Lee Cerveny

Figure 21—Fishing pier in Hoonah, Alaska.

of the halibut fishery, because charter fishing guests were not restricted on the size of the halibut taken. Many worried that too many halibut were being harvested before they reached reproductive maturity, thus reducing the total capacity of the fishery. For these reasons, commercial fishers wanted the charter fleet to be considered a subset of commercial fishing by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. As one long-time Craig fisherman explained,

Growth in charter fishing led to competition for fish and crowding on the water.

> Charter fishing has grown. There is no limited entry for charter fishing. They are out-fishing their quotas–they are not staying within the limits. They are always overharvesting. Charter fishing is now considered by Fish and Game as "sportfishing." They are NOT sport. They are commercial. The charter guys are out there now catching kings. We have only 5 days for king.

The growth in charter fishing activity also raised concerns for local residents who watched the boxes of fish pile up at the local floatplane dock or airport to be sent home to the Lower 48 States with the charter fishing guest. Many Craig residents worried that if visitors were taking the fish, there would be none left for them. "Stand out there on the float dock any day, and you'll see 30 boxes of fish stacked up and hundreds of pounds of fish going off to Wisconsin and Texas. They are taking all our fish." The image of boxes stacked like miniature skyscrapers was

powerful in the minds of Craig residents. For most, the boxes signified a concern about the export of fish out of state and a worry that there would not be enough fish left for local consumption. The unstated assumption here was that locals were entitled to a fair share of Alaska's harvest.

The presence of the charter industry also brought up issues of economic inequality between visitors and residents. Many claimed that the supply of halibut close to Craig had been fished out in 2001, requiring residents to travel farther to harvest them. Some Craig residents resented the fact that guests could afford to fly in and catch halibut and salmon for 4 days, when they themselves could not afford the cost of gasoline for their boat or the extra time required to travel farther from port. In some cases, operators of small skiffs were hesitant to travel farther out toward the open ocean, where halibut stocks were perceived to be more plentiful, because of safety issues associated with their smaller craft. Thus, those unable to afford larger boats were less likely to harvest halibut, according to residents interviewed.

A concern shared by commercial fishers in Craig and Hoonah was the impact of charter fishing on the total number of boats on the water. Commercial fishermen, particularly troll captains, explained the implications of the growing size of the charter fleet on their fishing experience. Charter boats tended to cluster together where the fishing was good, and many used the presence of a commercial fishing boat to signal a prime fishing spot. As charter boats cluster, maneuverability becomes significantly reduced. Maneuverability presents a greater concern for the larger commercial vessels. One commercial captain told me that when the charter boats gathered around him, he would automatically leave, because it made it harder for him to operate the nets and move around. Other problems have occurred when inexperienced charter captains are on the water and are not aware of the rules for passing or come too close to the commercial nets.

> Basically they [charter boats] get in your way. There are 30 to 40 of them–in some cases too many. When you are by yourself, it's really difficult to watch what's going on. They are a pain…. You have the right of way–the shoreline is supposed to be on your right, if they are going south. The charter guys often are mooching. If they see you catching fish, they stop and fish nearby. I drag my nets on the edge against the shoreline.

Several fishermen told me stories about working their boats alone and loading fish in the hold, not paying close attention to the water, only to find that a small

cadre of charter boats had come precariously close to them and there was barely enough time to move. Safety was a major concern for many fishermen.

Effects on customary and traditional uses—A third issue relevant in all three communities, but particularly topical in Hoonah, was the concern that tourism could adversely affect resources used for customary and traditional uses (subsistence). These topics were especially relevant because of the discoveries about cruise ship air emissions and wastewater effluent and the conviction in 1999 of Royal Caribbean International for illegally dumping toxins into Alaska waters. Two primary concerns dominated discussions related to tourism effects on subsistence use: the effect of cruise ships on the quality of fish, shellfish, kelp, plants, and game, and the impact of growing commercial recreation on access to subsistence resources.

Because of their proximity to popular cruise ship routes, Hoonah and Haines residents worried about the effects of cruise ships on wildlife and subsistence. Haines Natives wondered about the quality of their beach resources collected along Lynn Canal, whereas Hoonah families were concerned about shellfish, kelp, and other beach resources harvested along Icy Strait. An advocate of subsistence use in Haines talked about his harvest patterns in Lynn Canal.

> I steered clear from seaweed picking there for a couple of years. Now I go back there again. Most of the salmon I get is from the Chilkat side (90 percent). I have sent samples of the salmon to Fish and Game recently because some of the fish have warts. They said it wasn't cancer.

Hoonah residents also worried about the effects of underwater emissions from cruise ships on area wildlife and subsistence resources. One Huna elder was concerned about the impact of gray water on Point Adolphus, which had long been a hotspot for fishing. According to this clan leader, deer travel to Point Adophus in the winter for kelp. "You can't tell me that kelp is not contaminated. I wonder what else has been affected? I have no problem with people [tourists] in town. This subsistence lifestyle has gone to pot." Another resident was extremely worried about the discharges from cruise ships and effects on seaweed in popular harvest areas like Couverdon and Spasski Island. In 2001, tougher standards for wastewater treatment were introduced and the state was given authority to monitor wastewater quality in hopes that the industry would become cleaner over time.

Several residents interviewed wondered in general about the long-term effects of smog from cruise ships. One Huna Tlingit clan elder had observed specific

changes in goat behavior over many years. On one trip to Glacier Bay, he observed a dead mountain goat in the water.

> The cruise ships are affecting the mountain goat population. When the cruise ships add speed to the engine, it gives out a black smoke. When there is no wind, the black smoke just sits there and it contaminates the mountain goats' food. It's from that unused oil. There is one place we used to use for a fishing area. There used to be a lot of mountain goats there. Now there are no more goats.

Residents of all three communities were concerned that tourism activities would limit access to subsistence resources. A subsistence fisherman from Haines said it was getting more difficult to find a place to put his subsistence net in the water because the best spots along the Chilkat and Klehini Rivers were being used by tour groups for loading passengers. However, he acknowledged that he was more concerned about the effects of development than tourism on subsistence access. Many of the prime locations for berry picking, bark gathering, and hunting had been privatized, and access to local subsistence users was restricted. As state and Native corporation lands are sold to private landholders, access to prime harvest areas is likely to be reduced further.

As noted earlier, Craig residents wondered about the future of the halibut fishery. Local sport and subsistence users claimed that they were traveling farther from home to catch halibut, which meant they were spending more money on fuel and exerting more effort to harvest the same amount of fish.

> There used to be halibut on the inside waters, but now you can't find any.… It used to be that it would take 1 to 2 hours to get halibut. Now it takes all day. You have to go way out sometimes. Sometimes you don't get anything. It used to be that behind Fish Egg Island was good. Now there is nothing there.

Some had decided to forgo halibut and fish instead for salmon or freshwater species. Craig residents also observed a trend in the charter industry toward increased freshwater fishing, which was affecting local subsistence uses of area lakes and streams. "They keep following us around," one local subsistence user quipped.

Residents also worried about the growing frequency of encounters between subsistence users and tour operators. Hoonah interviewees described encounters with tour groups in places like Mud Bay—a prime site for salmon fishing and duck hunting, and a popular destination for fly-in fishermen from Juneau and adventure

tours from Gustavus. Hoonah fishermen were challenged by the growing popularity of Point Adolphus among charter fishermen, whale watchers, and adventure tours. Closer to home, subsistence users clashed with nonlocal charter operators in remote areas of Port Frederick, which formerly were used by a handful of local subsistence and sport fishers. Although it was not an issue at present, many Hoonah families observed the increased use of areas close to Hoonah by nonlocal tour operators, and considered the growing prospect that their clan's special places for harvesting berries, seaweed, cockles, or fish also could become popular tourist stops. Residents often cited an incident in 2000 when a local subsistence fishermen and his family encountered a tour operator in Port Frederick. A verbal conflict reportedly ensued when the fishing guide declared entitlement to fish in that area. Clearly, the quality of fish and game in Alaska is important to residents, and the increased use of culturally significant areas by tourists has implications for communities.

The Icy Strait Point development in 2004 expanded the influence of visitors from national forest lands to Native corporation holdings used by shareholders for subsistence purposes. Bear-viewing platforms were built on Native corporation land in an area known as Spasski Creek, a popular area for fishing, hunting, and gathering of berries and forest foods by Hoonah residents. Whereas shareholders historically were permitted to use these areas for subsistence, they were actively discouraged from visiting once the bear platforms were built and land tours were developed. Some continued to use the area, although stories of corporation employees asking local subsistence users to leave were circulating throughout the community. Although the corporation's policy toward local use of that area remained unclear in 2004, it had emerged as an issue early on in the history of Icy Strait Point. As visitor use of corporation lands increases beyond 2004, this issue likely will resurface.

Tlingit residents of Hoonah were particularly concerned about the loss of Glacier Bay National Park as an area for subsistence and cultural use.

Tlingit residents of Hoonah were particularly concerned about the loss of Glacier Bay National Park as an area for subsistence and cultural use. The increase in visitor use of the park and the coinciding exclusion of commercial and subsistence activities crucial to the local economy, as well as the cultural integrity of the community, were particularly disconcerting for residents. When I asked residents how tourism affected them, many simply told me to look at the case of Glacier Bay. "That's the biggest impact right there" said one elder. The important role of Glacier Bay history to the Huna was made clear to me by another elder, who stated,

> Hoonah used to be Glacier Bay. The feds took it away. They took our food—our strawberries, our seal, our goat, and our seagull. They stopped us from trapping. We should have subsistence in Glacier Bay. We're not going to rape the country.

Another community leader echoed these sentiments,

> We lost Glacier Bay. That's one of the impacts of tourism. They have taken our rights away from Glacier Bay. Kayakers are everywhere. They get off their boats, but I can't even get off my own boat. I'm not allowed. That's not right. I hope you agree with me.

