which do provide remuneration to the state.³³ Previously, the court had stated in dictum that the shore fisheries leasing program would not violate the public trust in part because shore fishery leases require compensation to the state for the use of public trust easements.³⁴ However, because profits realized from the sale of improvements constructed in an EGA went solely to the former EGA holder, and the Alaska Guide Licensing and Control Board routinely transferred the EGA to the buyer of those improvements, the public

29. *Id.*

30. *Id.* at 497.

31. *Id.* at 496-97.

32. *Id.* at 497.

33. *Id.*

34. *Id.* (citing *CWC Fisheries*, 755 P.2d at 1120-21).

trust doctrine was undermined by what was essentially an exclusive grant.³⁵

D. Common Use: Its Scope and Limits

The Alaska courts have held that the "common use" of fish and wildlife is entitled to a high degree of constitutional protection. In a 1983 dissent, Justice Rabinowitz introduced this idea, stating that common use is a "highly important interest running to each person within the state."³⁶ In later court decisions a majority has supported this statement. For example, the court held in *Owsichek* that the interest is so vital that grants of exclusive rights are subject to "close scrutiny."³⁷ Furthermore, the clause itself makes no distinction in the level of scrutiny between personal and professional use,³⁸ and it protects both derivative and direct uses of fish and wildlife.³⁹ Whether direct or derivative, the right protected under the common use clause must be defined by the nature of the resource (that is, fish, wildlife or waters) and the nature of the use (that is, commercial, sport, subsistence or personal use), but not by a particular method or means of use.⁴⁰

However, the common use clause does not govern all uses of fish and wildlife wherever they may be located. Constitutional history shows that the clause was not intended to govern the domestication of fur-bearing animals.⁴¹ Furthermore, the common

35. *Id.* at 496-98.

36. *State v. Ostrosky*, 667 P.2d 1184, 1196 (Alaska 1983) (Rabinowitz, J., dissenting).

37. *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 494.

38. In *CWC Fisheries*, the court noted that the public trust doctrine guaranteed fishermen access to public resources for "private commercial purposes" as well as recreation. 755 P.2d at 1121 n.14. Later that year, the court stated, "[t]he same [*CWC Fisheries*] rationale applies to professional hunting guides under the common use clause." *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 497.

39. The derivative use, however, should be "closely tied" to the actual taking of the fish or wildlife. For example, although professional hunting guides do not actually take game themselves, the court said that "[t]he work of a guide is so closely tied to hunting and taking wildlife that there is no meaningful basis for distinguishing between the rights of a guide and the rights of a hunter under the common use clause." *Owsichek*, 763 P.2d at 497 n.15.

40. See *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State Dep't of Fish and Game*, 838 P.2d 798 (Alaska 1992) (holding that the state may regulate the method of using natural resources without violating the common use clause).

41. 6 Proceedings of the Alaska Constitutional Convention app. V, at 98 (Dec. 16, 1955).

use clause does not govern fish in private ponds or legally registered trap lines.⁴² And, although the common use clause protects the public's right to use fish in natural waterways, it does not authorize people to trespass over private property to reach the waters.⁴³

III. THE "NO EXCLUSIVE RIGHT OF FISHERY" CLAUSE

A. History of the Clause

Article VIII, section 15 of the Alaska Constitution is often called the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause. It provides:

No exclusive right or special privilege of fishery shall be created or authorized in the natural waters of the State. This section does not restrict the power of the State to limit entry into any fishery for purposes of resource conservation, to prevent economic distress among fishermen and those dependent upon them for a livelihood and to promote the efficient development of aquaculture in the state.⁴⁴

Among the equal access clauses, section 15 is unique in two respects. First, because it applies only to fishery resources, this clause is narrower than both the common use clause,⁴⁵ which applies to wildlife, waters and fish, and the "uniform application" clause,⁴⁶ which applies to all natural resources. Second, unlike the other two clauses, the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause was not adopted in its entirety along with the original constitution. Only the first part, prohibiting exclusive rights and special privileges, was adopted originally. The second part, allowing the state to limit entry into fisheries, was added as an amendment sixteen years later.

The constitutional framers intended the first part to take the place of a pre-statehood federal law that regulated Alaska's fisheries.⁴⁷ That law, section 1 of the White Act, prohibited

42. *Id.*

43. *Owsichuk*, 763 P.2d at 494 (citing 4 Proceedings of the Alaska Constitutional Convention at 2460 (January 17, 1956)).

44. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 15.

45. *Id.* § 3.

46. *Id.* § 17.

47. The Committee on Resources of the Constitutional Convention stated that "[t]his section is intended to serve as a substitute for the provision prohibiting the several right of fisheries in the White Act." 6 Proceedings of the Alaska Constitutional Convention 87 (Alaska Legislative Council); *see also* 1960 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 9, at 3 (Apr. 8, 1960).

federal regulations from granting an "exclusive or several right of fishery."⁴⁸

The second part of the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause was submitted as a joint resolution to the Seventh Alaska Legislature in February 1971. It initially stated that "[t]he State may restrict entry to any fishery for purposes of conservation of the resource, to relieve economic distress among fishermen and those dependent upon them for a livelihood and to insure fair competition among those engaged in commercial fishing."⁴⁹ According to its sponsor, Governor William A. Egan, the purpose of the resolution was to make it "indisputably clear that the state may act to conserve and manage its fisheries in a manner which will benefit all Alaskans."⁵⁰ Further, the resolution was intended to remove all doubt that the first part of the clause, which prohibited exclusive rights of fisheries, did not necessarily prohibit "reasonable gear limitations or other restrictions on entry in our fisheries."⁵¹ Thus, the original resolution was considered to be a clarification of the prohibition against exclusive rights and special privileges, not an exception to it.

Ultimately, the opening language evolved from "[t]he State may restrict entry to any fishery . . . ," to "[t]his section does not restrict the power of the State to limit entry into any fishery"⁵² The legislature believed that the subtle change was needed to overcome ambiguity arising from the decision in *Bozanich v. Reetz*.⁵³ In *Bozanich*, the United States District Court for the District of Alaska held that laws limiting licenses to specific

48. Section 1 of the White Act reads:

Provided, that every such regulation made by the Secretary of the Commerce shall be of general application within the particular area to which it applies, and that no exclusive or several right of fishery shall be granted therein, nor shall any citizen of the United States be denied the right to take, prepare, cure, or preserve fish or shellfish in any area of the waters of Alaska where fishing is permitted by the Secretary of the Commerce.

White Act of 1924 ch. 272, § 1, 43 Stat. 464.

49. S.J. Res. 10, 7th Leg., 1971 SENATE J. 116.

50. Letter from Governor William A. Egan to Senator Terry Miller, Chairman, Senate Rules Committee (Feb. 3, 1971) in 1971 SENATE J. 116.

51. *Id.*

52. House Committee Substitute for Committee Substitute for S.J. Res. 10, 7th Leg., 1st Sess. (1971).

53. 297 F. Supp. 300 (D. Alaska 1969), vacated on other grounds and remanded, 397 U.S. 82 (1970).

groups of fishermen violated both the common use and the "no exclusive right of fishery" clauses.⁵⁴ In response to this decision, the Alaska Legislature altered the opening line in order "to show that the state's power to limit entry is a specific *exception* to the 'exclusive right' prohibition."⁵⁵ Because the amendment was intended to create an "exception" to the prohibition against exclusive rights and special privileges, the prohibition is more compelling than if the amendment were only intended to provide clarification.

B. Application of the Clause

In *McDowell v. State*,⁵⁶ the Alaska Supreme Court relied largely on section 15 in interpreting the constitutionality of the state's criterion for participating in subsistence uses of fish, game and other wild, renewable resources. Under the 1986 version of the subsistence law, only persons who resided in rural areas of Alaska were eligible to enjoy the subsistence priority, while persons residing in urban areas were excluded from subsistence uses.⁵⁷ It was this rural residency criterion that was challenged under the equal access clauses.⁵⁸

The *McDowell* court struck down the rural residency criterion, basing its decision on the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause and on its pre-statehood predecessor, the White Act. Noting that section 1 of the White Act guaranteed access to fisheries regardless of residence, the court reasoned that "section 15 likewise was

54. *Id.* at 304-07.

55. House Resources Committee, 1971 HOUSE J. 761 (emphasis added).

56. 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989).

