

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON FEDERAL AREAS

1990 ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 30, 1991

January 30, 1991

Dear Reader:

The Citizens' Advisory Commission on Federal Areas was established in 1981 by the Alaska State Legislature to provide assistance to the citizens of Alaska who are affected by the management of federal lands in the state. The need for the Commission arose primarily from the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) in 1980. ANILCA placed an additional 104 million acres of land in Alaska into federal conservation system units and outlined specific use requirements and restrictions for those areas.

The changes in land status which resulted from the creation of the conservation system units increased the potential for conflict between Alaskans' traditional uses of these federal lands and the mandates in ANILCA. The Commission is charged with the responsibility of researching issues and determining the impact of federal statutes, regulations and management decisions on the citizens of Alaska in order to minimize or resolve potential conflicts. Through the development and maintenance of a good working relationship with the various federal agencies, the Commission has been effective in assuring that land management decisions are consistent with both statutory language and Congressional intent and in protecting the interests of Alaska's citizens. This document represents the Commission's annual report to the Governor and the Alaska State Legislature as required by AS 41.37.080(f).

COMPOSITION

The Commission is composed of sixteen members, eight appointed by the Governor and eight by the Legislature. The Commission officers for 1990 were: Chairman, Mr. Lew Williams (Ketchikan) and Vice-Chairman, Ms. Thyes Shaub (Juneau), with Mr. Andy Hope (Juneau), Ms. Dorothy Jones (Talkeetna), and Senator Bettye Fahrenkamp (Fairbanks) serving on the Executive Committee.

STAFF

There are currently two staff positions for the Commission: an executive director and an administrative assistant. The office is located in Fairbanks.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

The duties of the Citizens' Advisory Commission on Federal Areas are mandated in AS 41.37.080:

(a) "The commission shall consider, research, and hold hearings on the consistency with federal law and congressional intent on management, operation, planning, development, and additions to federal management areas in the state.

(b) The commission shall consider, research, and hold hearings on the impact of federal regulations and federal management decisions on the people of the state.

(c) The commission may, after consideration of the public policy concerns under (a) and (b) of this section, make recommendation on the concerns under (a) and (b) of this section to an agency of the state or to the agency of the United States which manages federal land in the state.

(d) The commission shall consider the views, research, and reports of advisory groups established by it under AS 41.37.090 as well as the views, research, and reports of individuals and other groups in the state.

(e) The commission shall establish internal procedures for the management of the responsibilities granted to it under this chapter.

(f) The commission shall report annually to the governor and the legislature within the first 10 days of a regular legislative session.

(g) The commission shall cooperate with each department or agency of the state or with a state board or commission in the fulfillment of their duties.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

During 1990, in reviewing the duties mandated by its enabling legislation, the Commission decided that it would be appropriate to clarify its goals and objectives to ensure that it was fulfilling its responsibilities under the law. As a result, the following goals statement was adopted by the Commission.

- I. To provide a citizens' forum to facilitate improvement in intergovernmental relations regarding federal area management issues.

- II. To ensure that the impacts on Alaskans by federal area managers is minimized.
- III. To advocate for consistency, with the law, in the management of federal areas.
- IV. To circulate information to the public on federal area management.

In order to fulfill these goals the Commission will continue to perform the following functions:

The Commission will continue to monitor federal agency planning, management activities and implementation efforts.

Review of any federal/public lands proposed for exchange will also be continued.

Commission research on special projects mandated by ANILCA or other federal statutes will continue.

The Commission will continue its involvement at the earliest stages of planning activities for the conservation system units established or expanded by ANILCA.

Commission efforts to resolve conflicts between land managers and land users will be emphasized.

The Commission will help to assure that the best interests of the State of Alaska are brought into the decision making process.

The Commission will continue to work with the congressional offices and monitor federal legislation and regulations which have an impact on the administration and management of federal lands in Alaska.

The Commission will continue to report to the Governor and the Legislature on any recommendations made on federal land management decisions that affect Alaskans.

The Commission has developed and maintained good working relationships with federal and state agencies and with individual and organizational contacts by thoroughly analyzing issues before submitting comments and recommendations on land management issues. Although the Commission's primary role is advisory, it has the authority to recommend suit by the State's Attorney General against any federal agency which fails to act

within the bounds of congressional intent or within the limits of the law. For the first time in 1987, the Commission exercised this authority and recommended, through the Governor's office, that the state file suit against the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service over that agency's final regulations on the use and construction of cabins and other structures in the national parks in Alaska. Final action by the U.S. District Court on the state's lawsuit in this issue is still pending.