Many feared that what happened in Glacier Bay could be repeated in other federally owned lands, such as the Tongass National Forest. As one city official explained,

> I have a fear of being locked out of federal lands. When the Park Service people came, they promised that we would be allowed to continue seal hunting, berry picking, bear hunting—to keep our lifestyle that had always been there. But not any more—that's all gone.

Although Glacier Bay National Park was established for preservation of an important natural and geological area, and not strictly for tourism purposes, in the minds of many Hoonah residents, the area was taken away from them and their user rights were removed, whereas visitor use of the park was encouraged. The loss of Glacier Bay was significant from the standpoint of local resource use, but it also had long-reaching economic and cultural implications as well. In recent years, park officials have allowed limited harvest of subsistence foods, including seagull eggs and strawberries, indicating a willingness to work with the Huna people to restore some level of subsistence use (Hunn et al. 2003).

Community comparisons—The effects of tourism expansion on local patterns of resource use were experienced differently in each of the three study communities (table 16). For Haines, the movement of adventure tours into more remote recreation areas caused conflicts with local recreation users, many of whom valued their recreation habits as an important part of their reason for living in Alaska. In Craig, the issues centered around fish. Commercial fishers, charter guides, and subsistence fishers were competing for the same finite resources. This issue also was important in Hoonah, although to a lesser degree. There, residents worried most about ongoing access to subsistence resources in their historical harvest areas, including Glacier Bay.

Ethnographic data in these study sites show that stakeholder groups have different relations to resources and the environment. Thus, expansion in the tourist industry affected these groups differently. Local recreation users in Haines had to share some of their favorite recreation sites with both independent and guided

Table 16—Summary of resource effects mentioned by residents

Effect	Haines	Craig	Hoonah
Local recreation patterns	XX		X
Commercial fishing		XX	X
Subsistence resources	X	X	X

Levels were assigned by the author. "X" denotes that the item was mentioned by several interviewees (3 to 9) as being somewhat important. "XX" denotes that the item was mentioned by 10 or more interviewees.

visitor groups. As recreation sites became transformed by the presence of the tourism industry, locals worried about the fate of other valued natural areas. Commercial fishermen throughout southeast Alaska have had to share a larger portion of the total allocation with the expanding charter fleet.[20] Subsistence fishermen have watched their historical harvest sites become clogged with tourist activity. In some cases, locals were traveling farther from home to catch fish as close-in areas were perceived to be diminished compared to previous years. Interviews also revealed user conflicts among tourism businesses of different sizes and those engaged in different types of activities. In the Hoonah area, kayak groups were encountering jet boat tours and small cruise ships in rural bays used for wildlife viewing. These findings suggest that management and policy decisions related to tourism should weigh the different impacts among various groups to appreciate the comprehensive effects of tourism.

Discussion

Tourism led to new jobs and businesses, which circulated tourism dollars throughout the economy. Tourism offered opportunities for social interaction, exposure to new ideas and skills, community pride, enhanced cultural identity, and added recreational venues. Tourism also occurred along with certain tradeoffs. Some argued that tourism's economic benefits were muted because of the industry's tendency

[20] King salmon are managed under a quota system from the 1999 U.S.-Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty for wild salmon. Each year, a scientific panel estimates the abundance of wild king salmon. Once a figure is established, 10 percent is allotted to commercial gillnet fishermen and seine boats, 20 percent is awarded to sportfishers, including charter boats, and the remaining 70 percent to commercial troll fishermen. In recent years, sport anglers have greatly exceeded harvest levels–cutting into the commercial catch. In 2001, sport anglers (including charter boats) were allocated 42,000 king salmon but harvested 72,000. The additional 30,000 salmon represented an estimated loss of $900,000 (Juneau Empire 2003).

toward part-time, seasonal, and low-paying jobs, the importation of labor and supplies from outside southeast Alaska, and a growing trend toward nonlocal business ownership. Others pointed to changes in the sociocultural fabric of communities resulting from tourism, including the challenges of interacting with visitors, the growing influence of tourism professionals in community life, the increase in social tension among tourism proponents and critics, and the changing character of Alaska communities. Moreover, tourism altered local patterns of resource use, including recreation, commercial fishing, and subsistence use.

Sustainability—Resident perceptions of the economic, sociocultural, and resource effects of tourism are bases for evaluating the long-term sustainability of the industry. Sustainable tourism development seeks to maximize the quality of tourist experiences in a locality while at the same time preserving natural and cultural resources for the future and promoting the economic well-being of residents, including equity in the distribution of costs and benefits (McCool and Moisey 2001). If residents of host communities perceive that the social and economic costs of tourism exceed the benefits, long-term sustainability of the industry is at risk (Briassoulis 2002). Moreover, an examination of resident perceptions of tourism benefits and costs reveals important information about what rural southeast Alaskans value most about their lifestyle: small and safe communities, integrity of cultural systems, the health of natural resource systems, and continued access to resources. By comparing and contrasting tourism effects among these communities, important observations may be made that associate different forms of tourism with unique sets of challenges and opportunities.

Sustainable tourism development seeks to maximize the quality of tourist experiences in a locality while at the same time preserving natural and cultural resources for the future and promoting the economic well-being of residents, including equity in the distribution of costs and benefits.

Tourist volume was largest in Haines, and cruise ships were the most dominant form of tourist activity. The resulting benefits to the Haines economy included jobs, new business activity, and tax revenues. Because of the nature of tourism employment, most residents agreed that the greatest economic benefits were shared by a relatively small number of tourism providers. During the peak of cruise visitation in 2000, Haines experienced challenges associated with this tourism growth, the most significant being congestion and crowding in areas of town and popular recreation areas, noise effects, commercialization, and the transformation of natural areas into arenas of tourist activity. Visitor impacts also were spread geographically throughout the community, affecting the daily activities and decisions of residents from a wide range of backgrounds. Because of the dispersed nature of tourism activity in Haines, tourism effects were experienced by more residents and to a

greater degree than in other communities. Interviews with Haines residents suggested that visitor volumes had exceeded local capacity in 2000. Although the economic benefits were widely recognized, they did not exceed the costs of tourism to sociocultural life and resource use in the minds of most residents. This imbalance, if perpetuated, would suggest that the pace of tourism growth experienced until 2000 would exceed the level sustainable in Haines. When cruise visitation to Haines declined in 2001 and thereafter, this no longer was a pressing issue.

Craig hosted a modest number of visitors, with most associated with charter fishing lodges. Most Craig visitors stayed in fishing lodges or local bed and breakfast establishments and engaged in packaged fishing excursions. From the standpoint of residents, the economic benefits of tourism were concentrated in lodgeowners and businesses directly serving fishing guests. Overall economic benefits to the community were not widely recognized because it was perceived that the lodges captured most visitor spending. However, because visitors to Craig spent much of their time in the lodges, the sociocultural impacts of tourism in Craig were minimal. However, Craig residents spoke openly about their hopes and concerns for future tourism growth and the possible changes to their community. In particular, tourism stakeholders were concerned about the effect of charter fishing on the commercial fishing fleet and the health of the fishery. Craig tourism had not exceeded sustainable levels, owing to its modest volume and minimal sociocultural effects; however, many residents suggested that prolonged growth of the charter fishing fleet would lead to resource degradation. Because many stakeholders did not perceive that fishing lodges contributed significantly to the local economy, the future impacts of charter fishing on the health of the resource overshadowed economic benefits.

The costs and benefits of tourism were not equally distributed within the communities.

In Hoonah, the volume of visitors was rather modest during the primary field research in 2001. Although visitor volume was lower than in Craig, the effects of existing tourism on daily life were mentioned with greater frequency. In particular, Hoonah residents emphasized their discomfort in interacting with strangers. Hoonah residents also stressed the need for a strategy to deal with cultural resources and manage clan relations with regard to tourism. Tourism effects were apparent on lands and waterways outside Hoonah, including Glacier Bay National Park, Icy Strait, and adjacent waterways. With the arrival of cruise ships in 2004, visitors numbered more than 65,000. Residents frequently interacted with visitors who had came to town as part of guided tours or with individual itineraries. Residents also described encounters with guided tour groups on Native corporation lands. Although tourism had grown quickly, careful planning by the Point Sophia Development

Company had minimized the impacts of cruise-based tourism on the community. Residents perceived minimal costs compared to the benefits to the local economy or cultural life of the community, and resource use was thus far minimal. If the economic benefits are widely dispersed throughout the community, residents will likely consider the tourism project beneficial, particularly if perceived negative sociocultural effects are minimized.

Distribution of tourism effects among stakeholders—The associated costs and benefits of tourism were not equally distributed within the communities (Young 1999). Tourism resulted in direct and indirect economic benefits for some groups, whereas others experienced unwanted changes in their livelihoods or lifestyles. Stakeholder analysis was used to identify those most affected by the growth of tourism (Ramirez 1999).

In Haines, the relatively high volume of visitors in 2000 meant that the impacts were felt by a broader range of community residents. Although tourism providers and business owners benefited from the presence of the industry, residents of heavily impacted areas, tribal organizations, local recreation users, and members of the environmental community experienced the brunt of tourism's effects (table 17). The Alaska Department of Natural Resources, which managed many of the public lands in the Haines area, faced an increase in permit activity from commercial tourism providers, with no clear guidelines to regulate volume of use and reduced capacity to monitor resource effects. Tourism growth exacerbated existing social conflicts among key community stakeholders, especially between environmental organizations eager to limit tourist volume and those in favor of natural resource-based industry. In addition, tourism growth created new cleavages between types of tourism providers (e.g., cruise-based versus independent tourism providers), between seasonal workers and year-round residents, and among the tourism industry and local resource users and environmentalists.