57. ALASKA STAT. § 16.05.258 (1987) (amended 1992). The subsistence law established two different systems, or "tiers," for distinguishing who was eligible to participate in subsistence uses. The tiers were determined by resource abundance. When there was enough harvestable resource to satisfy all subsistence uses, that is, at the "first tier" of abundance, the urban-rural criterion determined eligibility. When abundance diminished below the point where all subsistence uses could be satisfied, then rural residents, all of whom who had qualified under the "first tier," were further distinguished by their dependence, their local residency and their availability of alternative resources. *Id.* This is called the "second tier." The *McDowell* court examined the criterion for first-tier eligibility, namely, rural residency.

58. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 1.

meant to ensure an equal right to participate in fisheries, regardless of where one resides."⁵⁹

Three years after *McDowell*, the court again construed the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause in *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State Department of Fish and Game*.⁶⁰ That case involved a ban on aerial fish spotting, the practice of using aircraft to locate fish and direct the operations of commercial fishermen, in the Bristol Bay salmon fishery.⁶¹ The court held that the ban did not violate the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause. The court found that the ban furthered equal access because all fishermen were equally excluded from aerial spotting, and that the pilots were not excluded from the numerous other uses of the resource.⁶² This finding suggests that if a certain method or means is prohibited, and a group of individuals has no other way to use the resource, the remaining users may have been granted an unconstitutional "exclusive right" or "special privilege."⁶³

Decisions construing the "limited entry" provision of article VIII, section 15 give further insight into the application of the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause. The Alaska Supreme Court has recognized the tension created by the clauses' simultaneous prohibition of exclusive rights in fisheries and the authorization of the state to limit entry.⁶⁴ The court has harmonized this apparent conflict by adopting a test of "least possible impingement."⁶⁵ This goal is achieved by the "optimum number" provision of Alaska Statutes section 16.43.290. Under this provision, the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission establishes the optimum number of permits for each fishery. This number may be greater or less than

59. *Id.* at 9.

60. 838 P.2d 798 (Alaska 1992).

61. See ALASKA ADMIN. CODE tit. 5, § 06.378 (June 1990).

62. *Id.* Other uses of the resource, as suggested by the court, were commercial fishing, participating in industries that support the fish harvest, using their planes to spot fish before an open harvest and transporting supplies and personnel for commercial fishing clients. *Id.* at 802.

63. The court made several other significant findings in upholding the fish spotter ban. First, it rejected the pilots' claim that they constituted a "user group" entitled to protection under the common use clause. *Id.* at 802. The court held that user groups are defined according to the nature of the resource (fish or wildlife) and the nature of the use (commercial, sport or subsistence), and not according to the particular tool used to take the resource. *Id.*

64. See *State v. Ostrosky*, 667 P.2d 1184 (Alaska 1983).

65. *Id.* at 1191.

the actual number of permits issued for the fishery. If greater, the state must issue additional permits until the optimum number is reached.⁶⁶ If lesser, the state must buy back permits until the optimum number is reached.⁶⁷ The Alaska Supreme Court has found that this system strikes an acceptable balance between fishermen's interest in access and the state's interest in conserving resources.⁶⁸

Although limited entry is a unique situation, the "least impingement" principle may apply to other schemes that would create a special privilege for a subset of users.⁶⁹ In those instances, the inquiry should focus on whether another scheme, less intrusive upon equal access values, could achieve the same goals. For example, the Alaska Supreme Court suggested in *McDowell* that a system based on individual characteristics could be used to determine subsistence eligibility so long as it only minimally infringes upon the rights of those who are excluded.⁷⁰

As previously discussed, the common use clause does not prohibit restrictive registration systems, such as "superexclusive" fisheries, if the system's restrictions on individuals result in greater public participation.⁷¹ By the same rationale, these systems should also survive the exclusive use prohibitions of the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause. It is the element of choice that distinguishes a system where the state assigns areas (such as the EGA system)

66. ALASKA STAT. § 16.43.330 (1992).

67. *Id.* §§ 16.43.310-320.

68. *Johns v. Commercial Fisheries Entry Comm'n*, 758 P.2d 1256 (Alaska 1988).

69. Analysis under the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause, as discussed earlier, applies only to situations where a portion of a user group is granted a privilege over the remaining members or potential members. The analysis is not applicable to differential treatment between resource uses, e.g., an advantage given to sport use over commercial use of a certain fish stock. These "preferences among beneficial uses" are the crux of fish and wildlife allocations, and they are specifically endorsed by the constitution. See ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 4; *McDowell v. State*, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989); *Meier v. State* 739 P.2d 172 (Alaska 1987); *Kenai Peninsula v. State*, 628 P.2d 897 (Alaska 1981).

70. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 3.

71. For example, the court came to this conclusion when comparing the competitive bidding system for allocating leases and exclusive concessions on state lands with the seniority system for granting EGAs. See *Owsichek v. State*, 763 P.2d 488 (Alaska 1988). The court found that a bidding system is constitutional because it allows a wider field of applicants than does a system based on prior use, occupancy and investment in the area underlying the private rights. *Id.* at 497.

from one where users register for areas (such as the superexclusive registration system). Even though a user may not have access to all areas, he or she is not initially excluded from any particular area. Thus, the apparent meaning of "equal access" is that no citizen enjoys guaranteed and exclusive use of a fish stock or wildlife population.

IV. THE "UNIFORM APPLICATION" CLAUSE

The third equal access clause, section 17 of Article VIII, is often called the "uniform application clause." It states:

Laws and regulations governing the use or disposal of natural resources shall apply equally to all persons similarly situated with reference to the subject matter and purpose to be served by the law or regulation.⁷²

The legislative history of the "uniform application clause" is sparse. The commentaries to the constitutional convention refer to it only once: "This section is intended to exclude any especially privileged status for any person in the use of natural resources subject to the disposition of the state."⁷³

The Alaska Supreme Court recently interpreted the "uniform application" clause in *Gilbert v. State*.⁷⁴ There the court examined regulations allocating salmon among "intercept" and "destination" fisheries.⁷⁵ The regulations restrict harvest by fishermen who are further from spawning grounds in favor of fishermen who are closer to the grounds.⁷⁶ Drawing on principles derived from earlier decisions, the court articulated a test for satisfying the "uniform application" clause. Because the individual interest in equal access to fish and game resources is a "highly important interest running to each person within the state," the state must have an important purpose to countervail that interest.⁷⁷ The state then has the burden of proving that the means used to further its important purpose are carefully drawn and designed for the "least possible infringement on article VIII's open access values."⁷⁸

72. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 17.

73. 6 Proceedings of the Alaska Constitutional Convention 84 (Dec. 16, 1955).

74. 803 P.2d 391 (Alaska 1990).

75. *Id.* at 393.

76. See ALASKA ADMIN. CODE tit. 5, § 18.260 (June 1988).

77. *Gilbert*, 803 P.2d at 399.

78. *Id.* (quoting *McDowell v. State*, 785 P.2d 1, 10 (Alaska 1989)).

A question left open by the *Gilbert* test concerns the meaning of "open access." One type of access not likely to be protected by this test involves access by one user group and a resulting denial of access to another user group. Inequality of access between user groups results from the need to allocate resources and derives support from the constitution's sanction of "preference among beneficial uses."⁷⁹ Due to the court's ability to distinguish user groups, it is unlikely that an allocation conflict would ever reach the potentially problematic final step of the *Gilbert* test. Competing groups will likely differ in meaningful ways and, thus, the issue would not qualify for analysis under the test. For example, the opposing fisheries in *Gilbert* differed in their biological spawning patterns, historic catch levels, and participation.⁸⁰ Thus, because the fisheries were not "similarly situated," there was not a "non-uniform classification," and the uniform application clause was not implicated.⁸¹

More likely, the *Gilbert* test applies to situations involving individual access to resource user groups. This inference derives from the court's distinction between allocation and limits on admission to these groups.⁸² This interpretation of *Gilbert* is also consistent with the court's decisions in *McDowell* and the limited entry cases. All of these cases examined limits on admission to user groups, not inter-group allocations.

In *Kenaitze Indian Tribe v. State*,⁸³ however, which is presently pending before the Alaska Supreme Court, a superior court interpreted the *Gilbert* decision differently. *Kenaitze* arose from the prohibitions on subsistence fishing and hunting established by a 1992 statute.⁸⁴ That statute states:

The boards may not permit subsistence hunting or fishing in a nonsubsistence area. The boards, acting jointly, shall identify by regulation the boundaries of nonsubsistence areas. A non-subsistence area is an area or community where dependence

79. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 4.

80. *Gilbert*, 803 P.2d at 399.