COMMISSION ACTIVITIES IN 1990

1990 was the eighth full calendar year of operation for the Commission. The year's objectives were divided between reviewing and commenting on federal agency planning documents and regulations, investigating citizen complaints and working to ensure maximum levels of public participation in all stages of planning for the management of federal lands in Alaska. Following is a brief discussion of the major issues in which the Commission was involved during this past calendar year. Minutes, as well as tapes, of all Commission meetings held during 1990 are available if any reader desires more detailed information on any issue. Additionally, copies of all resolutions or recommendations made by the Commission are also available from Commission staff upon request.

* * * * *

SUBSISTENCE

Probably the most important resource issue facing Alaskans during 1990 was the situation surrounding subsistence uses of fish and wildlife. At the heart of this issue was a fundamental conflict between the provisions of the Alaska Constitution and the statutory requirements in Title VIII of ANILCA.

Title VIII of ANILCA grants a preference to the taking of fish and wildlife by rural residents for subsistence purposes on the federal public lands over the taking of fish and wildlife on those lands for other purposes. While ANILCA recognizes the state's authority to manage fish and wildlife on all lands in Alaska, it also requires that the rural subsistence priority be provided for in state laws and regulations governing the allocation of fish and wildlife in order for the state to retain that management authority on the federal public lands. Until December, 1989 the state had in place laws and regulations that were in full compliance with ANILCA.

On December 22, 1989 the Alaska Supreme Court issued a ruling in the case of McDowell v. State of Alaska that found the state's subsistence law in violation of the Alaska Constitution. Specifically, the Supreme Court found that the preference granted to rural residents for the taking of fish and wildlife for subsistence purposes violated Article VIII, sections 3, 15 and 17 of the Alaska Constitution. These sections, respectively,

reserve fish and wildlife to the people of the state for common use, prohibit the creation or authorization of an exclusive right or special privilege of fishery, and require that laws and regulations governing the use or disposal of natural resources apply equally to all persons.

The effect of the McDowell ruling was that the state was determined to no longer be in compliance with the provisions of ANILCA Title VIII. This, in turn, meant that unless the state was able to adopt some mechanism which allowed it to comply with the rural priority in the federal law, the federal government would assume management of subsistence activities on the federal public lands. The federal government gave the state until July 1, 1990 to develop and adopt a management program that was consistent with ANILCA.

The Commission's involvement in this issue began shortly after the McDowell decision. At our meeting of February 2-3, Commission members were briefed by the Department of Law on the history and evolution of the subsistence issue since 1978, when the first state subsistence law was passed. Options for resolving the issue were discussed. These options included amending ANILCA, passage of a new state subsistence law that was consistent with both ANILCA and the Alaska Constitution, challenging the rural priority in ANILCA through a lawsuit, or amending the state's constitution to attain consistency with ANILCA.

Because of the controversy and the many uncertainties surrounding the subsistence issue, Commission members agreed that before making any recommendations on resolving the issue, it would be necessary to gather additional public input. The decision was made to schedule another Commission meeting, prior to the end of the legislative session, in order to take public testimony on subsistence and to aid the Commission in the development of recommendations. In the interim, Commission staff was directed to contact interest groups and organizations to solicit their views on subsistence and how they thought the issue could be resolved. Additionally, Commission members attended meetings of several interest groups and conducted their own research on the feasibility of the various options.

On March 31, the Commission held its next meeting, which was teleconferenced to 20 Alaska communities, in order to take public comment on subsistence. Testimony received by the Commission showed that there is a wide diversity of opinion on the issue. A number of people expressed their opposition to the rural preference granted to subsistence users by both ANILCA and the recently overturned state statute, as well their adamant opposition to amending the state's constitution in order to comply with the federal law. Many other people testified strongly in favor of subsistence and the priority for rural residents and urged the Commission to support a constitutional amendment. There was also some testimony favoring a subsistence priority for Alaskan Natives, regardless of residence status.