The need to mitigate some of the issues associated with tourism in Haines resulted in several public processes and social movements involving key stakeholders. The city initiated a tourism planning committee to deal with issues of transportation, aggressive business practices, and noise. Several members of industry and citizen groups appeared on this committee. A multistakeholder planning process was initiated in 2000 for the Chilkoot corridor area to deal with the effects of visitor traffic from tours and independent visitors. This planning effort involved numerous local stakeholders, including neighborhood residents, tourism providers, environmental organizations, business interests, and tribal officials. Grassroots

Table 17—Distribution of tourism effects, by stakeholders: Haines

Group	How affected
Business owners	Economic benefits from direct and indirect tourist spending
Tourism providers	Promoting sustainable growth of the tourism industry Direct economic gains from tourism Ongoing concern for quality of tourism products in Haines Some conflicts among competing tourism providers
Environmental organizations	Concern about quality and integrity of habitat for wildlife (bears, eagles, etc.) Concern about the loss of remote recreation areas and wild lands Focus on pollution issues associated with cruise lines Focus on noise effects of airplanes traveling over remote neighborhoods
Chilkoot Indian Assoc.	Tribal members benefited from tourism employment Resource impacts on Chilkoot historical and sacred sites
Local recreation users	As ship volume increased, recreation users shared favorite places with visitors Local recreation users adapted by shifting use to less populated areas or timing their visits to avoid cruise visitors Concern about the change in landscape at Glacier Point and the potential loss of remote recreation sites
Subsistence users	Concern about ongoing access to subsistence areas on Chilkat and Chilkoot Rivers Focus on integrity of subsistence resources after cruise ship dumping
Alaska Department of Natural Resources	Management pressure on heavily used recreation areas Public pressure to restrict tourism providers using state lands Lack of regulatory mechanism to manage growing commercial use
City and Borough of Haines	Economic benefits in the form of tax revenues and docking fees Impacts on city infrastructure: sidewalks, roads, waste, sewage, water Expanded need for public restrooms and other facilities Created demand for transportation and tourism planning
Neighborhoods	Downtown and Fort Seward residents saw the largest flow of visitors to and from the dock Lutak residents felt tourism pressure and congestion in the Chilkoot area Chilkat Peninsula (Mud Bay) residents were impacted by noise effects from overhead flights

efforts to manage tourism growth also resulted. Environmental organizations clashed with a tour operator over noise issues and the effects of large-scale commercial tourism at Glacier Point resulting in a series of protests and legal actions in 2000 and 2001.

The story in Craig was similar, although the distinction between those who benefited and those who did not was not as obvious. The business community, in general, and the tourism industry, in particular, benefited economically from the presence of tourism to some degree. Meanwhile, commercial, subsistence, and

Table 18—Distribution of tourism effects, by stakeholders: Craig

Group	How affected
Business owners	Modest economic benefits from spending by visitors and tourism providers
Tourism providers (including lodgeowners and charter operators)	Direct economic benefits from visitors engaged in charter fishing and other forms of tourist activity Some user conflicts among tourism providers of different scale and type (e.g., larger lodges and smaller charter operators)
Commercial fishermen	Change in allocation reduces total amount available for commercial catch Competition on the water for space and in harbor for berths Concern about the shift in lifestyle away from commercial fishing
Craig Community Association	Supported tourism that generates work for Native artists and employment for all tribal members Concern about effects of charter fishing on subsistence Focus on protecting cultural resources and cultural property
Sport and subsistence users	Compete for halibut and salmon with charter lodges Some travel farther for halibut or have switched to other species Shift to freshwater fishing in response to growing charter activity
Tongass National Forest Craig Ranger District	Increased management pressure on public resources shared with other user groups
City of Craig	Tax benefits from sales tax Increased pressure on city dock and harbors Some effects on infrastructure (roads, utilities, services)
Neighborhoods	Residents located near the boat harbor, floatplane dock, and fishing lodges saw increased visitor activity (e.g., Port Saint Nicholas)

local sportfishers competed with the charter fleet for total allocation and for access to fishing areas and dock space. Competition had expanded from saltwater to freshwater venues as lodges and charter guides expanded into freshwater fishing. Tension arose in the community owing to perceived lifestyle differences between commercial fishermen and charter guides. The Forest Service experienced an increase in commercial use of the Tongass National Forest for commercial recreation activity and witnessed an increase in user conflicts between local users and commercial groups. Table 18 details the distribution of tourism effects in Craig.

Because tourism levels in Hoonah were modest in 2001, impacts were not as significant as in Haines or Craig, with the exception of Glacier Bay National Park. Residents living downtown were more likely to interact with visitors than those residing in other parts of the community. Increased visitor activity in remote areas of Port Frederick, Point Adolphus, and Mud Bay meant greater opportunities for user conflicts among local hunters and fishermen and among various types of

Table 19—Distribution of tourism effects, by stakeholders: Hoonah

Group	How affected
Business owners and local tourism providers	Local tour operators with vendor contracts at Point Sophia gain direct economic benefits from cruise ships Downtown businesses develop strategies to attract visitors away from the cannery to increase local economic benefits
Huna Totem Corp.	Potential benefits from presence of visitors Employment and dividends for Huna Totem shareholders
Hoonah Indian Assoc.	Tribal members employed by Point Sophia development Concern about protecting cultural resources Tribal members affected by increasing use of remote subsistence areas by nonlocal tourism providers
Nonlocal tourism providers	Based out of Juneau, Gustavus, Elfin Cove, and other Icy Strait communities, guides benefited from the sale of tours taking place in the Hoonah area
Subsistence users	Greater potential for interactions with tourism providers in subsistence harvest areas, especially with development of cannery project Bear-viewing center at Spasski Creek limits subsistence activity during cruise ship visits
Elders	Concerned about the effects of tourism on community life and cultural resources Concern about change in community character and loss of control to outsiders
Tongass National Forest Hoonah Ranger District	Increased management pressure on public resources shared with other user groups Increased visitor activity in forest related to Point Sophia cannery project
City of Hoonah	Need for improved infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic: roads, sidewalks, restroom facilities, signs, visitor services, waste, sewage, and health care Cannery project suggests need for transportation and overall tourism planning
Neighborhoods	Residents of downtown Hoonah saw an increased flow in visitor traffic

tourism providers. These effects are detailed in table 19. The Forest Service was able to regulate use in high-intensity areas to some degree through the distribution of permits.

The development at Icy Strait Point suggests the potential for new effects on the economy, community resources, and public and private lands. The project provided part-time jobs and business opportunities for community residents and a market for local artists. Retail shops and tourism-related businesses located outside the cannery development sought ways to increase economic benefits from tourism.

Those living downtown saw an increase in visitor traffic during cruise ship stops, with a few dozen visitors coming to town from the cannery by foot or bus. Transportation planning will likely minimize impacts to downtown residents. Resource planning may help to avoid user conflicts on public and private lands used for hunting, fishing, and subsistence activities.

In each site, business owners and tourism providers stood to gain from tourism. Those relying on access to natural resources for their livelihood, personal consumption, or recreation experienced some degree of changes in their patterns of use as a result of tourist activity. Tribal organizations faced difficult questions about the best way to manage cultural property owned by the clans. Municipalities benefited from the presence of the tourism industry but also experienced pressure on existing infrastructure and services to accommodate an increase in visitors. State and federal resource managers also saw an increase in commercial recreation activity and in user conflicts between various recreation users. In addition, each community had neighborhoods where tourism impacts were perceived to be greater, owing to the concentration of visitors or a sudden increase in visitor activity, p a rticularly in rural areas.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Section 6: Key Findings and Management Considerations

The use of ethnographic research methods and extended residence within the study communities enabled the researcher to gain insight into the experience of Alaska residents engaged with tourism. Identifying stakeholders involved in tourism development and analyzing the effects of tourism development on social groups has led to a more complex picture of tourism-community relations in rural southeast Alaska communities.

Southeast Alaska's abundant wildlife, prevalence of scenic resources, and the unique cultural and social history draw tourists to the "Last Frontier." Effective marketing by the cruise lines will likely continue to attract visitors to Alaska for many years. Tourism leads to expansion of jobs, businesses, and income to communities and is one of the only industries in Alaska to show consistent growth in the last 10 years. Southeast Alaskans recognize the potential for tourism to build or bolster the local economy. Many community leaders look to tourism as a salvation for the community–keeping families fed and allowing young people to continue living and working in Alaska. Thus, in spite of its many tradeoffs, southeast Alaska officials still consider tourism an important option for economic growth.

As communities embrace tourism to various degrees, changes occur to the economic, social, and cultural fabric of community life. Visitors bring to Alaska different ideas, tastes, and interests, to which the tourism industry must respond. Tourism workers bring new values to the community and create new opportunities for social interaction. Moreover, tourism can transform the look and feel of communities, changing the way people think about and relate to places they call home. The influx of visitors and the tourism workers who may introduce new values and behaviors may cause some Alaskans to wonder about their own identity and lifestyle choices. Thus, it is important to consider how tourism can occur while preserving the lifestyle choices of Alaskans and allowing residents to live beyond the tourist gaze.

Tourism also affects the way locals use and perceive their natural environment and resources. As tourist volume expands, opportunities for encounters between hosts and guests increase. As tourism providers enter the market and compete for resources, they develop new activities and locations to entertain visitors. Expansion of the geographic domain of tourism often means that locals must share their special areas with visitors. Tourism also causes Alaskans to think about the natural resources they value. Access to fish and game and the proximity of wild lands and wilderness areas are important features to most Alaskans (Cuba 1987, Haycox

2002). Yet, these same resources also are commodities for consumption by visitors. When people come to Alaska, they expect to take something home, be it a box of fish, a picture of a bear, or a memory of a kayak trip. When these products are exported to nonlocals, issues of entitlement arise. As resources become scarce, competition and user conflicts may intensify (Briassoulis 2002).