81. Similarly, the *Gilbert* test also did not apply to the ban on fish spotting in Bristol Bay. Because the ban applied equally to all citizens, there was no "non-uniform classification" and, therefore, the uniform application clause was not implicated. *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State Dep't of Fish and Game*, 838 P.2d 798, 804 (Alaska 1992).

82. See *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 8.

83. No. 3AN-91-4569 (Alaska Super. Ct. Oct. 26, 1993).

84. ALASKA STAT. § 16.05.258(c) (1992).

upon subsistence is not a principal characteristic of the economy, culture, and way of life of the area or community.⁸⁵

Residents of nonsubsistence areas challenged this provision, claiming it violated the equal access clauses.⁸⁶ Despite finding that the legislature's purpose for authorizing nonsubsistence areas was to allocate resources, the superior court struck down the provision under the *Gilbert* test.⁸⁷

In *Kenaitze*, the superior court added a new condition for allocating natural resources. It held that, under the "least possible infringement" standard, the state could not prohibit subsistence activities in a certain area without first considering whether resources there could support some kind of balance between all possible uses.⁸⁸ Generally, this decision means that the state may not allocate resources so that one use is excluded in an area while maintaining others unless there is a finding that resource abundance will not support all uses simultaneously.

V. UNIFYING THEMES AMONG THE EQUAL ACCESS CLAUSES

There are several common themes and principles unifying the equal access clauses. Among these common themes are the clauses' reference to territorial fish and wildlife management, their prohibition on exclusive or special privileges and their focus on individual admission to resources "user groups."

A. Reference to Territorial Fish and Wildlife Management

In several opinions construing the equal access clauses, the Alaska Supreme Court has referred to pre-statehood fish and wildlife management practices. The court has assumed that the framers of the constitution were aware of these practices, and has consistently concluded that they did not intend the clauses to prohibit contemporary practices that are equivalent to historic ones.

In *Owsichek v. State*,⁸⁹ for example, the court stated:

We observe initially that, in guaranteeing people "common use" of fish, wildlife and water resources, the framers of the constitution clearly did not intend to prohibit all regulation of the use of these resources. Licensing requirements, bag limits, and seasonal restrictions, for example, are time-honored methods of conserv-

85. *Id.*

86. *Kenaitze*, No. 3AN-91-4569, slip op. at 4.

87. *Id.* at 12.

88. *Id.* at 10.

89. 763 P.2d 488 (Alaska 1988).

ing the resources that were respected by delegates to the constitutional convention.⁹⁰

Similarly, in *State v. Hebert*,⁹¹ the court observed that gear size and "time and area" limitations are among "time honored brakes" imposed on fishermen to achieve conservation.⁹² The court upheld superexclusive registration for herring fisheries because convention debates did not reveal an intent to prohibit a comparable, pre-statehood management tool, namely exclusive registration for salmon fisheries.⁹³ The court came to a similar conclusion regarding the ban on fish spotting in *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State Department of Fish and Game*.⁹⁴ Because the framers of the constitution submitted the constitutional provision simultaneously with an ordinance prohibiting fish traps, the court concluded that the framers had found nothing inconsistent in adopting the common use clause while concurrently banning certain methods and means of harvest.⁹⁵

Although the court has recognized historic conservation practices, it is not clear whether the existence of a general conservation purpose will excuse a violation of equal access principles. On the one hand, usefulness in wildlife conservation and management was not sufficient to save the EGA system from being declared unconstitutional.⁹⁶ On the other hand, the court implied in *McDowell* that an exclusionary system would be more acceptable if it served conservation purposes.⁹⁷

B. Prohibition on Exclusive or Special Privileges

One principle that applies to all of the equal access clauses is reflected in the wording of the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause.⁹⁸ The court has interpreted this clause consistently, stating that "[a]lthough the ramifications of these clauses are varied, they

90. *Id.* at 492.

91. 803 P.2d 863 (Alaska 1990).

92. *Id.* at 866-67.

93. *Id.* at 866.

94. 838 P.2d 798 (Alaska 1992).

95. *Id.* at 802.

96. *See Owsichek v. State*, 763 P.2d 488 (Alaska 1988).

97. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 9. "We do not imply that the constitution bars all methods of exclusion where exclusion is required for species protection reasons."
Id.

98. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 15.

share at least one meaning: exclusive or special privileges to take fish and wildlife are prohibited."⁹⁹

The court has not limited its "no exclusive right or privilege" analysis to the "no exclusive right of fishery" clause. The court has similarly held that the common use and the uniform application clauses were also intended to prohibit exclusive or special privileges.¹⁰⁰

C. Individual Admission to Resource "User Groups"

The equal access clauses also scrutinize limits on admission to user groups.¹⁰¹ In fact, the EGA system and the rural residency criterion, the only state actions struck down under the clauses, have both involved such user group admission limits.¹⁰² Thus, it is important to understand the meaning of "user group" in fish and wildlife management in order to fully comprehend the application of the equal access clauses.

In the context of the common use clause, the court has defined user group according to "the nature of the resource (*i.e.*, fish or wildlife) and the nature of the use (*i.e.*, commercial, sport or subsistence)."¹⁰³ User groups include recreational hunters,

99. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 6.

100. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Hebert*, 803 P.2d 863 (Alaska 1990).

101. *See, e.g.*, *Tongass Sport Fishing Ass'n v. State*, 866 P.2d 1314 (Alaska 1994) ("[T]he 'common use' clause of article VIII, section 3, the 'no exclusive right of fishery' clause of section 15, and the 'uniform application' clause of section 17 are not implicated unless limits are placed on the admission to resource user groups.").

102. This principle was recognized in a recent superior court decision. In *Kodiak Seafood Processors Ass'n v. State*, No. 1JU-93-274 CI, slip op. (Alaska Sup. Ct. Sept. 14, 1993), seafood processors challenged an exploratory scallop fishing permit issued by the Department of Fish and Game to a commercial fisherman. The permit allowed the fisherman, under the control of department biologists, to operate a scallop dredge in an area closed to commercial scallop fishing. *Id.* at 2-3. Plaintiffs claimed, *inter alia*, that issuance of the permit violated the equal access clauses. *Id.* at 4-5.

The superior court found that the issuance of the permit did not constitute the opening of a "commercial fishery" because it occurred at an exploratory, test-fishing stage during which no user group had access to the resource. *Id.* at 20-21. "Until the resource is open to recognized user groups, and the plaintiffs are excluded from a particular user group, . . . there can be no violation of the 'equal access clauses.'" *Id.* at 22. This holding is presently being appealed to the Alaska Supreme Court. *Kodiak Seafood Processors Ass'n v. State*, No. S-5987.

103. *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State Dep't of Fish and Game*, 838 P.2d 798, 803 (Alaska 1992).

subsistence hunters, sport fishermen, commercial fishermen, personal use fishermen, subsistence fishermen and even professional hunting guides.¹⁰⁴ However, the court has rejected a definition of "user group" that is based on a particular means or method of using the resource. For example, persons who operate aircraft for aerial fish spotting are not a user group for purposes of the common use clause.¹⁰⁵

The court revisited the "user group" issue recently in *Tongass Sport Fishing Ass'n v. State*.¹⁰⁶ In 1991, the Board of Fisheries allocated chinook salmon in southeast Alaska between the commercial troll and sport fisheries by establishing a percentage of the harvestable stock which each group could catch. Several sport fishing groups filed a suit challenging the allocation scheme, claiming, *inter alia*, that the system violated both the common use and the no exclusive right of fishery clauses of Article VIII.¹⁰⁷

In rejecting the Article VIII claim, the Alaska Supreme Court restated principles announced in earlier opinions on the equal access clauses. The court affirmed that the equal access clauses are not implicated unless the state places limits to admission on resource user groups.¹⁰⁸ The court cited several opinions, including *Gilbert* and *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n*, in which the Board's authority to allocate among different fisheries had been recognized, and distinguished allocating resources from placing limits on admission to resource user groups.¹⁰⁹

VI. THE EQUAL ACCESS CLAUSES' RELATION TO OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

The equal access clauses do not function in a vacuum. In fact, the clauses are significantly influenced by at least two other constitutional provisions. Specifically, the Alaska Supreme Court has had to square the equal access clauses with the "preferences among beneficial uses" clause of Article VIII, section 4. Addition-

104. The court recognized that "[t]he work of a guide is so closely tied to hunting and taking wildlife that there is no meaningful basis for distinguishing between the rights of a guide and the rights of a hunter under the common use clause." *Owsichek v. State*, 763 P.2d 488, 497 n.15 (Alaska 1988).

105. *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n*, 838 P.2d at 803.

106. 866 P.2d 1314 (Alaska 1994).