With few exceptions, public testimony indicated that the most important consideration in resolving this issue was that the state retain its management authority over fish and game allocation on all lands in the state. Concern was expressed that a federal subsistence management program would be less responsive to the needs of subsistence and other users of fish and game than the current state program. A number of individuals also felt that a federal program would be subject to greater influence from people outside the state who might have little understanding or appreciation for the importance of subsistence uses in Alaska. Concern was expressed that this influence would result in the reduction or possibly the elimination of subsistence opportunities because of the growing opposition to consumptive uses of fish and game resources by anti-hunting groups.

Because of the wide range of testimony heard by Commission members and the desire on the part of a number of members to further consult with the constituencies they represented, it was decided to defer final recommendation. Several members also indicated that they wanted to attend the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) conference on subsistence scheduled for early April before making any final decision on what recommendation the Commission should make.

At its next meeting, on April 17, the Commission, on a majority vote, passed a motion recommending an amendment to the Alaska Constitution. The proposed amendment would add a new section to the constitution and reads as follows:

SECTION 19. USE OF FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES FOR SUBSISTENCE. The legislature may grant a preference in the use of fish and wildlife resources for subsistence based upon geographic, socioeconomic and cultural considerations.

The decision to recommend an amendment to the state's constitution was not made lightly by this Commission. Members were sensitive to the strong objections many people had to such a course of action. However, after considering the range of alternatives available to resolve this issue, Commission members determined that the best option was an amendment that would restore the authority of the Alaska Legislature to formulate a subsistence statute consistent with ANILCA. The Commission's proposal differed from other recommended amendments in that it makes no mention of consistency with federal law, nor does it attempt to place a definition of subsistence uses in the state's constitution. Commission members felt that these points were more appropriately dealt with by the legislature in its deliberations of the statute.

The Commission also adopted a general policy statement that was submitted to the governor and the legislature along with the proposed constitutional amendment. The statement, which explained the Commission's

reasoning behind recommending a constitutional amendment, made the following points:

The State of Alaska must take immediate action to prevent federal intervention in fish and wildlife management on federal lands. We believe that if the federal government revokes the state's authority to manage fish and wildlife on federal lands that all Alaskans will suffer but none more so than those people whom ANILCA Title VIII was intended to protect. Imposition of a subsistence management scheme fashioned by Washington can only be inferior to a locally derived solution utilizing the democratic processes governed by the Alaska Constitution.

Protection of subsistence uses for Alaska's citizens is an achievable goal. Whether they live in an "urban" or in a "rural" area, all of Alaska's people have a stake in subsistence. Both federal and state courts have repeatedly affirmed this important point which is being overlooked in the scramble to achieve that which ANILCA, unfortunately, failed to define. We are confident that Alaskans are capable of understanding each other's needs and acting responsibly to meet those needs. Granting the Legislature broad authority to consider appropriate criteria, including geographic factors, i.e. "rurality", if you will, is a necessary first step. The Legislature must respond with positive leadership now and in the future to ensure retention of local authority to resolve this issue.

We recognize the special importance of subsistence activities in those geographic areas of the state removed from the centers of commerce. We believe that geographic, socioeconomic and cultural considerations are the basis for the special importance of subsistence to people in so-called rural areas of Alaska. Recognizing the importance of subsistence to those Alaskans who do not have easy access to jobs, markets and services does not have to be as painful as we have been making it. Nor should an individual's choice of where to live preclude the opportunity to harvest fish and wildlife resources for personal and family consumption. Again, it is a matter of coming to understand each other's needs.

We propose amending the Alaska Constitution in such a way as to empower our elected officials to act responsibly. Once the constitution is amended, we urge the Legislature to provide, by statute, a preference in the use of local resources by local people in those geographic areas of Alaska where subsistence has special importance. When resource uses must be limited to preserve the biological integrity of fish and wildlife populations, the Alaska Statutes should provide for an allocative decision making process which protects the needs of those people for

whom subsistence has special importance. Opportunities for all Alaskans to enjoy use of our fish and wildlife resources can be maintained and enhanced. Active management of our resources and understanding each other's needs are all that is necessary to assure these opportunities.

As the reader is no doubt aware, the legislature was unable to reach agreement on a bill which would have placed a constitutional amendment on the ballot for the 1990 general election. Consequently, on July 1, 1990 the federal government assumed management of subsistence use of fish and game on the federal public lands in Alaska.