Communities respond differently to different types and levels of tourism.

This study also illustrates that tourism can assume many forms within a geographic region. Consequently communities respond differently to different types and levels of tourism. In Haines, which predominantly catered to cruise ships, a high volume of visitors resulted, along with significant employment and business growth. As the community became more invested in cruise-based tourism, the economy, to a greater extent, became dependent on this source of revenue. In Craig, where tourism was largely rooted in charter fishing, the economic and social effects of tourism were minimal; however, tourism did result in conflicts over resource use when changes in the quality and quantity of fish resources were observed. In Hoonah, visitor interactions elicited concerns about privacy and safety. The need to protect cultural resources and traditions, as well as ongoing access to customary and traditional resource use, was considered paramount, especially amidst efforts to jump-start the tourism industry by the Native corporation. Southeast communities share many similarities when it comes to tourism. The experiences of one community may help another as each attempts to develop a form of tourism that maximizes community well-being. Southeast Alaska residents have stated their desire to have more control over the shape and flavor of tourism development. Local involvement in the process of tourism development may help to shape how these changes occur.

Tourism Development and Economic Effects

Several key findings emerged from the analysis of tourism in rural Alaska communities. Based on the study of Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, several conclusions may be drawn:

1. Community location is crucial in delineating options for tourism development. Communities located along principal cruise ship corridors have the option of developing their public or private facilities and attracting cruise ships through tax incentives, subsidized fees, and marketing. Communities in more remote locales may develop specialized tourism niches, such as fishing, nature-based tourism, or cultural tourism, to attract guests.

2. Local governments play various roles in tourism growth. In Haines, an alliance between business and local government to improve local infrastructure and visitor

services attracted the interest of cruise lines. In Craig, tourism growth occurred in a laissez-faire fashion, with minimal public involvement. Hoonah government officials helped facilitate dialog about tourism and improve local infrastructure. In each case, local governments became involved in tourism after recognizing that other industries were declining.

3. Investment in tourism by Native corporations altered the scale and pace of tourism development in rural southeast Alaska communities. In each study site, village corporations had invested significant capital resources in developing tourism ventures and improving local infrastructure. These developments generally were met with enthusiasm by shareholders eager for jobs. Access to land and capital made these tourism subsidiaries formidable competitors for existing tourism providers.

Investment in tourism by Native corporations altered the scale and pace of tourism development in rural southeast Alaska communities.

4. Tourism corporations have played a critical role in sparking local tourism development. The decision of cruise corporations to dock in Haines changed the dynamics of the local tourism industry and reshaped the local economy. An alliance between local tourism providers and cruise lines was crucial in expanding visitor volume. In Craig, a corporate partnership resulted in the creation of Waterfall Resort, establishing Craig as a hub for charter fishing. In 2001, several corporate-owned lodges competed with local businesses for charter guests. In Hoonah, an alliance between a Native corporation, a nonlocal tourism provider, and a major cruise line sparked a large-scale tourism enterprise. Without this corporate investment, tourism would likely continue at a low volume. In each case, corporate players played a dramatic role in shaping local tourism through their investment, with little or no involvement of local stakeholders.

5. In addition to these larger corporate entities, southeast Alaska's tourism industry was characterized by numerous small-business enterprises with a horizontal management structure, consisting of a small set of principals and a larger workforce of front-line employees. Because of this structure, vertical mobility was limited. Tourism workers eager to advance in tourism did so by branching off to start their own businesses. In both Haines and Craig, established tourism providers helped former employees develop their own niche of products and services.

6. Tourism was a source of income for local workers, creating opportunities for workers displaced by losses in other industries. In each study site, there was evidence that some former timber-industry employees, or their family members, had made the transition to tourism as owners or workers. As visitor volume expanded,

communities also saw an influx of nonresident workers and seasonal business owners. In all three sites, seasonal business owners and workers who lived outside the community in the off-season participated significantly in the industry. Statewide, one out of four jobs in the leisure and hospitality industry went to nonresident workers in 2002 (Hadland 2004). Before 2004, tourism enterprises in Hoonah were locally owned and staffed, with the exception of a few seasonal charter guides. After the Icy Strait Point development, some workers and entrepreneurs were imported from outside Hoonah. Commercial fishermen also were involved in tourism, mostly as fishing guides, as a means to supplement their income and hedge against future lulls in commercial fishing.

7. Tourism growth in rural southeast Alaska communities occurred without significant involvement from public resource agencies at the state or federal level. The expansion of cruise ship itineraries, the increase in cruise ship capacity, the construction of lodges, resorts, and facilities on private lands, and the increase in charter fishing operators all occurred without significant regulation from any public agency. The heterogeneous nature of tourism, namely its ability to assume many forms and to evolve quickly, along with the problem of overlapping political jurisdictions makes managing the industry a challenge.

8. The potential economic benefits of tourism were acknowledged in each study site, particularly the capacity for tourism to contribute to the employment base. In communities with more visitors, residents were more likely to observe additional benefits, such as business growth, contributions to the city tax base, and the secondary effects of visitor spending.

Sociocultural Effects

Respondents also linked the tourism industry with changes in community character. A comparison of tourism's sociocultural effects within the study communities reveals several important trends.

1. The sociocultural impacts of tourism differed at each site. In Haines, where visitor volume was highest in 2000, residents described a wide variety of changes associated with tourism, most notably: congestion in town, the quickened pace of life, growing commercialism, and social frictions among key stakeholders. Craig residents did not comment extensively on the sociocultural effects of tourism, possibly owing to having only limited interaction with visitors. Although tourist volume was modest in Hoonah in 2001, the sociocultural effects observed were more

pronounced, because of the compact nature of downtown and because of local attitudes toward strangers. By the end of the 2004 season, Hoonah respondents had become accustomed to the presence of cruise ship visitors in their community.

2. Residents of host communities typically perceived the seasonal tourism work force as a separate subpopulation of the community. Often they were assumed to have different values, habits, priorities, and levels of commitment to the community than other residents. In the case of Craig, this group of tourism workers (fishing guides) was considered to be somewhat alien to the existing culture of commercial fishermen.

3. Tribal officials in each community stressed the importance of protecting cultural resources and traditions from exploitation by outsiders. In addition, there was shared concern that local tourism providers would seek to benefit economically from cultural tourism without compensating the tribe or local clans who owned the material. In Hoonah and Craig, tribal officials had begun discussing the issue of interpreting cultural information for visitors.

4. Tourism impacted some neighborhoods more than others. In Haines, tourism providers had expanded into new geographic areas to avoid other tour groups and to offer guests a diversity of venues. This dispersal of tourism meant that more residents were seeing and interacting with visitors near their homes and places of recreation. The increasing frequency of these interactions took a toll on residents, who found fewer places and times to avoid visitors. Hoonah downtown residents also were more likely to describe visitor encounters. Residents of neighborhoods that received tourist visits were more likely to note problems associated with tourism during interviews.

5. Vocal groups in each study site raised important issues about the effects of tourism and the need to protect important community attributes. In Haines, citizens organized against the development at Glacier Point and the rapid growth of cruise-based tourism in general. In Craig, fishermen warned about the implications of an uncontrolled charter fleet. In Hoonah, clan elders cautioned tourism officials about the need to protect cultural resources and community life. The reactions of various stakeholders to tourism shaped the nature and pace of tourism growth.

6. In all three communities, local governments were involved in planning for future tourism. In Haines, where visitor impacts were most often vocalized, a city planning committee was established to manage tourism effects. Craig municipal officials were involved in island-wide tourism development and planning efforts.

Hoonah city leaders focused on infrastructure development, such as ferries, boat harbors, docks, parks, and streets.

Resource Effects

The rapid increase of cruise visitors to southeast Alaska combined with the emphasis on nature-based tours has had implications for the management of public resources. The large number of visitors has resulted in a subsequent increase in the frequency and intensity of use of popular natural areas with special scenic qualities or wildlife viewing opportunities. Moreover, tourism providers have expanded into new sites to provide visitors with a unique Alaska experience that is different from that of their competitors and that avoids contact with other tour groups. And, tour operators are relying on new transportation options to enable them to access previously remote areas. All these trends affect the way southeast Alaskans interact with these same resources. Several themes emerged in the analysis of effects of tourism on resource use.

1. The emphasis on consumptive tourism (hunting and fishing) caused some residents of the study communities, particularly Craig and Hoonah, to worry about long-term resource sustainability. The rapid growth in charter fishing activity was a concern for those residents who relied on fish for their livelihood or personal consumption. The increase in charter activity had caused some local fishermen to modify their harvest patterns—relying on different salmon species or freshwater species, or moving to different fishing grounds. These shifts evoked local conversations about entitlement to Alaska's resources and the desire for local protections.

2. The expansion of tourist activity into more remote areas meant that Alaskans using these areas for subsistence harvest had to share these spaces with visitors. Although tourism had not impeded access to subsistence resources to a great extent, some active subsistence users wondered about the quality and integrity of these resources, given cruise ship pollution. In each of the study sites, subsistence users reported moving to new harvest sites to avoid visitor contact. Because subsistence is viewed as both an economic and a cultural practice, any significant changes in subsistence patterns related to tourism would likely be hotly debated.

3. Tourism resulted in shifted patterns of local recreation use, particularly in Haines and Hoonah. In particular, those who had moved to Alaska for its recreational opportunities and immediate access to undeveloped areas did not always appreciate sharing those spaces with tour groups. Residents frequently reported that they had curbed their use of some high-volume areas and shifted to less desirable sites to

avoid visitor contact. Those who continued to use these high-volume areas reported a diminished experience.