107. *Id.* at 1315.

108. *Id.*

109. *Id.* at 1318.

ally, because the equal access clauses have been called "a special type of equal protection guarantee," it is necessary to compare the standard of review used by the court to apply the equal access clauses with the equal protection test articulated by the court under Article I, section 1 of the state's constitution.

A. The "Preferences Among Beneficial Uses" Clause

Article VIII, section 4 of the Alaska Constitution provides:

Fish, forests, wildlife, grasslands, and all other replenishable resources belonging to the State shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, *subject to preferences among beneficial uses*.¹¹⁰

The Alaska Supreme Court has recognized the tension between the equal access clauses, which prohibit exclusive rights and special privileges, and the last phrase of section 4, which authorizes "preferences." In *McDowell v. State*,¹¹¹ Justice Moore rejected any implication in the majority opinion that all preferences, especially subsistence preferences, would violate the equal access clauses.¹¹² Justice Moore noted the apparent conflict between the clauses' prohibition against special privileges and section 4, which "clearly authorizes some preferences based upon uses."¹¹³ Moreover, in his dissenting opinion, Justice Rabinowitz argued that the majority decision would conflict with the explicit language of section 4, which explicitly authorizes rural preferences.¹¹⁴

The court has attempted to clarify this apparent conflict by distinguishing between allocating resources among resource uses and limiting admission to resource user groups. In *Kenai Peninsula Fisherman's Cooperative Ass'n v. State*¹¹⁵ the court stated:

While section 15 [the "no exclusive rights" clause] does prohibit granting monopoly fishing rights, that section was not meant to prohibit differential treatment of such diverse user groups as commercial, sports, and subsistence fishermen. To conclude that, because a certain species is made available for sport fishing in a given area, commercial fishing of the same species must also be allowed, would be to go far beyond the purpose of the section.¹¹⁶

110. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 4 (emphasis added).

111. 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989).

112. *Id.* at 13 (Moore, J., concurring).

113. *Id.* (Moore, J., concurring).

114. *Id.* at 17 (Rabinowitz, J., dissenting).

115. 628 P.2d 897 (Alaska 1981).

116. *Id.* at 904.

In *McDowell v. State*¹¹⁷ the court stated that “[t]he state may, indeed must, make allocation decisions between sport, commercial, and subsistence users. That authority, however, does not imply a power to limit admission to a user group.”¹¹⁸ As an allocative system, such application is unauthorized under the “preferences” phrase of section 4.

B. Equal Access and Equal Protection

Because the uniform application clause requires that laws and regulations “apply equally to all persons similarly situated,”¹¹⁹ it provides a clear equal protection guarantee for the use and disposal of natural resources. In *McDowell*, the court described the equal access clauses in general as “a special type of equal protection guarantee.”¹²⁰ This raises the question of how analysis under Alaska’s equal protection clause differs from analysis under the equal access clauses, and in particular, under the uniform application clause.

The equal protection clause in Article I, section 1 of the Alaska Constitution provides that “all persons are equal and entitled to equal rights, opportunities, and protection under the law”¹²¹ When determining whether legislation comports with this clause, Alaska courts employ a “sliding” test that the Alaska Supreme Court has described as follows:

We first determine the importance of the individual interest impaired by the challenged enactment. We then examine the importance of the state interest underlying the enactment, that is, the importance of the enactment. Depending on the importance of the individual interest, the equal protection clause requires that the state’s interest fall somewhere on a continuum from mere legitimacy to a compelling interest. Finally, we examine the nexus between the state interest and the state’s means of furthering that interest. Again depending upon the importance of the individual interest, the equal protection clause requires that the nexus fall somewhere on a continuum from substantial relationship to least restrictive means.¹²²

117. 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989).

118. *Id.* at 8.

119. ALASKA CONST. art. VIII, § 17.

120. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 11.

121. ALASKA CONST. art. I, § 1.

122. *State v. Enserch Constr., Inc.*, 787 P.2d 624, 631-32 (Alaska 1989) (footnote omitted).

Before *McDowell*, the court had said very little about the test for applying the "uniform application clause," nor had it discussed the equal access clauses in terms of equal protection. In one instance, the court opined that in cases involving natural resources the "uniform application clause" may require more stringent review of a statute than does the general equal protection clause.¹²³ However, the court did not articulate a specific standard to be applied to natural resource cases.

In *McDowell*, the court implicitly followed an equal protection analysis in striking down the rural residency preference in the subsistence law. Placing the *McDowell* analysis into the equal protection framework leads to the conclusion that the "individual interest" at issue was the interest of each person in the state in participating in subsistence uses of renewable resources. The court said that this was a "highly important" interest.¹²⁴

As for the competing state interest, the court said that it must be at least "important" to sustain legislation that burdens the equal access clause.¹²⁵ The court noted that an "important" state interest embodied in the subsistence law was "to ensure that those Alaskans who need to engage in subsistence hunting and fishing in order to provide for their basic necessities are able to do so."¹²⁶

In analyzing the "nexus" between the state's "important" interest and the legislation's "means" for accomplishing it, the court held that the government's approach must be the "least possible infringement on article VIII's open access values."¹²⁷ When the court applied this standard, it concluded that the "means used to accomplish this purpose [were] extremely crude."¹²⁸ Specifically, the court pointed to evidence showing that there were "substantial numbers of Alaskans living in areas designated as urban who have legitimate claims as subsistence users. Likewise, there are substantial numbers of Alaskans living in areas designated as rural who have no legitimate claims."¹²⁹ Thus, the court's ground for striking down the rural-urban classification scheme was that it was

123. *Gilman v. Martin*, 662 P.2d 120 (Alaska 1983).

124. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 10.

125. *Id.*

126. *Id.*

127. *Id.*

128. *Id.*

129. *Id.* at 10-11.

both under-inclusive and over-inclusive.¹³⁰ In his *McDowell* concurrence, Justice Moore stated that he would have followed an explicit equal protection analysis under article 1, section 1 of the Alaska constitution. He argued that the individual interest at stake, access to wildlife for subsistence purposes, was "a species of the important right to engage in economic endeavor."¹³¹ The subsistence law, therefore, would be subjected to "close scrutiny," and it would have to at least be "closely related to an important state interest."¹³² Justice Moore called the state's interest more than "important"; it was "compelling."¹³³ Therefore, Justice Moore would have found the subsistence law defective because its classification scheme established only a modest correlation, rather than a close relationship, between those who resided in rural areas and those who were dependent on subsistence hunting and fishing.¹³⁴

In dissent, Justice Rabinowitz maintained that the individual interest at stake, the right to participate in subsistence hunting and fishing, was not a fundamental right. Thus, Justice Rabinowitz argued, the "strict scrutiny" and "least restrictive alternative" standards were not applicable.¹³⁵ Justice Rabinowitz therefore concluded that the means-end fit of the subsistence criterion was sufficiently close to satisfy equal protection under both the "uniform application clause" and under the general equal protection clause of the constitution.¹³⁶

Recently, the Alaska Court of Appeals addressed the issue of whether the Alaska Supreme Court had created a constitutional analysis for the equal access clauses that was distinct from its analysis for the equal protection clause. The Court of Appeals stated that the Alaska Supreme Court appeared to use the same

130. *McDowell*, 785 P.2d at 10-11. After striking down the "extremely crude" means for distinguishing persons who were eligible for subsistence uses, the court suggested a legislative solution: "A classification scheme employing individual characteristics would be less invasive of the article VIII open access values and much more apt to accomplish the purpose of the statute than the urban-rural criterion." *Id.* at 11.

131. *Id.* at 13 (Moore, J., concurring).

132. *Id.* (Moore, J., concurring).

133. *Id.* (Moore, J., concurring).

134. *Id.* (Moore, J., concurring).

135. *Id.* at 19 (Rabinowitz, J., dissenting).

136. *Id.* (Rabinowitz, J., dissenting).

approach for both, requiring the state to meet a rigorous test.¹³⁷ The state must demonstrate both an "important" legislative purpose and means narrowly tailored to accomplish that purpose.¹³⁸

VII. CONCLUSION

The equal access clauses are unique to Alaska's constitution and, at the same time, based on established, historic principles arising under the public trust doctrine, pre-statehood fish and wildlife management policy and equal protection analysis. Although largely neglected in their first three decades, the clauses have recently been frequently scrutinized by the Alaska Supreme Court. In six opinions since 1987, the court has attempted to clarify the meaning of "equal access" as it applies to Alaska's fish and wildlife. While exclusive and special privileges to take subsistence resources are prohibited, these limitations are qualified by constitutional provisions that authorize limited entry to commercial fisheries and that enable the state to establish preferences among various uses. From among these provisions, one fundamental, consistently applied principle has emerged: Limitations on admission to fish and wildlife "user groups" are subject to strict judicial scrutiny under the equal access clauses.