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

At the same time the Commission was working toward an Alaskan solution to the subsistence issue, it was also attempting to work with the federal land management agencies in the development of a federal subsistence management program. Unfortunately, those federal agencies provided only limited opportunity for any consultation during the drafting of their management program and implementing regulations. Draft regulations for the federal management program were only available for a ten day public review prior to finalization. Additionally, only four public hearings were held in Alaska to take public testimony on the draft regulations.

In response to the Commission's requests to provide more opportunity for public review and comment, we were repeatedly assured that once the federal program was in place after July 1, the public would be brought fully into the process. However, the first two meetings of the Federal Subsistence Board were closed to the public. Commission staff strongly protested these closed meetings, arguing that because regulatory changes were made at the meetings, the public should have been allowed to attend and participate in the meetings. In late August, 1990, Commission staff met with officials from the Department of the Interior to discuss the federal program and to again protest the closed meetings. As a result of this meeting, the remainder of the meetings of the Federal Subsistence Board were opened to the public.

During the fall, in conjunction with the development of a permanent federal subsistence management program and the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the Federal Subsistence Board held some 60 public meetings throughout Alaska. At those meetings, comments were taken on issue related to subsistence such as rural and non-rural determinations for communities and areas in the state, criteria for determining customary and traditional uses for subsistence purposes, the adequacy of the existing state system of regional councils and local fish and game advisory committees and how a permanent federal program should be structured.

The Federal Subsistence Board is now in the process of preparing permanent federal regulations for subsistence management and an environmental impact statement which will assess the impacts of implementing the federal program. The draft environmental impact statement is scheduled for release in Spring, 1991, with the permanent federal program to be implemented by December, 1991. The Commission will continue to monitor this process and work with the Federal Subsistence Board to the maximum extent possible in the development of their permanent program.

COMMERCIAL & SUBSISTENCE FISHING IN GLACIER BAY

In early 1990, Commission staff was contacted by a number of commercial fishermen from the area around Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve. These fishermen were concerned about rumors circulating that the National Park Service was going to close the waters of Glacier Bay to commercial fishing. Additionally, subsistence fishermen from Hoonah also contacted the Commission because they had heard that Glacier Bay was to be closed to subsistence fishing as well. These fishermen requested the Commission's assistance in preventing what appeared at the time to be an imminent closure of the bay. Commission staff began an investigation of the situation and placed the issue on the agenda for the Commission's February meeting.

Commission member, Representative Peter Goll, was also contacted by a number of constituents in his district, asking for his assistance. Rep. Goll contacted the director of the National Park Service, James Ridenour, in Washington, D.C. to discuss the situation with him. Mr. Ridenour provided Rep. Goll with a statement explaining that the National Park Service had no authority under ANILCA to allow subsistence fishing in Glacier Bay National Park. He also pointed out that commercial fishing was prohibited by National Park Service regulation in all waters of Glacier Bay and prohibited in designated wilderness waters in the park by the Wilderness Act of 1964. Mr. Ridenour further indicated that the National Park Service was obligated to enforce the statutory prohibitions on commercial fishing in wilderness waters and the regulatory prohibition on commercial fishing in all park waters. Mr. Ridenour did state, however, that the National Park Service would agree to consider supporting legislation that would allow commercial and subsistence fishing in the marine waters of Glacier Bay, provided that studies demonstrated that these activities would not cause adverse impacts to the park's resources or purposes. Finally, Mr. Ridenour invited concerned citizens of the region to arrange a meeting with the Alaska regional director of the Park Service, Boyd Evison.

This statement was presented at the Commission meeting on February 3, 1990. At that same meeting, Commission members also heard testimony from a number of commercial and subsistence fishermen who expressed their concern regarding the apparent closure of the bay. Marvin Jensen,

the superintendent of Glacier Bay, was present to discuss the situation and to clarify a number of points for Commission members.

Jensen explained that commercial fishing was prohibited by NPS regulations that were adopted in 1983. These regulations prohibit commercial fishing within a national park unless specifically authorized by statute. These regulations have never been enforced within Glacier Bay. In addition, Glacier Bay is one of the park units in Alaska where subsistence activities are not authorized by ANILCA. However, in 1989 the Alaska Board of Fisheries had authorized a subsistence fishery in Glacier Bay for the residents of Hoonah and issued permits for that fishery. Jensen stated that this action by the state put them in a difficult position. The agency felt that it would be very difficult to enforce a law that prohibits subsistence fishing while allowing an illegal use, commercial fishing to continue. The NPS was forced into considering other alternatives.