4. The development of tourism facilities in remote areas resulted in the perceived loss of natural spaces and the encroachment of civilization into the natural realm for some southeast Alaskans. For those who reside in Alaska in part because of the predominance of undeveloped spaces, these developments were perceived as disruptive to their desired quality of life. Moreover, some residents resented the packaging, marketing, and sale of "developed wilderness" to visitors. Glacier Point epitomized this issue: once a local kayak destination, picnic spot, and a goat-hunting ground, now it is a "wilderness safari" sold to cruise ship guests. In Hoonah, Glacier Bay, an area once used for harvest of seals, strawberries, and seagull eggs, was marketed by tourism providers to visitors worldwide as a natural wonder. The imposition of the tourist landscape, with an entirely new set of definitions and activities, onto these natural areas sometimes conflicted with use and perception of these spaces by local residents.

The heterogeneous nature of tourism makes the industry more difficult to manage than previous resource-based industries, such as timber, and requires new tools and expertise.

5. The proliferation of tourism providers throughout the region resulted in user conflicts (a) among tour operators with different group sizes, (b) among tour operators engaged in different types of activities (e.g., whale watching, fishing, bear hunting), and (c) among operators using different means of transportation (e.g., small cruise ships, kayaks, jet boats). These conflicts were observed by residents and resource managers in all three study sites. Public resource managers have stepped in to diminish conflicts by scheduling user activities in popular areas and encouraging dialogue among providers. Tourism providers in some cases have cooperated to avoid scheduling conflicts and ensure their guests a quality experience. Public agencies are beginning to apply tools for establishing optimal carrying capacity of recreation sites.

6. The expansion of nature-based tourism providers has had other implications for public land and resource managers. State and federal land managers, such as the Tongass National Forest and the Alaska Department of Natural Resources, saw increases in permit activity by commercial providers. State and federal agencies overseeing fish and game activities saw an increase in license requests and harvest levels. In some cases, public agencies were not equipped to manage the changes experienced. Resource managers often lacked tools for measuring or regulating commercial recreation use. Moreover, they lacked internal capacity and personnel to monitor commercial recreation over vast areas. Some regulations and policies

for resource management were based on outdated assumptions.[21] The heterogeneous nature of tourism makes the industry more difficult to manage than previous resource-based industries, such as timber, and requires new tools and expertise.

Management Considerations

This study identifies factors that influence relations between tourism growth and community well-being in southeast Alaska. This information may be useful to Forest Service planners making decisions related to tourism management and recreation development on the Tongass National Forest; it also may be useful to state officials engaged in tourism promotion and planning in rural communities; and it may be instructive for community leaders as they face decisions to encourage local tourism. Some key points for consideration are listed below.

Economic benefits to host communities are related to the degree of direct local control residents have over the industry.

1. Enhancing local employment opportunities. The United Nations Brundtland Commission report on sustainable development stressed the need for social equity or the fair distribution of resources and opportunities across income categories and social groups (Walsh et al. 2001). Residents in each of the case study communities considered the ability of the tourism industry to contribute to the local economy as paramount. The economic benefits of tourism could be enhanced if more local workers were trained and employed and local households directly benefited from the industry. Providing opportunities for year-round employment and training for entry-level and middle-management positions in the local tourism industry might further encourage the disbursement of economic benefits throughout the community (Pattullo 1996).

2. Local control. The need for local control of tourism development echoed throughout each of the research sites. Tourism scholars have found that economic benefits to host communities correlate with the degree of direct local control residents have over the industry (Munt 1994, Pattullo 1996). In a rural Indiana study, researchers revealed that when tourism was generated and maintained by local organizations, the industry was able to grow at a rate residents perceived to be sustainable, and local employment opportunities were abundant (Lewis 2001). In Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, tourism growth was sparked by private corporations

[21] For example, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game managed charter fishing under "sportfishing," which implicitly assumed small groups of independent anglers and not expansive fishing lodges with a fleet of 25 vessels.

and nonlocal actors, often with minimal public involvement or planning at the outset. Communities found themselves at the mercy of developers, and residents have experienced changes in the use of public spaces and local resources. Southeast Alaska residents who were interviewed wanted more control over the pace of tourism development, the type of tourism being pursued, and the process of managing tourism growth. Participation in tourism planning is useful for stakeholders to influence and share control over tourism development (World Bank 2002).

3. Considering costs and benefits among stakeholders. Any industry, whether timber, small-scale manufacturing, or small-scale ecotourism, affects the economic and social life in the community and the surrounding environment. Individual perceptions or interpretations of these effects differ depending on one's source of income, neighborhood of residence, profession, use of natural resources, and value orientations. Benefits and costs of tourism may not be evenly distributed (Stonich 2000, Young 1999). Those reaping economic gains from tourism may be more willing to endure the industry's less desirable attributes, whereas those incurring more of the cost may not appreciate some of the changes wrought by tourism. Understanding the distribution of benefits and costs of local tourism enables community leaders to develop mechanisms that minimize undesirable effects perceived by stakeholders and social groups.

4. Stakeholder involvement in local tourism planning. Involving stakeholders during planning processes promotes social equity and maximizes local control over tourism development and promotes a sense of ownership (King and Stewart 1996, Paskaleva-Shapira 2001). Many stakeholders affected by tourism have property rights or livelihoods that depend on natural resources. Planning efforts to mitigate tourism's effects were evident in southeast Alaska in the form of city-level tourism planning committees (Haines), site-focused planning efforts (e.g., Chilkoot corridor), and subregional planning processes such as on Prince of Wales Island. Local planning efforts that are initiated in a proactive fashion so as to influence and shape future tourism developments, rather than react to existing problems, will likely be more satisfying to those involved. Public and private participation has been shown to be central to the success of local tourism planning efforts (Paskaleva-Shapira 2001). Some stakeholders need extra assistance from state and federal agencies to be involved effectively, including organizational skills, capital resources, and technical support (King and Stewart 1996).

Communication among key players in industry and government about proposed recreation and tourism initiatives is important for acknowledging the potential for both cumulative effects and competing interests.

5. Developing mechanisms for regional planning. Sustainable tourism is difficult to achieve without mechanisms for local and regional planning to monitor tourism development (Hunter 1997). Tourism growth in southeast Alaska occurred with few regulations from state or federal agencies as to the volume or frequency of cruise ships or visitors to the region. Resource management agencies at multiple levels have the ability to work cooperatively and proactively to ensure that tourism growth does not outpace capacity to manage this growth. Communication among key players in industry and government about proposed recreation and tourism initiatives is important for acknowledging the potential for both cumulative effects and competing interests, with implications for Alaska's communities and resources. An interagency governing mechanism with participation from public and private sectors could provide a useful model for addressing tourism issues and shaping regional tourism policy (Paskaleva-Shapira 2001). Coordination among governmental and nongovernmental agencies concerned with transportation, economic development, resource use, and the environment is helpful to understanding the wide range of factors affecting tourism. Strategic planning efforts among multilevel stakeholders have helped plan tourism growth in other regions worldwide (Hall 1999). Incorporating the perspectives and needs of diverse stakeholders early in the planning process provides a more equitable distribution of tourism benefits and minimizes undesirable effects. Key to these planning processes is finding an agreeable definition of sustainability relevant for the region (Paskaleva-Shapira 2001).

Future Research

This study aimed to provide a comparison of tourism-community relations in three rural southeast Alaska communities. This research was exploratory by design, seeking to identify issues, challenges, and themes that were common to the study communities, as well as those unique to certain locales. Study findings suggest the need for more indepth and directed investigations of the tourism industry and its complex relationship with local communities and the natural resource base used and valued by rural residents. I suggest several studies pertinent to tourism in southeast Alaska. First, it would be useful to gain a more nuanced understanding of how the geographic expansion of tourism articulates with places and spaces of local significance.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank many individuals who made this research possible and who contributed to this report. For assistance in research design, I thank Robert Schroeder, Fred Norbury, Guy Robertson, and Beth Pendleton of the USDA Forest Service. I thank members of my doctoral dissertation committee at Syracuse University, including Peter Castro, Maureen Schwarz, and Hans Buechler of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University; Chad Dawson of the State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry; and Robert Schroeder. I thank many institutions and individuals in Alaska for assistance in providing data, including Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, the former Alaska Division of Tourism, Haines Convention and Visitor's Bureau, City and Borough of Haines, City of Craig, Prince of Wales Island Chamber of Commerce, City of Hoonah, Hoonah Indian Association, Craig Community Association, Sheldon Museum, Chilkat Indian Association, Huna Totem Corporation, Klukwan, Inc., and Shaan-seet Corporation. I thank many Alaskans who provided support during the many months of field research, especially Wanda and Dick Aukerman, C.J. Jones, Lee Roberts, Gladys Narino, Paul Matter, Chuck Parsley, Geno Cisneros, Ronda Morrison, Dale Kanen, Terry Fifield, Teresa Busse, Julie Piggott, Ben Thomas, Jan Caulfield, Bill Wilson, and Elaine Schroeder. Many fine individuals provided technical review of this report, including Susan Charnley, Peter Castro, and Robert Schroeder. I also thank Linda Kruger and Roger Clark for their careful reading of early drafts and many useful comments. Appreciation is extended to Rhonda Mazza and Kelly Lawrence for editing assistance, as well as technical support for maps, figures, and photographs. Finally, I acknowledge the many research participants whose stories fill these pages.

English Equivalents

When you know	Multiply by:	To find:
Kilometers	0.6215	Miles
Hectares	2.47	Acres
Degrees Celsius	1.8 + 32	Degrees Fahrenheit
Kilograms	2.205	Pounds

Literature Cited

Adams, K.M. 1990. Cultural commoditization in Tana Toraja, Indonesia. Cultural Survival Quarterly. 14(1): 31-34.

Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission. 2004. Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission. Sport charter operators by region by port, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003. http://www.cfec.state.ak.us/mnu_Search _Databases.htm. (November 16).

Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs. 2001a. DCRA community database. Craig community overview 2001. On file with: Alaska Division of Community Advocacy, P.O. Box 110809, Juneau, AK 99811.

Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs. 2001b. DCRA community database. Hoonah community overview 2001. On file with: Alaska Division of Community Advocacy, P.O. Box 110809, Juneau, AK 99811.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game [ADF&G]. 2000a. King salmon stamp summary sales report. Unpublished data. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, AK. Data on file with author.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game [ADF&G]. 2000b. Registered charter vessels in southeast Alaska ports, Board of Fisheries Report: 21. On file with: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 1255 W 8th St., Juneau, AK 99801.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game [ADF&G] 2001a. Bear harvest data from Game Management Unit 4. Unpublished data. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Ketchikan Field Office, Ketchikan, AK. On file with author.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game [ADF&G]. 2001b. Southeast deer survey, 2000-01. Unpublished data. On file with: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 1255 W 8th St., Juneau, AK 99801.

Alaska Division of Community and Business Development 2001. 2000 southeast Alaska commercial recreation survey, preliminary draft report. http://www.dced. state.ak.us/oed/toubus/pub/recsurvey.pdf. (January 31, 2005).

Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. 2002. Annual employment statistics. http://www.ak.state.gov. (July 26, 2004).

Allen, S.D.; Robertson, G.; Schaefers, J. 1998. Economies in transition: an assessment of trends relevant to management of the Tongass National Forest. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-417. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 101 p.

Bandy, J. 1996. Managing the "other" of nature: sustainability, spectacle, and global regimes of capital in ecotourism. Public Culture. 8: 539-566.

Begley, S. 1996. Beware of the humans (ecotourism is hurting ecosystems). Newsweek. 127: 52-54.

Bernard, H.R. 1999. Research methods in anthropology. 2nd ed. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press. 585 p.

Biersack, A. 1999. Introduction: from the "new ecology" to the new ecologies. American Anthropologist. 101(1): 5-18.

Boissevain, J. 1996. "But we live here!" Perspectives on cultural tourism in Malta. In: Briguglio, L.; Butler, R., eds. Sustainable tourism in islands and small states. New York: Pinter: 220-240.

Briassoulis, H. 2002. Sustainable tourism and the question of the commons. Annals of Tourism Research. 29(4): 1065-1085.

Britton, S. 1982. The political economy of tourism in the Third World. Annals of Tourism Research. 9: 331-358.

Brown, D.F. 1999. Mayas and tourists in the Maya world. Human Organization. 58(3): 296-304.

Bryant, R.L. 1992. Political ecology: an emerging research agenda in Third World studies. Political Geography. 11(2): 12-36.

Burns, P.M. 1999. An introduction to tourism and anthropology. London, United Kingdom: Routledge. 188 p.

Burns, P.; Holden, A. 1995. Tourism: a new perspective. London, United Kingdom: Prentice-Hall. 239 p.

Burr, S.W. 1995. The rural action class's perception of tourism and its potential for economic development—case studies from four rural Pennsylvania counties. In: McCool, S.F.; Watson, A.E., comps. Linking tourism, the environment, and sustainability. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-GTR-323. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station: 82-89.

Catton, T. 1997. Inhabited wilderness: Indians, Eskimos, and national parks in Alaska. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press. 287 p.

Cerveny, L.K. 2004a. Preliminary research findings from a study of the sociocultural effects of tourism in Haines, Alaska. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-612. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 144 p.

Cerveny, L.K. 2004b. Tourism and transformations in the Alaska frontier: a study of tourism growth and its effects on three southeast Alaska communities. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University. 635 p. Ph.D. dissertation.

Chambers, E. 2000. Native tours. The anthropology of travel and tourism. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. 137 p.

Chevalier, J. 2001. Stakeholder analysis and natural resources management. Carleton University. Ottawa, ON. http://www.carleton.ca/~jchevali/STAKEH2.html. (July 12, 2004).

Chilkat Valley News. 1989a. Tour season. April 27; 1 (col. 1).

Chilkat Valley News. 1989b. Tourism task force expects to woo cruise customers. July 27; 2 (col. 1).

Chilkat Valley News. 1999a. Initiative seeks to cap big ship visits. September 30; 4 (col. 1).

Chilkat Valley News. 1999b. Otis, tourism taxes on top–for now. October 7; 1 (col. 4).

Chilkat Valley News. 1999c. Princess cancels port of call. October 28; 1 (col. 3).

Chilkat Valley News. 1999d. Standard bed tax won't work here, or will it? September 30; 5 (col. 4).

Chilkat Valley News. 1999e. Tax on tours: Land mine for industry or levy on luxury? September 30; 4 (col. 1).

Chilkat Valley News. 2000a. City tourism planning gets under way. May 25; 14 (col 1).

Chilkat Valley News. 2000b. Surveys give industry mixed review. February 24; 1 (col 1).

Chilkat Valley News. 2000c. Voters to decide bed, tour tax on Tuesday. April 13; 1 (col 4).

Chilkat Valley News. 2001. Large cruise ship dockings set to double. December 20; http://www.chilkatvalleynews.com/archive/index.html. (December 22, 2004).

Chilkat Valley News. 2003a. Fate of tour tax to be decided Tuesday. March 20; http://www.chilkatvalleynews.com/archive/index.html. (December 22, 2004).

Chilkat Valley News. 2003b. Holland America drops dockings. January 31; http://www.chilkatvalleynews.com/archive/index.html. (December 22, 2004).

Chilkat Valley News. 2003c. Voters repeal tour tax. March 27; http://www.chilkatvalleynews.com/archive/index.html. (December 22, 2004).

Christensen, N.; Fay, G.; McCollum, D.; Miller, S.; Watson, A. 2003. Alaska visitor statistics program: Alaska Native culture and rural tourism. March 2003. Presentation at the annual meeting of the Alaska Wilderness Recreation and Tourism Association. http://www.dced.state.ak.us/oed/toubus/ pub/Final_ AWRTA_2003_presentation.ppt. (December 10, 2004).

City of Hoonah. 1999. Hoonah overall economic development plan. Prepared by the Hoonah OEDP Committee. 26 p. On file with: City of Hoonah, 300 Garteeni Highway, Hoonah, AK 99829.

Clark, R.N.; Lucas, R.C. 1978. The forest ecosystem of southeast Alaska. Vol. 10. Outdoor recreation and scenic resources. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. 116 p.

Cohen, E. 1988. Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. Annals of Tourism Research. 15: 371-386.

Craig Overall Economic Development Plan. 1990. Annual report. Craig overall economic development committee. On file with: City of Craig, 500 3rd St., Craig, AK 99821.

Crick, M. 1989. Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: sun, sex, savings and servility. Annual Review of Anthropology. 18: 307-344.

Cruise Lines International Association [CLIA]. 2004a. Cruise industry overview. http://www.cruising.org/press/overview/ind_overview.cfm. (March 10, 2005).

Cruise Lines International Association [CLIA]. 2004b. CLIA member cruise lines post strong passenger growth with over 9.3 million cruisers in 2003. http://www.cruising.org/CruiseNews/news.cfm?NID=156. (March 15).

Crystal, E. 1989. Tourism in Toraja. In: Smith, V., ed. Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press: 139-170.

Cuba, L. 1987. Identity and community on the Alaskan frontier. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. 202 p.

Dawson, C. 2001. Ecotourism and nature-based tourism: one end of the tourism opportunity spectrum. In: McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N., eds. Tourism, recreation and sustainability. London: CAB International: 51-54. Chapter 3.

Deitch, L.I. 1989. The impact of tourism on the arts and crafts of the Indians of the Southwestern United States. In: Smith, V., ed. Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press: 223-236. Chapter 11.

De Kadt, E. 1979. Tourism: Passport to development? New York: Oxford University Press. 360 p.

De Laguna, F. 1990. Tlingit. In: Suttles, W., ed. Handbook of North American Indians: Northwest Coast. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press: 203-228.

Dickenson, B.; Vladimir, A. 1996. Selling the sea. An inside look at the cruise industry. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 384 p.

Ditton, R.B.; Holland, S.M.; Anderson, D.K. 2002. Recreational fishing as tourism. Fisheries. 27(3): 17-24.

Duggan, B.J. 1997. Tourism, cultural authenticity, and the Native Crafts Cooperative: The eastern Cherokee experience. In: Chambers, E., ed. Tourism and culture: an applied perspective. Albany, NY: SUNY Press: 31-58. Chapter 3.

Durbin, K. 1999. Tongass: pulp politics and the fight for the Alaskan rain forest. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press. 328 p.

Durkheim, E. 1965. Elementaires de la vie religieuse [Elementary forms of religious life]. Fields, K.E., translator. New York: Free Press. 464 p.

Eadington, W.; Smith, V. 1992. The emergence of alternative forms of tourism. In: Smith, V.; Eadington, W., eds. Tourism alternatives. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press: 1-13. Chapter 1.

Eppenbach, S. 1987. Artists prefer Haines. Travel-Holiday. December: 48-53.

Faulkenberry, L.V.; Coggeshall, J.M.; Backman, K.; Backman, S. 2000. A culture of servitude: the impact of tourism and development on South Carolina's coast. Human Organization. 59(1): 86-95.

Freitag, T.G. 1994. Enclave tourism development: For whom the benefits roll? Annals of Tourism Research. 21: 538-554.

Fried, N.; Windisch-Cole, B. 2004. Leisure & hospitality. Alaska Economic Trends. 24(1): 3-14.

Gilbertsen, N. 2003. The global salmon industry and its impacts in Alaska. Alaska Economic Trends. 23(10): 3-11.

Gilbertsen, N. 2004. Residency and the Alaska fisheries. Alaska Economic Trends. 24(12): 4-14.

Gilbertsen, N.; Robinson, D. 2003. Natural resources: mining and timber. Alaska Economic Trends. 23(12): 3-13.