Several other principles have evolved pertaining to the individual equal access clauses. The common use clause, for example, disallows the "privatization" of public fish and wildlife resources, especially if special privileges are long-term and do not compensate the public. The "no exclusive right of fishery" clause requires a "least possible infringement" inquiry when faced with a scheme that creates exclusive rights in fisheries, even if it is a form of limited entry. A similar test under the "uniform application" clause applies to nonuniform classifications among Alaskans who harvest these resources.

The pending Alaska Supreme Court decision in *Kenaitze Indian Tribe v. State*¹³⁹ affords the court an opportunity to clarify the nature of the "access" guaranteed by the constitution. *Owsichek v. State*¹⁴⁰ and *McDowell v. State*¹⁴¹ hold that "access"

137. *Baker v. State*, 878 P.2d 642, 644-45 (Alaska Ct. App. 1994).

138. *Id.*

139. No. 3AN-91-4569 (Alaska Super. Ct. Oct. 26, 1993).

140. 763 P.2d 488 (Alaska 1988).

141. 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989).

means access to membership in a user group. Other decisions hold that "access" does not mean equal opportunity among user groups to harvest fish and wildlife.¹⁴² However, the issue of whether the state may limit access to fish and wildlife outside of the context of a user group has not been decided.¹⁴³ Another unanswered question is whether a restriction on a certain use of a resource may be justified by the availability of other uses of that resource.¹⁴⁴ With Alaska's finite resources and Alaskans' growing demand for fish and wildlife, the equal access provisions of the constitution will have a continuing, central role in providing answers.

142. See, e.g., *Kenai Peninsula v. State*, 628 P.2d 897 (Alaska 1981).

143. There is some support for the idea that the court may limit access outside of this context. In interpreting the White Act, the territorial predecessor to the "no exclusive right of fishery clause," the United States Supreme Court stated that "[e]xclusive," as used in Section 1 of the White Act, forbids not only a grant to a *single person or corporation* but to any special group or number of people." *Hynes v. Grimes Packing Co.*, 337 U.S. 86, 122 (1949) (emphasis added).

144. The answer to this question is probably yes. In *Alaska Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State Dep't of Fish and Game*, one reason the ban on fish spotting was found not to violate the common use clause is because there were alternative ways that aerial spotters could still use the fisheries resource. 838 P.2d at 802.

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 406(RES)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTIETH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY THE HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**Offered:
Referred:**

Sponsor(s): HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act relating to subsistence uses of fish and game and to preferred uses of
2 fish and game."

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

4 * **Section 1. FINDINGS AND INTENT.** (a) The Alaska State Legislature finds that

5 (1) the ability to harvest fish and game for personal and family use for
6 sustenance is a fundamental right under the Constitution of the State of Alaska;

7 (2) the common use clause of the Constitution of the State of Alaska imposes
8 on the state a trust duty to manage the fish, game, and water resources of the state for the
9 benefit of all the people;

10 (3) the harvest of fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance is
11 the highest and best use of fish and game;

12 (4) the fish and game resources of Alaska have adequate biological and
13 reproductive capacity to provide an abundance of fish and game for all users.

14 (b) It is the intent of the Alaska State Legislature to provide

1 (1) for a preference for personal and family use of fish and game for
2 sustenance that parallels the Congressional intent underlying the subsistence preference under
3 Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act but does not violate the
4 fundamental constitutional rights of Alaskans to subsistence, equal protection, and common
5 use of fish and game under the Constitution of the State of Alaska:

6 (2) a greater role for local fish and game advisory committees and regional fish
7 and game councils in the review and approval of regulations governing the use of fish and
8 game resources;

9 (3) for a greater abundance of fish and game resources to serve as a source of
10 food for persons who depend on those resources for personal and family use for sustenance.

11 * **Sec. 2.** AS 16.05 is amended by adding a new section to article 7 to read:

12 **Sec. 16.05.911. Preferred use of fish and game.** The harvest of fish and
13 game for personal or family use for sustenance by residents is the highest and best use
14 of fish and game. Notwithstanding other provisions of this chapter, the Board of
15 Fisheries, the Board of Game, and the department shall adopt regulations, policies, and
16 management plans to implement a preference for consumptive use of fish and game
17 for personal or family use for sustenance over other uses of fish and game.

0-LS1573\H

Utermohle

2/21/98

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 406(RES)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWENTIETH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY THE HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Offered:

Referred:

Sponsor(s): HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act relating to fish and game."

2 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

3 * Section 1. FINDINGS AND INTENT. (a) The legislature finds that

4 (1) the ability to take fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance
5 is a fundamental right under the Constitution of the State of Alaska;6 (2) the common use clause of the Constitution of the State of Alaska imposes
7 on the state a trust duty to manage the fish, game, and water resources of the state for the
8 benefit of all the people;9 (3) the harvest of fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance is
10 the highest and best use of fish and game;11 (4) the fish and game resources of Alaska have adequate biological and
12 reproductive capacity to provide an abundance of fish and game for all users;13 (5) the harvest of fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance
14 does not constitute or affect interstate commerce and is not subject to regulation under the
15 commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States.

1 (b) It is the intent of the legislature to provide
2 (1) a preference for personal and family use of fish and game for sustenance
3 that parallels the Congressional intent underlying the subsistence preference under Title VIII
4 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (P.L. 96-487) but does not violate the
5 fundamental constitutional rights of Alaskans to sustenance, equal protection, and common use
6 of fish and game under the Constitution of the State of Alaska;

7 (2) a greater role for local fish and game advisory committees and regional fish
8 and game management boards in the review and approval of regulations governing the use of
9 fish and game resources;

10 (3) for a greater abundance of fish and game resources to serve as a source of
11 food for persons who are dependent on fish and game for personal and family use for
12 sustenance.

13 * Sec. 2. AS 16 is amended by adding a new chapter to read:

14 **Chapter 16. Use of Fish and Game for Sustenance.**

15 **Sec. 16.16.010. Preferred use of fish and game.** The harvest of fish and
16 game for personal and family use for sustenance by residents is the highest and best
17 use of fish and game. The Board of Fisheries, the Board of Game, and the department
18 shall adopt regulations, policies, and management plans to implement a preference for
19 consumptive use of fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance over
20 other uses of fish and game.

21 **Sec. 16.16.020. Dependence on fish and game for sustenance.** (a) The
22 Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game acting jointly shall identify and define areas
23 of the state where fish and game dependent uses exist. A fish and game dependent use
24 area is an area where dependence on fish and game for personal and family use for
25 sustenance is the principal characteristic of the economy and way of life of the area.
26 In determining whether dependence on fish and game for personal and family use for
27 sustenance is the principal characteristic of the economy and way of life of an area
28 the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game shall jointly consider the relative
29 importance of dependence on fish and game in the context of the totality of the
30 following socioeconomic characteristics of the area:

31 (1) the social and economic structure;

- 1 (2) the stability of the economy;
- 2 (3) the extent and kinds of employment for wages, including full-time,
- 3 part-time, temporary, and seasonal employment;
- 4 (4) the amount and distribution of cash income among those who live
- 5 in the area;
- 6 (5) the cost and availability of goods and services to those who live in
- 7 the area;
- 8 (6) the variety of fish and game species used by those who live in the
- 9 area;
- 10 (7) the seasonal cycle of economic activity;
- 11 (8) the percentage of those who live in the area participating in hunting
- 12 and fishing activities or using wild fish and game;
- 13 (9) the harvest levels of fish and game by those who live in the area;
- 14 (10) the historical, social, and economic values associated with the
- 15 taking and use of fish and game;
- 16 (11) the geographic locations where those who live in the area hunt and
- 17 fish;
- 18 (12) the extent of sharing and exchange of fish and game by those who
- 19 live in the area;
- 20 (13) the other sources of direct and indirect economic support available
- 21 in the area;
- 22 (14) additional similar factors the boards establish by regulation to be
- 23 relevant to a determination under this subsection.

