

LAKE CLARK

Q: In the Alaska Lands Act, we have a compromise that divides the "Lake Country" between park and preserve.

What does S. 49 do to this compromise?

A: Destroys it.

Q: With the exception of Lake Clark Pass, the administration changes all of the Park's high country and east side to preserve, leaving a west side park only.

Wont't non-hunters in the high country be almost totally deprived of a park wildlife experience during hunting season (August on) and be in conflict with sport hunters?

How can you justify such a wholesale butchering of one of the big 6 parks in Alaska?

Q: Where has subsistence hunting traditionally taken place in the park, if anywhere?

A: Around the upper lakeshore of Lake Clark, and in the Tanalian Mountain-lower Lake Kontashibuna area. Nearly all of the subsistence hunting takes place on the preserve and on private (Native) lands.

Q: Given the insignificant amount of subsistence hunting in the Park, can you use the "equity argument" to justify opening vast areas to sport hunting?

Q: Could you add the Native lands to the Committee map for us?

Q: You say in your statement that the administration's proposal would leave a 1.1 million acre park the size of Grand Canyon National Park.

Where would Lake Clark be on the list of Alaska parks in terms of size if the administration or S. 49 were to be adopted?

A: Only Kenai Fjords (567,000), Aniakchak (138,000), and Cape Krusenstern (560,000) would be smaller.