Glacier Bay National Park. 2000. Summary data on visitor use. Unpublished data. On file with: Glacier Bay National Park, Gustavus, AK 99826.

Global Insight. 2004. The Alaska tourism satellite account: a comprehensive analysis of the economic contribution of travel and tourism. http://www.commerce.state.ak.us/oed/toubus/pub/AK_TSA_april.pdf. (November 16).

GMA Research Corp. 1996. Images of Alaska. Prepared for the Alaska tourism marketing council. Anchorage, AK. On file with: Alaska Office of Tourism Development, P.O. Box 110801, Juneau, AK 99811.

Gossling, S. 2002. Human-environmental relations with tourism. Annals of Tourism Research. 29(2): 539-556.

Greenwood, D. 1989. Culture by the pound: an anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. In: Smith, V., ed. Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press: 171-186. Chapter 8.

Hadland, J. 2004. Nonresidents working in Alaska–2002. Alaska Economic Trends. 24(2): 3-21.

Haines Borough. 2000. Business license data. On file with: Haines City and Borough, P.O. Box 1209, Haines Highway, Haines, AK 99827.

Haines Borough. 2001. Commercial and residential property assessments: 1991-2001. On file with: Haines City and Borough, P.O. Box 1209, Haines Highway, Haines, AK 99827.

Haines Convention and Visitors Bureau. 2000. Haines visitor guide. [Brochure]. Haines, AK: Chilkat Valley News. 14 p.

Haines Convention and Visitors Bureau. 2004. Visitor arrivals by cruise ship. Unpublished data. On file with: Haines Convention and Visitors Bureau, Second Avenue, Haines, AK 99827. [Pages unknown].

Hall, C.M. 1999. Tourism planning: policies, process and relationships. Harlow, United Kingdom: Longman. 248 p.

Hannerz, U. 1973. Marginal entrepreneurship and economic change in the Cayman Islands. Ethnos. 38: 101-112.

Haycox, S. 2002. Frigid embrace: politics, economics and environment in Alaska. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press. 180 p.

Hinckley, T.C. 1965. The Inside Passage: a popular gilded age tour. Pacific Northwest Quarterly. 46 (April): 67-74.

Honey, M. 1999. Ecotourism and sustainable development: Who owns paradise? Washington, DC: Island Press. 405 p.

Horochowski, K.; Moisey, R.N. 2001. Sustainable tourism: the effect of local participation in Honduran ecotourism development. In: McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N., eds. Tourism, recreation and sustainability. London, United Kingdom: CAB International: 163-175. Chapter 9.

Hunn, G.; Johnson, D.R.; Russell, P.N.; Thornton, T.F. 2003. Huna Tlingit environmental knowledge, conservation, and the management of a "wilderness" park. Current Anthropology. 44(Supplement): S79-S103.

Hunter, C. 1997. Sustainable tourism as an adaptive paradigm. Annals of Tourism Research. 24(2): 850-867.

Institute for Social and Economic Research [ISER]. 1999. Economics of sport-fishing in Alaska: executive summary. On file with: Institute for Social and Economic Research, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508.

Jaenicke, M.J.; Frenette, B.J. 2000. Summary data from the sport fishery for Pacific halibut in the IPHC area, 2c portion southeast Alaska. On file with: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Sportfish, 1255 W 8th St., Juneau, AK 99801.

Jafari, J. 1987. Tourism models: the sociocultural aspects. Tourism Management. 8: 151-159.

Johnson, D. 2002. Environmentally sustainable cruise tourism: a reality check. Marine policy. 26: 261-270.

Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau. 2000. Cruise passenger traffic to Juneau, Alaska. Unpublished data. On file with: Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, 369 S Franklin St., Juneau, AK 99801.

Juneau Empire. 1999. Southeast city hopes to lure cruises. October 27; http://www.juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 17, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2000a. Cruise rep warns of Haines boycott. February 21; http://juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 16, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2000b. Haines voters OK 4 percent tourism tax. April 26; http://juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 16, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2000c. Huna Totem stays on fiscal course. May 19; http://juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 16, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2000d. Tourist dollars are easy come, easy go. May 16; http://juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 16, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2002a. Alaska businesses unsure about cruise company merger. October 31; http://juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 16, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2002b. Independent travelers are getting rarer, businesses catering to nonpackaged tours are ailing. June 9; http://juneauempire.com/smart_search. (December 16).

Juneau Empire. 2003. King plan hacks at sport harvest. January 12. http://www.juneauempire.com/smart_search. (March 23, 2004).

Juneau Empire. 2004a. 2004 prediction: cruise passengers up by 9%. February 3; http://juneauempire.com/stories/020304/loc_cruise.shtml. (March 15).

Juneau Empire. 2004b. How to entice the independent travelers. March 3; http://juneauempire.com/stories/030304/loc_independant.shtml. (March 15).

Keller, R.H.; Turek, M.F. 1998. American Indians and national parks. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press. 319 p.

King, D.A.; Stewart, W.P. 1996. Ecotourism and commodification: protecting people and places. Biodiversity and Conservation. 5: 293-305.

Klein, R. 2002. Cruise ship blues: the underside of the cruise industry. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers. 192 p.

Kottak, C.P. 1999. The new ecological anthropology. American Anthropologist. 101(1): 23-35.

Kroll, L. 2004. Cruise control. Forbes. 4: 96-102.

Lankford, S.V.; Williams, A.; Lankford, J.K. 1997. Perceptions of outdoor recreation opportunities and support for tourism development. Journal of Travel Research. 35(3): 65-69.

Lewis, J.B. 2001. Self-developed rural tourism: a method of sustainable tourism development. In: McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N., eds. Tourism, recreation, and sustainability. London: CABI: 177-194. Chapter 10.

Lickorish, L.J.; Jenkins, C.L. 1997. An introduction to tourism. Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann. 244 p.

Lindberg, J. 1999. Under the bridge: below decks, backstage, and behind the scenes of the world's biggest cruise ship. Travel & Leisure. July: 98-102.

Lindberg, K. 1998. Ecotourism: a guide for planners and managers. Bennington, VT: The Ecotourism Society. Vol. 2.

Lofgren, O. 1999. On holiday: a history of vacationing. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 320 p.

Lynn Canal News. 1980. Tourism—an industry with a future here. November 20:1 (col. 1).

Lynn Canal News. 1982. Tour ship cruises into happy waters. July 1: 3 (col. 1).

Mansperger, M.C. 1995. Tourism and cultural change in small-scale societies. Human Organization. 54(1): 87-94.

Marcus, G.E. 1998. Ethnography through thick and thin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 275 p.

Marsh, H.R.; Henshall, B.D. 1987. Planning better tourism: the strategic importance of tourist-resident expectations and interactions. Tourism Recreation Research. 21(2): 47-54.

Mathieson, A.; Wall, G. 1982. Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts. New York: Longman. 208 p.

McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N. 2001. Introduction: pathways and pitfalls in the search for sustainable tourism. In: McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N., eds. Tourism, recreation and sustainability. London: CAB International: 1-16. Chapter 1.

McDonald, L. 1984. Alaska steam: a pictorial history of the Alaska Steamship Company. Alaska Geographic. 11(4): [Pages unknown].

McDowell Group. 1993. Alaska visitor arrivals, summer 1993: Juneau, AK: Alaska Visitor Statistics program, Department of Commerce and Economic Development, Alaska Division of Tourism.

McDowell Group. 2000a. Alaska tourism marketing needs survey. Alaska Division of Tourism. On file with author: 400 N 34th St., Seattle, WA 98103.

McDowell Group. 2000b. Economic impact of the cruise industry in southeast Alaska, Southeast Conference, October 2000. On file with author: 400 N 34th St., Seattle, WA 98103.

McDowell Group. 2002. Southeast Alaska and the new Alaska traveler's survey. Conference. Working together: tourism in southeast Alaska. On file with: McDowell Group, 416 Harris St., Suite 301, Juneau, AK 99801.

McLaren, D. 2003. Rethinking tourism and ecotravel. 2nd ed. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian. 220 p.

Menke, K. 1997. Timber [Brochure]. Haines, AK: Sheldon Museum and Cultural Center.

Mitchell, D.C. 1997. Sold American: the story of Alaska Natives and their land, 1867-1959. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England. 476 p.

Morgan, D.L. 1988. Focus groups as qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 85 p.

Munt, I. 1994. The "other" postmodern tourism: culture, travel and the new middle classes. Theory, Culture and Society. 11: 101-123.

Nash, D.; Smith, V. 1991. Anthropology and tourism. Annals of Tourism Research. 18(1): 12-25.

Nash, R. 1981. Tourism, parks, and the wilderness idea in the history of Alaska. Alaska in perspective. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Historical Commission and the Alaska Historical Society. 4(1): 1-28.

NFO Plog Research. 2002. 2002 market profile study. Cruise Lines International Association. http://www.cruising.org/wip/crsprospect/prospseg2_files/ frame. htm# slide0039.htm. (December 21, 2004).

Norris, F. 1985. Gawking at the midnight sun: the tourist in early Alaska. Alaska Historical Commission Studies in History, 170. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Historical Commission. 177 p.

Northern Economics, Inc. 2002. Alaska visitor arrivals and profile, summer 2001. Alaska Department of Community and Economic Development. http://www.juneau.org/tourism2/documents2001/2000-01F-WArrivals.pdf. (March 10, 2005).

Northwest Cruise Ship Association. 2004. Cruising for the facts. http://nwcruise ship.org/group.cfm?menuId=95. (December 10).

Oliver-Smith, A. 1989. Tourist development and the struggle for local resource control. Human Organization. 48(4): 345-350.

Olwig, K.F. 1980. National parks, tourism, and local development: a West Indian case. Human Organization. 39(1): 22-31.