24 (b) If the Board of Fisheries or the Board of Game, as appropriate, determines

25 that a shortage of fish or game resources available for harvest in a fish and game

26 dependent use area exists, the board may establish a preference for fish or game

27 dependent uses and, consistent with sustained yield, reserve a sufficient portion of the

28 resource to provide a reasonable opportunity to satisfy the need for fish and game

29 dependent uses of the resource. A board shall make its determination of whether

30 sufficient fish or game resources exist in an area to provide a reasonable opportunity

31 to satisfy fish and game dependent uses of the resource based on the recommendations

1 of the department's area management biologist for the area, the regional fish and game
2 board for the area, and the advisory committees for the area. The preference
3 established under this subsection shall be extended to a person who is determined to
4 be dependent on fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance under (c) -
5 (g) of this section. In a time of shortage of fish or game resources, the appropriate
6 board may adopt a regional preference among beneficial uses of fish and game by
7 requiring that the flesh or meat of fish and game be consumed within the region where
8 the fish or game was taken.

9 (c) A person is dependent on fish and game for personal and family use for
10 sustenance if the person

11 (1) possesses a \$5 resident hunting, trapping, and sport fishing license
12 issued under AS 16.05.340(a)(6); and

13 (2) submits to the local fish and game advisory committee for the area
14 in which the person lives a signed written statement that the person

15 (A) is dependent on fish and game for personal and family use
16 for sustenance or has no alternate means of sustenance as the result of the
17 absence of a cash-based economy in the area where the person lives or as the
18 result of the person's decision to adopt a fish and game dependent life style;

19 (B) has consumed in the preceding 12 months a minimum
20 number of species or groups of species of fish and game, as determined by the
21 Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game acting jointly; the minimum number
22 of species or groups of species or the groups of species may vary among the
23 fish and game management regions of the state in accordance with the diversity
24 of fish and game species in each region; and

25 (C) has shared fish and game resources taken by the person
26 with a minimum number of households, as determined by the Board of
27 Fisheries and the Board of Game acting jointly, or received fish and game
28 resources taken by members of a minimum number of other households, as
29 determined by the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game acting jointly.

30 (d) Each local fish and game advisory committee shall review the written
31 statements submitted by persons asserting a dependence on fish and game for personal

1 and family use for sustenance and make recommendations as to whether the person is
2 entitled to a preference under (b) of this section. An advisory committee may hold a
3 hearing to gather additional information regarding whether a person is dependent on
4 fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance. Each advisory committee
5 shall forward its recommendations regarding each person's eligibility for a preference,
6 all written statements received by the advisory committee, and all additional
7 information collected by the advisory committee to the regional fish and game board
8 for the region in which the advisory committee is located. The regional board shall
9 defer to a recommendation made by an advisory committee unless a person disputes
10 the recommendation of the advisory committee under (e) of this section.

11 (e) A person who disputes the recommendation of the advisory committee as
12 to the person's eligibility for the preference may appeal the recommendation to the
13 regional fish and game board for the region in which the person lives. The regional
14 board shall make a determination as to whether the person is dependent on fish and
15 game for personal and family use for sustenance and should be recommended to the
16 Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game to receive the preference authorized under
17 (b) of this section. Proceedings of a regional board under this subsection are subject
18 to AS 44.62.330 - 44.62.630.

19 (f) Each regional fish and game board shall forward all recommendations,
20 written statements, and additional information received from the advisory committees
21 in the region, together with recommendations made by the regional board under (e) of
22 this section and additional information collected by the regional board, to the Board
23 of Fisheries and the Board of Game. The Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game,
24 acting jointly, shall make the final determination as to who is entitled to the preference
25 authorized under (b) of this section. The boards shall defer to the recommendations
26 of the advisory committees and the regional fish and game boards unless a person
27 disputes the recommendation made by an advisory committee or a regional board. The
28 boards shall hold a hearing subject to AS 44.62.330 - 44.62.630 to make a final
29 determination of whether the person is dependent on fish and game for personal and
30 family use for sustenance.

31 (g) A person who is determined by the Board of Fisheries and the Board of

1 Game to be dependent on fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance
2 may take fish and game in any location in the state where a preference for the harvest
3 of fish or game for personal and family use for sustenance has been established under
4 (b) of this section.

5 (h) The Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game shall adopt regulations
6 governing the allowable level of noncommercial barter and sharing of fish and game
7 resources taken for personal and family use for sustenance. The boards shall set the
8 level of allowable noncommercial barter at a documented historical level that does not
9 subject barter of fish and game taken for personal and family use for sustenance to
10 federal regulation under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States.

11 **Sec. 16.16.095. Definitions.** In this chapter,

12 (1) "principal" means more than 50 percent;

13 (2) "reasonable opportunity" means an opportunity, as determined by
14 the Board of Fisheries or the Board of Game, as appropriate, that allows a person to
15 participate in a fishery or hunt that provides a normally diligent participant with a
16 reasonable expectation of success of taking of fish or game; "reasonable opportunity"
17 does not mean a guarantee of taking fish or game;

18 (3) "shortage" means the amount of fish or game resources available
19 for harvest is not sufficient to reasonably provide for the sustenance needs of persons
20 who are dependent upon fish and game for personal and family use for sustenance;

21 (4) "sustained yield" means a level of utilization of a fish or game
22 population for consumptive uses by humans that is capable of being maintained in
23 perpetuity.

24 * Sec. 3. AS 16.05.090(c) is amended to read:

25 (c) There is established in the department a section of fish and game
26 dependent use [SUBSISTENCE HUNTING AND FISHING].

27 * Sec. 4. AS 16.05.094 is amended to read:

28 **Sec. 16.05.094. Duties of section of fish and game dependent use**
29 **[SUBSISTENCE HUNTING AND FISHING].** The section of fish and game
30 dependent use [SUBSISTENCE HUNTING AND FISHING] shall

31 (1) compile existing data and conduct studies to gather information,

1 including data from persons dependent upon fish and game for personal and family
2 use for sustenance [SUBSISTENCE USERS], on all aspects of the role of
3 [SUBSISTENCE] hunting and fishing for fish and game dependent use in the lives
4 of the residents of the state;

5 (2) quantify the amount, nutritional value, and extent of dependence on
6 food acquired through [SUBSISTENCE] hunting and fishing for fish and game
7 dependent use;

8 (3) make information gathered available to the public, appropriate
9 agencies, and other organized bodies;

10 (4) assist the department, the Board of Fisheries, and the Board of
11 Game in determining what uses of fish and game, as well as which users and what
12 methods, should be termed fish and game dependent [SUBSISTENCE] uses, users,
13 and methods;

14 (5) evaluate the impact of state and federal laws and regulations on
15 [SUBSISTENCE] hunting and fishing for fish and game dependent use and, when
16 correctiv action is indicated, make recommendations to the department;

17 (6) make recommendations to the Board of Game and the Board of
18 Fisheries regarding adoption, amendment, and repeal of regulations affecting
19 [SUBSISTENCE] hunting and fishing for fish and game dependent use;

20 (7) participate with other divisions in the preparation of statewide and
21 regional management plans so that those plans recognize and incorporate the needs of
22 [SUBSISTENCE] users of fish and game for fish and game dependent use.

23 * Sec. 5. AS 16.05 is amended by adding a new section to read:

24 Sec. 16.05.245. Review of regulatory proposals. (a) Notwithstanding
25 AS 44.62, each proposal for a regulation to be adopted by the Board of Fisheries or
26 the Board of Game shall be submitted to local fish and game advisory committees and
27 regional fish and game boards that may be affected by the proposal. Each advisory
28 committee and regional board may review the proposed regulation and submit
29 comments and recommendations regarding the proposal to the Board of Fisheries or
30 the Board of Game, as appropriate. This subsection does not apply to emergency
31 regulations considered by either the Board of Fisheries or the Board of Game.

1 (b) The Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game shall carefully review each
2 recommenderdation made by a regional fish and game board and shall defer to the
3 recommendation of the regional board, unless

- 4 (1) there is a contrary recommendation from another regional board;
5 (2) the recommendation is not consistent with the conservation of the
6 fish or game resource;
7 (3) the recommendation involves issues of statewide significance; or
8 (4) the recommendation involves conflicts between regional boards.

9 (c) If the Board of Fisheries or the Board of Game chooses not to follow the
10 recommendation of an advisory committee or a regional board, the appropriate
11 statewide board shall inform the advisory committee or regional board of the action
12 and state the reasons for not following the recommendation.

13 (d) Subject to (a) and (b) of this section, the Board of Fisheries and the Board
14 of Game may consider and adopt any proposal for a regulation that is submitted for
15 adoption, even if comments or recommendations regarding the proposal are not
16 received from an advisory committee or a regional board.

