## For Subsistence Hunting of Migratory Birds



## Why Is The Fish and Wildlife Service Proposing To Establish Regulations For Subsistence Hunting Of Migratory Birds?

The Fish and Wildlife Service proposes to establish subsistence hunting regulations in order to: I) establish a regulatory framework to govern subsistence hunting of migratory birds in Alaska; 2) allow residents of rural areas in Alaska to continue to hunt migratory birds in order to meet subsistence needs; and 3) provide a mechanism for controlling baryest as necessary to ensure the continued availability of these birds for the benefit of all people who use and enjoy them. The proposal is stimulated by a 1986 ruling by the U.S. District Court for Alaska. However, concern about subsistence hunting of migratory birds goes back well beyond 1986 and is best understood by knowing about some of the exents that occurred before the court decision. These exents are described below.

a pressional and the contract of the contract

In 1916, the Canadian Treaty was prompted by concern in both countries about declines or populations of migratory birds and lack of protection for these birds during the nesting season. The Canadian Treaty eliminated spring hunting, it generally probabits hunting between March 10 and September 1 when most birds are nesting. An exception is made for Indians to take scoters and Indians and Eskinios to take certain seabirds and their eggs for food, but hunting other waterlows and other migratory birds during spring and summer even for subsystence—is allegal under terms of the Canadian Treaty.

In 1925, Congress passed the Alaska Cambe Act. The Came Act gooded management of all hunting in the ferniory of Alaska until Alaska became a state. Among other things the Came Act allowed Alaskar Natives, prospectors and travelers to take tesh and widelite, including migratory birds, during closed seasons when they were in need of food and other sufficient food was not available. The provisions of the Came Act thus differ from those in the Canadian Treaty in regard to subsistence historing.

In 1936, the U.S. concluded a treaty with Mexico for conservation of migratory bods and other wildlife. The Mexican Insity does not mention subsestence hunting, but it specifically probabilistaking of ducks between March. 10 and September 1.

In 1959, when Alaska became a state, it was thought that the 1925 Alaska Game Act as it applied to migratory build hunting was repealed. In the absence of the Game Act it was believed that the provisions of the Gamathan Insaty, which made most hunting of viaterioid during spring and summer illegal, had to be followed. Subsistence bursters, who customards took migrators birds for Good during the closed season, were thoreby placed in the position of being unwilling stolators of the law. In an effort to resolve the problem, the Eish and Wildlide Service undertook a study of subsistence hunting. The study report recommended that actions be taken to better accommodate subsistence hunting to the 1960's were unsuccessful.

In the 1970's, the Fish and Wildlife Service undertook a renewed effort to establish a legal basis for subsistence bunting of impratory bird featies with Japan in 1972 and with the Societ Union in 1976 contained expanded provisions for subsistence hunting.

In 1978, the Congress passed the Enh and Wildlife Improvement Act. It authorized the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to described in the Soviet Treaty. In passing the Improvement Act, Congress expressed is intent that the provisions of the Soviet Treaty should be the standard for regulating

subsistence hunting of migratory lands. The subsistence hunting provisions of the Canadian and Soviet Treaties differ markedly, his order to resolve these differences an amendment to the Canadian beaty was proposed, and subsequently was descriped by the Ersh and Wildlife Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service.

representators of the Cented States and Canadian governments 79, the subsistence burding provisions of the Canadian Treaty the subsistence burding provisions of the Canadian Treaty In essence, the amendment provides that migratory birds may be taken for mitribional and other essential needs in accombine with seasons set by the tederal authorities in each country. For the Limited States, the authority is the Secretary of the Interior. The experital needs must be determined by the authorities in cach capitally and are seasons that may be set imporprised for the preservation and maintenance of the stocks of ringratory birds. The amendment contained in the projectal has not get been catilled by the United States Senate Decause of continuersy sweetness the amendment swould be applied. The mason for the controvers, is a concern that spring and summer fronting will not be adequately controlled and, it permitted, will have sexion, afterseeffects on populations of ringratory birds. It was agreed that the United States and Canada should address and poolse these concerns. Discussions continue with Canada to mach agreement on how each nation will apply the amendment. It is anticipated that the current public process to develop regulations sail gove further direction to Just subsocience Equating of migratory furth should be managed in Alaska.

In 1984, An agreement to manage grees that nest on the Yukon-Kuskokwin Delta was signed at Hooper Boy. Alaska Thoagreement was expanded in 1985 and called the YukonKuskokwin Delta Coose Management Plan. The 1984 agreement covered three species
of greese, all of which were known to have undergone severn declines. These species
were cacking Canada greese, Pacific Flywas white-fronted greese, and Pacific brant
in 1985 the emperor grosse was added. The purpose of the plan was to reduce baseest
of these greese throughout their ranges, to desclop better findogolal information to
improve management, and to focus attention on the need to protect habitat. The
plan was descloped cooperatisely by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Alaska Department of Fish and Came, the Association of Village Council Presidents, residents of
the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, the California Waterlow! Association and the Waterlow!
Habitat Owners Alliance, in 1984, this cooperatively developed plan was challenged
in court on the grounds that since it recognized and accepted some hunting during
the period between Main h. 10 and September 1, it violated the closed season required
by the Canadian Treaty.

In 1986, the U.S. District Court for Alaska roled that, until regulations are adopted under the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act. Alaska Natives may take migratory waterlowl under the Alaska Came Act when they or members of their family are in need of food and other softiment food is not available. This roling is currently under appeal.

Under the U.S. District Court ruling subsistence hunting is permitted, but only when there is a need for food and only when no other sufficient food is available. This is a strict standard and it is not known how much of the subsistence hunting that presently occurs would be valid under this standard. In addition, the Act does not provide an adequate basis for conservation of migratory birds. Taking can be prohibited only when a population of birds is in danger of extermination. Thus, the Game Act does not provide for management actions, such as restric-

tions on harvest, that would help prevent depletion of populations before they reached the danger point. In contrast, the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act specifically directs that the populations of migratory birds should be maintained, and provides greater flexibility to regulate the harvest of migratory birds for nutritional purposes. Given this situation, it seems advisable to follow the direction indicated by the court to establish regulations under the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978.