Commission staff was then directed to work with the regional office of the National Park Service to set up a meeting with local fishermen and the NPS to discuss fishing in Glacier Bay and explore alternatives to resolve the situation. The Commission, in cooperation with the NPS and the office of several state legislators, scheduled a series of five public meetings.

Public meetings were held in Juneau, Hoonah, Pelican, Gustavus and Yakutat during the week of March 5, 1990. Attendance at all of these meetings was excellent, with a total of nearly 200 people attending. At each of the meetings, NPS representatives explained the legal, regulatory and policy guidelines under which they had to address this issue. What the agency proposed was essentially to maintain the status quo for a period of several years. During this time they would conduct studies to determine the impacts of fishing activity on the other resources within the park. The studies would be conducted in cooperation with the state and the fishing industry. If the studies demonstrated that commercial and subsistence fishing did not have unacceptable levels of impacts to the park, the NPS would then consider supporting legislation that would allow these activities to continue. In the interim, the NPS would have to revise its regulations to allow commercial fishing to continue for the duration of the studies. However, because ANILCA provides no authority to allow subsistence fishing within the park, this activity could not be permitted by simply changing the regulations. With regard to subsistence fishing, one possibility would be to permit a personal use type fishery similar to the state's. The possibility for this option is provided for in existing NPS regulations. Commercial fishing in designated wilderness would still be prohibited, although it was unclear whether or not the NPS would begin to enforce this prohibition.

At each of the meetings, public testimony indicated very strong support for the continuation of both commercial and subsistence fishing within

park waters. Many people spoke about the importance of the Glacier Bay area, particularly the waters along the outer coast, to the commercial fishing industry in Southeastern Alaska. The residents of Hoonah discussed the long history of use of the bay by the Tlingit people. A number of people felt that the level of cruise ship, tour boat and sport fishing charter boats had a greater impact on the park than commercial fishing. Considerable interest was expressed in working with the NPS and the state in developing criteria and guidelines for any studies conducted in the bay. The question of ownership of the waters of the bay also came up a number of times during the meetings.

Based upon the public testimony received at the five public meetings, the Commission formulated the following recommendations, which were submitted to the National Park Service, Governor Cowper and the congressional delegation:

- 1) While we understand that the National Park Service is constrained by current regulations prohibiting commercial fishing within national park units and by ANILCA which does not specifically provide for subsistence activities within the park, we urge the Service to examine all options that will allow these traditional activities to continue without interruption. Closing the park to commercial and subsistence fishing would have serious social and economic impacts to the communities in the area.
- 2) During the public meetings, the National Park Service stated that studies will be initiated to determine the impacts of commercial and subsistence fishing on the other resources of the park. The Commission supports the proposed studies and urges the NPS to cooperate closely with the State of Alaska, the commercial fishing industry and other interested parties in this effort. We believe that the studies will demonstrate that commercial and subsistence fishing have few, if any, adverse impacts to the other resources of the park or to the enjoyment of the area for park visitors.
- 3) It is our understanding that the NPS is presently considering revisions to existing regulations which would allow commercial fishing to continue, at current levels, for the duration of the proposed studies. The Commission supports this effort and encourages the NPS to hold public hearings in the area of the park to discuss any regulatory changes and the criteria under which the studies will be conducted.
- 4) Finally, as a long term solution to the problem, the Commission fully supports legislation that would specifically provide for the continuation of commercial fishing and subsistence fishing within Glacier Bay National Park. Sealaska Corporation has

drafted proposed legislation which would amend ANILCA to authorize these activities within the park. The Commission sees legislation as the best means to ensure that these two important activities can continue into the future.

During the remainder of 1990, commercial fishing continued without interruption in Glacier Bay National Park. There was also some subsistence fishing activity in the park, but it is not clear how much actually occurred. Although it has not yet been enforced, the federal subsistence management regulations that went into effect on July 1, 1990 specifically prohibit subsistence activities in the park. In addition, the NPS has drafted regulations that would allow the continuation of traditional forms of commercial fishing in the park pending completion of a proposed 5 to 7 year study that would determine the impacts of commercial fishing within the park. According to information received from the agency, these proposed regulations would prohibit commercial fishing in designated wilderness waters of the park and provide for "personal use fishing" utilizing hook and line. It is not known at this time when these regulations will be released for public review.