17 * Sec. 6. AS 16.05.251(a) is amended to read:

18 (a) The Board of Fisheries may adopt regulations it considers advisable in
19 accordance with AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) for

20 (1) setting apart fish reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the
21 waters of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the
22 legislature;

23 (2) establishing open and closed seasons and areas for the taking of
24 fish; if consistent with resource conservation and development goals, the board may
25 adopt regulations establishing restricted seasons and areas necessary for persons 60
26 years of age and older to participate in sport fishing, personal use fishing, or
27 [SUBSISTENCE] fishing for personal and family use for sustenance;

28 (3) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, and sex and size
29 limitations on the taking of fish;

30 (4) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit,
31 capture, and transport of fish;

1 (5) establishing marking and identification requirements for means used
2 in pursuit, capture, and transport of fish;

3 (6) classifying as commercial fish, sport fish, guided sport fish,
4 personal use fish, [SUBSISTENCE FISH,] or predators or other categories essential
5 for regulatory purposes;

6 (7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management, conservation,
7 protection, use, disposal, propagation, and stocking of fish;

8 (8) investigating and determining the extent and effect of disease,
9 predation, and competition among fish in the state, exercising control measures
10 considered necessary to the resources of the state;

11 (9) prohibiting and regulating the live capture, possession, transport, or
12 release of native or exotic fish or their eggs;

13 (10) establishing seasons, areas, quotas, and methods of harvest for
14 aquatic plants;

15 (11) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of
16 fishing licenses, permits, and registrations and the transfer of permits and registrations
17 between registration areas is allowed; however, this paragraph does not apply to
18 permits issued or transferred under AS 16.43;

19 (12) regulating commercial fishing, sport fishing, guided sport fishing,
20 fishing for personal and family use for sustenance [SUBSISTENCE], and personal
21 use fishing as needed for the conservation, development, and utilization of fisheries;

22 (13) requiring, in a fishery, observers on board fishing vessels, as
23 defined in AS 16.05.475(d), that are registered under the laws of the state, as defined
24 in AS 16.05.475(c), after making a written determination that an on-board observer
25 program

26 (A) is the only practical data-gathering or enforcement
27 mechanism for that fishery;

28 (B) will not unduly disrupt the fishery;

29 (C) can be conducted at a reasonable cost; and

30 (D) can be coordinated with observer programs of other
31 agencies, including the National Marine Fisheries Service, North Pacific

1 Fishery Management Council, and the International Pacific Halibut
2 Commission;

3 (14) establishing nonexclusive, exclusive, and superexclusive
4 registration and use areas for regulating commercial fishing;

5 (15) regulating resident or nonresident sport fishermen as needed for
6 the conservation, development, and utilization of fishery resources;

7 (16) requiring unlicensed fishing vessels present in or transiting the
8 waters of the state to report to the department the quantity, species, and origin of fish
9 on board; in this paragraph, "unlicensed fishing vessel" means a fishing vessel that is
10 not licensed under AS 16.05.490 - 16.05.530.

11 * Sec. 7. AS 16.05.251(d) is amended to read:

12 (d) Regulations adopted under (a) of this section must, consistent with
13 sustained yield and the provisions of AS 16.16.020 [AS 16.05.258], provide a fair and
14 reasonable opportunity for the taking of fishery resources by personal use, sport, and
15 commercial fishermen.

16 * Sec. 8. AS 16.05.255(a) is amended to read:

17 (a) The Board of Game may adopt regulations it considers advisable in
18 accordance with AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) for

19 (1) setting apart game reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the
20 water or on the land of the state over which it has jurisdiction, subject to the approval
21 of the legislature;

22 (2) establishing open and closed seasons and areas for the taking of
23 game;

24 (3) establishing the means and methods employed in the pursuit,
25 capture, taking, and transport of game, including regulations, consistent with resource
26 conservation and development goals, establishing means and methods that may be
27 employed by persons with physical disabilities;

28 (4) setting quotas, bag limits, harvest levels, and sex, age, and size
29 limitations on the taking of game;

30 (5) classifying game as game birds, song birds, big game animals, fur
31 bearing animals, predators, or other categories;

1 (6) methods, means, and harvest levels necessary to control predation
2 and competition among game in the state;

3 (7) watershed and habitat improvement, and management, conservation,
4 protection, use, disposal, propagation, and stocking of game;

5 (8) prohibiting the live capture, possession, transport, or release of
6 native or exotic game or their eggs;

7 (9) establishing the times and dates during which the issuance of game
8 licenses, permits, and registrations and the transfer of permits and registrations between
9 registration areas and game management units or subunits is allowed;

10 (10) regulating sport hunting and [SUBSISTENCE] hunting for
11 personal and family use for sustenance as needed for the conservation, development,
12 and utilization of game;

13 (11) taking game to ensure public safety.

14 * Sec. 9. AS 16.05.255(d) is amended to read:

15 (d) Regulations adopted under (a) of this section must provide that, consistent
16 with the provisions of AS 16.16.020 [AS 16.05.258], the taking of moose, deer, elk,
17 and caribou by residents for personal or family consumption has preference over taking
18 by nonresidents.

19 * Sec. 10. AS 16.05.255(f) is amended to read:

20 (f) The Board of Game may not significantly reduce the taking of an identified
21 big game prey population by adopting regulations relating to restrictions on harvest or
22 access to the population, or to management of the population by customary
23 adjustments in seasons, bag limits, open and closed areas, methods and means, or by
24 other customary means authorized under (a) of this section, unless the board has
25 adopted regulations, or has scheduled for adoption at the next regularly scheduled
26 meeting of the board regulations, that provide for intensive management to increase
27 the take of the population for human harvest consistent with (e) of this section. This
28 subsection does not apply if the board

29 (1) determines that intensive management would be

30 (A) ineffective, based on scientific information;

31 (B) inappropriate due to land ownership patterns; or

1 (C) against the best interest of persons who take game for
2 personal and family use for sustenance [SUBSISTENCE USES]; or

3 (2) declares that a biological emergency exists and takes immediate
4 action to protect or maintain the big game prey population in conjunction with the
5 scheduling for adoption of those regulations that are necessary to implement (e) of this
6 section.

7 * Sec. 11. AS 16.05.259 is amended to read:

8 Sec. 16.05.259. No personal and family use [SUBSISTENCE] defense. In
9 a prosecution for the taking of fish or game in violation of a statute or regulation, it
10 is not a defense that the taking was done for personal and family use for sustenance
11 [SUBSISTENCE USES].

12 * Sec. 12. AS 16.05.260 is repealed and reenacted to read:

13 Sec. 16.05.260. Local advisory committees and regional boards. (a) The
14 Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game, acting jointly, shall establish a maximum
15 of five fish and game management regions in the state.

16 (b) The Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game, acting jointly, shall adopt
17 regulations establishing a maximum of nine fish and game areas in each fish and game
18 management region established under (a) of this section that together comprise the
19 whole of the region and shall establish a local fish and game advisory committee for
20 each area. The advisory committees shall be composed of persons well informed on
21 the fish or game resources of the area. The boards shall set the number of members
22 and the terms of each of the members of the advisory committees and shall designate
23 one member of each committee as chair.

24 (c) A local fish and game advisory committee may

25 (1) hold public hearings on fish or game matters;

26 (2) make recommendations regarding fish and game matters and fish
27 and game regulatory proposals to the regional fish and game board for the region in
28 which the committee is located and to the Board of Fisheries, the Board of Game, and
29 the department;

30 (3) advise the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game as to the
31 appropriate criteria for determining whether a person is dependent on fish and game

1 for personal and family use for sustenance under AS 16.16.020.

2 (d) Recommendations from the local fish and game advisory committees on
3 regulatory proposals and other fish and game matters shall be forwarded to the
4 appropriate regional and statewide boards for consideration.

5 (e) For each fish and game management region established under (a) of this
6 section, there is established a regional fish and game board. Each board consists of
7 nine members appointed by the governor from a list of names submitted by the fish
8 and game advisory committees within the region of the board. The governor may
9 reject one or more names submitted by the advisory committees and may ask for
10 additional names. The governor shall appoint each member on the basis of interest in
11 public affairs, good judgment, knowledge, and ability, and with a view to providing
12 diversity of interest and points of view in the membership. The members shall be
13 residents of the state and shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation or
14 geographical location of residence. The members of the boards appointed by the
15 governor are subject to confirmation by the legislature in joint session. The members
16 of the boards serve staggered terms of three years. The terms of members of the
17 boards begin on July 1. Notwithstanding AS 39.05.080(1), by April 1 of the calendar
18 year in which the term expires, the governor shall appoint a person to fill the vacancy
19 that will arise on a board due to expiration of the term of a member of the board and
20 submit the name of the person to the legislature for confirmation. If a vacancy arises
21 on the board, the governor shall, within 30 days after the vacancy arises, appoint a
22 person to serve the balance of the unexpired term and submit the name of the person
23 to the legislature for confirmation. A person appointed to fill the balance of an
24 unexpired term shall serve on the board from the date of appointment until the earlier
25 of the expiration of the term or the failure of the legislature to confirm the person
26 under AS 39.05.080. Members of a regional fish and game board serve without
27 compensation but are entitled to per diem and travel expenses authorized for boards
28 and commissions under AS 39.20.180.

29 (f) The governor may only remove a member of a regional fish and game
30 board for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or misconduct in office, or because the
31 member, while serving on the regional board, is convicted of a misdemeanor for

1 violating a statute or regulation related to fish or game or is convicted of a felony.
2 The governor shall deliver to the member a written copy of the charges and give the
3 member an opportunity to be heard in person or through counsel at a public hearing
4 before the governor or a designee upon at least 10 days' notice by registered mail.
5 The member may confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses. Upon removal, the
6 governor or a designee shall file in the proper state office the findings and a complete
7 statement of all charges made against the member.

8 (g) A majority of the members of a regional fish and game board constitutes
9 a quorum for the transaction of business, for the performance of any duty, and for the
10 exercise of any power. A majority of the full board membership is required to carry
11 all motions, regulations, and resolutions.

12 (h) Each regional fish and game board may

13 (1) exercise authority delegated to it by the Board of Fisheries, the
14 Board of Game, or the commissioner;

15 (2) hear appeals from recommendations of a local fish and game
16 advisory committee under AS 16.16.020;

17 (3) hold public hearings on fish and game matters;

18 (4) make recommendations regarding fish and game matters and fish
19 and game regulatory proposals to the Board of Fisheries, the Board of Game, and the
20 department;

21 (5) advise the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game as to the
22 appropriate criteria for determining whether a person is dependent on fish and game
23 for personal and family use for sustenance under AS 16.16.020.

24 (i) The regional fish and game boards shall carefully review each
25 recommendation made by a local fish and game advisory committee within its region
26 regarding regulatory proposals and other fish and game matters. The regional board
27 shall defer to the recommendation of the advisory committee, unless there is a contrary
28 recommendation from another advisory committee, the recommendation is not
29 consistent with the conservation of the fish or game resource, the recommendation
30 involves issues of regional significance, or the recommendation involves conflicts
31 between advisory committees. If the regional board does not adopt or concur in the

1 proposal of the advisory committee, the board shall inform the advisory committee of
2 its decision and state the reasons for its action.

3 (j) The commissioner shall delegate authority to a regional board for
4 emergency closures during established seasons. The appropriate statewide board shall
5 adopt the necessary regulations governing these closures. The commissioner may set
6 aside and void only opening of seasons set by a regional board under this subsection.

7 * Sec. 13. AS 16.05.270 is amended to read:

8 **Sec. 16.05.270. Delegation of authority to commissioner or to a regional**
9 **fish and game management board.** (a) For the purpose of administering
10 AS 16.05.251 and 16.05.255, each board may delegate authority to the commissioner
11 **or to a regional fish and game board** to act in its behalf.

12 (b) If there is a conflict between the board and the commissioner on proposed
13 regulations, public hearings shall be held concerning the issues in question. If, after
14 the public hearings, the board and the commissioner continue to disagree, the issue
15 shall be certified in writing by the board and the commissioner to the governor who
16 shall make a decision. The decision of the governor is final.

17 * Sec. 14. AS 16.05.403 is amended to read:

18 **Sec. 16.05.403. Special licenses and permits.** (a) A resident hunting license,
19 a resident sport fishing license, a resident [SUBSISTENCE] fishing permit **for**
20 **personal and family use for sustenance,** or a resident personal use fishing permit
21 indicating that the purchaser is blind may be obtained from the department upon
22 payment of the fee prescribed in AS 16.05.330 - 16.05.430 and upon presentation of
23 either an affidavit of the applicant stating that the applicant cannot distinguish light
24 from darkness or an affidavit signed by a licensed physician or a licensed optometrist
25 stating that the applicant's central visual acuity does not exceed 20/200 in the better
26 eye with correcting lenses or that the applicant's widest diameter of visual field
27 subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees.

28 (b) A resident who is a person with physical disabilities may obtain from the
29 department upon payment of the fee prescribed in AS 16.05.330 - 16.05.430 and upon
30 submission of satisfactory proof of physical disabilities a resident hunting license, a
31 resident sport fishing license, a resident [SUBSISTENCE] fishing permit **for personal**

1 and family use for sustenance, or a resident personal use fishing permit indicating
2 that the purchaser is a person with physical disabilities.

3 (c) A resident who is 65 years of age or older may obtain from the department
4 upon payment of the fee prescribed in AS 16.05.330 - 16.05.430 and upon submission
5 of satisfactory proof of age a resident hunting license, a resident sport fishing license,
6 a resident [SUBSISTENCE] fishing permit for personal and family use for
7 sustenance, or a resident personal use fishing permit indicating that the purchaser is
8 a person who is 65 years of age or older. This subsection does not limit the right of
9 a resident person who is 65 years of age or older to claim an exemption from hunting
10 or sport fishing license requirements under AS 16.05.400(b).

11 * Sec. 15. A 16.05.405(c) is amended to read:

12 (c) Notwithstanding AS 16.05.420(c), a resident holding a valid noncommercial
13 fishing license may take fish on behalf of a person who is blind, a person with
14 physical disabilities, or a person who is 65 years of age or older if the resident
15 possesses on the resident's person

16 (1) a document signed by the person on whose behalf the fish is taken,
17 stating that the resident possesses the person's sport fishing license, [SUBSISTENCE]
18 fishing permit for personal and family use for sustenance, personal use fishing
19 permit, or permanent identification card in order to take fish on behalf of that person;

20 (2) the person's

21 (A) resident sport fishing license issued under AS 16.05.403 or
22 permanent identification card issued under AS 16.05.400(b);

23 (B) resident [SUBSISTENCE] fishing permit for personal and
24 family use for sustenance issued under AS 16.05.403; or

25 (C) resident personal use fishing permit issued under
26 AS 16.05.403; and

27 (3) all other documents issued to the person that are required by law
28 as a condition of taking the fish being pursued.

29 * Sec. 16. AS 16.05.930(e) is amended to read:

30 (e) This chapter does not prevent the limited noncommercial
31 [TRADITIONAL] barter of fish and game taken for personal and family use for

1 sustenance [BY SUBSISTENCE HUNTING OR FISHING], except that the
2 commissioner may prohibit the barter of [SUBSISTENCE-TAKEN] fish and game by
3 regulation, emergency or otherwise, if a determination on the record is made that the
4 barter is resulting in a waste of the resource, damage to fish stocks or game
5 populations, or circumvention of fish or game management programs.

6 * Sec. 17. AS 16.05.940(2) is amended to read:

7 (2) "barter" means the exchange or trade of fish or game, or their parts,
8 taken for personal and family use for sustenance [SUBSISTENCE USES]

9 (A) for other fish or game or their parts; or

10 (B) for other food or for nonedible items other than money if
11 the exchange is of a limited and noncommercial nature;

12 * Sec. 18. AS 16.05.940(5) is amended to read:

13 (5) "commercial fishing" means the taking, fishing for, or possession
14 of fish, shellfish, or other fishery resources with the intent of disposing of them for
15 profit, or by sale, barter, trade, or in commercial channels; the failure to have a valid
16 fishing [SUBSISTENCE] permit for personal and family use for sustenance in
17 possession, if required by statute or regulation, is considered prima facie evidence of
18 commercial fishing if commercial fishing gear as specified by regulation is involved
19 in the taking, fishing for, or possession of fish, shellfish, or other fish resources;

20 * Sec. 19. AS 16.05.940 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

21 (37) "fish and game dependent uses" means the noncommercial,
22 historical uses of fish and game by a resident for direct personal or family
23 consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation, for the making and
24 selling of handicraft articles out of nonedible by-products of fish and game resources
25 taken for personal or family consumption, and for the limited noncommercial barter
26 or sharing for personal or family use for sustenance; in this paragraph, "family" means
27 persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, and a person living in the household
28 on a permanent basis.

29 * Sec. 20. AS 16.10.380(b) is amended to read:

30 (b) In this section "user group" includes [, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO,] sport
31 fishermen, processors, commercial fishermen, persons who fish for personal and