In August, 1990 a lawsuit was filed by the Alaska Wildlife Alliance and American Wildlands against the National Park Service. The lawsuit requests that, among other things, "...the Court issue an order directing the defendants to take immediate steps to curtail illegal fishing activity in Glacier Bay National Park." Allied Fishermen of Southeast Alaska, a group representing a diverse cross-section of commercial fishing interests has filed a motion to intervene in the suit. At the time of this report, the lawsuit has not been settled.

The Commission will continue to monitor this issue and work with interested parties, state agencies and the National Park Service to provide whatever assistance possible to resolve this issue.

In the ten years since the passage of ANILCA, scores of management plans, policies and regulations have been proposed or implemented. The impacts to the citizens of this state have been considerable. As the federal agencies continue their implementation and planning efforts, impacts will also continue. A review of the proposed planning schedules for the federal land management agencies strongly indicates the need for continued monitoring and citizen participation in the process. With the completion of general management plans for national park units and the comprehensive conservation plans for the national wildlife refuges, resource management plans and unit specific regulations are now being prepared.

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is currently engaged in the preparation of public use management plans for the Togiak, Kodiak, Alaska Peninsula, Becharof and Tetlin National Wildlife Refuges. The Service is also developing fisheries management plans, river management plans, furbearer and big game management plans for these and several other refuges. In addition, the agency is preparing a regional seabird plan and a sea otter management plan.

The National Park Service, in consultation with this Commission and other state agencies, began the preparation of a resource management plans for Gates of the Arctic National Park & Preserve, Denali National Park & Preserve, Kenai Fjords National Park, Bering Land Bridge National Preserve and Wrangell-St. Elias National Park & Preserve in 1990. Preliminary scoping work on similar management plans for the Noatak National Preserve, Kobuk Valley National Park and Cape Krusenstern National Monument is also scheduled to begin in early 1991. Commission staff will continue its involvement in this planning process in the coming year.

The U.S Forest Service is continuing its work on the revision of the Tongass Land Management Plan. Although a draft environmental impact statement was released for a lengthy public review in June, 1990, the passage of the Tongass Timber Reform Act means that extensive revisions to the original draft will be necessary. The act, which was passed by congress in October and signed into law in November, made a number of significant changes in both land status and management of the forest. These changes will be analyzed in a supplement to the environmental impact statement. Once the supplement is completed, an opportunity for public review and comment will be provided.

It is also anticipated that recommendations for additional wilderness designations for a number of national park units and national wildlife refuges will be submitted to Congress during the coming session. These recommendations are the result of the wilderness reviews mandated by ANILCA Section 1317 completed several years ago. The amount of acreage that may be recommended is not known at this time. With deliberations over the future of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge certain to occur in the near future, the Commission will continue to monitor the issue and offer its views.

On December 2, 1990, the Alaska Land Use Council, established by Section 1201 of ANILCA, was terminated after ten years of operation. This organization and its advisory body, the Land Use Advisors Committee, were important components in the implementation of ANILCA. While many people felt that the Alaska Land Use Council never realized its full potential, it did serve a valuable function by providing a forum for state, federal and Native land managers to formally discuss land management issues and work toward the resolution of conflicts between those managers. The Land Use Advisors Committee, as the public participation

element in the Council structure, did an excellent job of bringing the views of the public into the Council's deliberations.

This Commission strongly supported the work of the Alaska Land Use Council through the years and worked closely with them whenever possible. On a number of occasions, joint meetings were held with the Land Use Advisors Committee. We believe it is unfortunate that the Council was terminated and recommend that the Council, or a similar organization, be reauthorized by Congress and receive full support by the state. With the termination of the Council, this Commission remains the best available vehicle to monitor federal land management issues, keep the public and state agencies advised of those issues and to help protect the interests of the State of Alaska and its citizens.

In the coming year, the Commission will continue to advocate for maximum levels of public involvement in the planning process for all the federal agencies and for the protection of customary and traditional uses of the federal lands in Alaska. As competition for resources increases, cooperation between user groups will be critical to successful management of these areas. At the same time, the federal agencies must recognize the importance of citizen participation in the process and provide the opportunities for that participation. The Commission will strive to work toward these and other stated goals during 1991.

Sincerely,

Lew Williams, Jr., Chairman
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON FEDERAL AREAS



By: Stan Leaphart
Executive Director