Overseas Development Administration [ODA] 1995. Guidance note on how to do stakeholder analysis of aid projects and programmes. Social Development Department London. http://www.euforic.org/gb/ stake1.htm. (July 15, 2004).

Paskaleva-Shapira, K. 2001. Innovative partnerships for effective governance of sustainable urban tourism: framework approach. Institute for Technology Assessment and System Analysis. Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, Germany. http://sut.itas.fzk.de/papers/pack1/SUT_Deliverable1_FrameworkApproach.pdf.

Pattullo, P. 1996. Last resorts: the cultural cost of tourism in the Caribbean. London: Sterling. 220 p.

Paulson, S.; Gezon L.L.; Watts, M. 2003. Locating the political in political ecology. Human Organization. 62(3): 205-217.

Pearce, J.A. 1980. Host community acceptance of foreign tourists: strategic considerations. Annals of Tourism Research. 7(2): 224-233.

Pearce, P. 1982. The social psychology of tourist behavior. Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon.

Pearce, P.L.; Moscardo, G.; Ross, G.F. 1996. Tourism community relationships. London, United Kingdom: Pergamon. 259 p.

Pelto, P.J.; Pelto, G.H. 1978. Anthropological research: the structure of inquiry. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. 333 p.

Pi-Sunyer, O.; Thomas, R.B. 1997. Tourism, environmentalism and cultural survival in Quintana Roo. In: Johnston, B., ed. Life and death matters: human rights and the environment at the end of the millennium. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira: 187-212.

Price, R.E. 1990. The great father in Alaska: the case of the Tlingit and Haida salmon fishery. Douglas, AK: First Street Press. 203 p.

Prince of Wales Chamber of Commerce. 2001. Explore! Prince of Wales Island, Alaska. 2001 guide to Prince of Wales Island [Brochure]. On file with: Prince of Wales Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 497, Craig, AK 99921.

Rakestraw, L. 1994. A history of the United States Forest Service in Alaska. R10 FR-03. Anchorage, AK: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Alaska Region. [Pages unknown].

Ramírez, R. 1999. Stakeholder analysis and conflict management. In: Buckles, D., ed. Cultivating peace: conflict and collaboration in natural resource management. Washington, DC: IDRC and World Bank Institute: 101-128.

Robertson, G. 2004. An analysis of changing income sources. In: Mazza, R., tech. ed. Economic growth and change in southeast Alaska. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-611. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station: 1-32.

Robertson, G. 2001. Understanding the role of recreation and tourism in southeast Alaska's regional economy. Workshop on recreation and tourism research in Alaska. http://www.fs.fed.us/r10/ro/recforum. (April 5, 2004).

Rothman, H.K. 1998. Devil's bargains: tourism in the twentieth-century American West. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas. 434 p.

Schensul, S.L.; Schensul, J.J.; LeCompte, M.D. 1999. Essential ethnographic methods. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira. 318 p.

Sharpley, R. 2003. Tourism, tourists and society. Cambridgeshire, United Kingdom: ELM Publications. 294 p.

Smith, E. 1997. Hegemony and elite capital: the tools of tourism. In: Chambers, E., ed. Tourism and culture: an applied perspective. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press: 199-214.

Smith, V. 1989. Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. 341 p.

Snyder, J. 1988. Ft. William H. Seward "The post" [Brochure]. On file with: Sheldon Museum and Cultural Center, P.O. Box 269, Haines, AK 99827.

Southeast Stevedoring. 2004. Cruise passengers by port. Unpublished data. On file with: Southeast Stevedoring, 1330 Eastaugh Way, Suite 4, Juneau, AK 99801.

Spradley, J.P. 1979. The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 247 p.

Stewart, A. 1998. The ethnographer's method. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 97 p.

Stonich, S.C. 1998. Political ecology of tourism. Annals of Tourism Research. 25: 25-54.

Stonich, S.C. 2000. The other side of paradise: tourism, conservation, and development in the Bay Islands. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation. 205 p.

Stronza, A. 2001. The anthropology of tourism. Annual Review of Anthropology. 30: 261-283.

Urry, J. 1995. Consuming places. London: Routledge. 257 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1997. Tongass land management plan revision, final environmental impact statement. R10-MB-338b. Juneau, AK: Alaska Region.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1999. Saltwater shoreline-based outfitter guide analysis 1998 [Database]. On file with: Eugene Cisneros, Hoonah Ranger District, 430A Airport Way, Hoonah, AK 99829.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2000. Saltwater shoreline-based outfitter guide analysis 1999 [Database]. On file with: Eugene Cisneros, Hoonah Ranger District, 430A Airport Way, Hoonah, AK 99829.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2001. Saltwater shoreline-based outfitter guide analysis 2000 [Database]. On file with: Eugene Cisneros, Hoonah Ranger District, 430A Airport Way, Hoonah, AK 99829.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2000. 2000 census of population, social, and economic characteristics of Alaska. Washington, DC. [Pages unknown].

Walsh, J.A.; Jamrozy, U.; Burr, S.W. 2001. Sense of place as a component of tourism marketing. In: McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N., eds., Tourism, recreation, and sustainability. London: CABI: 195-216. Chapter 11.

West, C. 1997. Mr. Alaska. The Chuck West story: forty years of Alaska tourism. 1945-1985. Seattle, WA: Weslee Publications. 153 p.

World Bank. 2002. Stakeholder analysis. http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/essd/essd.nsf. (March 15, 2004).

World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED]. 1987. Our common future. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. 383 p.

World Tourism Organization. 2004. An historic perspective of world tourism. http://www.world-tourism.org/facts/trends/historical.htm (December 21).

World Travel and Tourism Council [WTTC]. 2003. Blueprint for new tourism. http://www.wttc.org/blueprint/WTTCBlueprintFinal.pdf. (March 15, 2004).

World Travel and Tourism Council [WTTC]. 2004. Tourism satellite accounting. http://www.wttc.org/2004tsa/frameset2a.htm. (December 21).

Wyatt, V. 1995. The Harriman expedition in historical perspective. In: Grinnell, G.B.; Burroughs, P.; Wyatt, V., eds. Alaska 1899: essays from the Harriman expedition. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press: [Pages unknown].

Young, E.H. 1999. Balancing conservation with development in small-scale fisheries: Is tourism an empty promise? Human Ecology. 27(4): 581-620.

Appendix 1: Social Actors and Stakeholders

Table 20—Social actors and stakeholder groups in Haines

Category	Description	Number represented
Commercial fishing	Residents currently or previously involved in commercial fishing	8
Timber	Residents previously employed in the timber industry	6
Environmental leaders	Residents actively involved in environmental issues	11
Business owners (nontourism)	Owners of businesses not related to tourism	12
Tourism providers	Owners and workers in tourism businesses	37
Nontourism workers	Workers in contracting, mechanical trades, technical trades (nursing, child care)	6
Retirees	Retired residents not formally involved in the labor force	5
Tribal members	Chilkoot or Chilkat tribal members	5
Municipal officials	Representatives from borough and city offices	5
State officials	Representatives from state resource agencies	3

Table 21—Social actors and stakeholder groups in Craig and Klawock

Category	Description	Number represented
Commercial fishing	Residents currently or previously involved in commercial fishing	12
Timber	Residents currently or previously employed in the timber industry	4
Business owners	Owners of businesses not related to tourism	20
Tourism providers	Owners and workers in tourism-related businesses, including charter fishing lodges	27
City officials	Employees of city government	5
Forest Service	Employees of Forest Service	8
Tribal officials and members	Members of tribal organizations in Craig or Klawock	8
Subsistence and sportfishers	Active hunters, fishers, and subsistence users	9

Table 22—Social actors and stakeholder groups in Hoonah

Category	Description	Number represented
Commercial fishing	Residents currently or previously involved in commercial fishing	4
Business owners (nontourism)	Owners of businesses not related to tourism	15
Tourism providers	Owners or workers in local tourism businesses, including charter fishing	15
Tribal officials and members	Employees or board members of the Hoonah Indian Association and clan leaders	14
City officials	Employees of the city and public schools	7
Huna Totem Corp.	Board members or executives of Huna Totem Corp.	4
Forest Service	Forest Service employees at the Hoonah Ranger District	6
Subsistence users	Native residents active in hunting and fishing for subsistence	10
Timber industry	Persons currently employed in the timber industry and/or living at the Whitestone logging camp	4
Game Creek	Residents of Game Creek community	5

Appendix 2: Sample Characteristics of Haines, Craig, and Hoonah

Haines Sample Characteristics

Residents involved in the study represented a wide range of backgrounds and experiences. Half (50 percent) of the people were between the ages of 46 and 65, and one-third were between the ages of 26 and 45. About 15 percent were over 65 and just 2 percent were under 25 years. Of respondents, 28 percent had lived in Haines fewer than 10 years, and 29 percent had lived in Haines for more than 30 years. Nearly one-fourth of research participants (23 percent) were born and raised in Haines, with another 9 percent originally from another region of Alaska. Most research participants (68 percent) were reared out of state. Research participants were predominantly male (65 percent) and predominantly non-Native (93 percent).

Craig Sample Characteristics

Of the Craig residents interviewed, 42 percent were female and 48 percent male. A significant portion of residents interviewed (24 percent) were Native (Tlingit or Haida), which roughly reflects the proportion of Alaska Natives living in Craig (22 percent). One-third of research participants were relative newcomers to Craig, having lived fewer than 10 years in the community. Another third had lived in Craig between 10 and 30 years, and one-third had lived in Craig more than 30 years, including 25 percent who were born and raised in the community. Most residents interviewed were between 46 and 65, with no interviewees under the age of 25 and just two over the age of 65.

Hoonah Sample Characteristics

The sampled residents represented a broad range of backgrounds and experiences. Roughly 40 percent of the sample was female, which is slightly below the percentage of females in Hoonah in 2000 (47 percent). The sample was 56 percent Native and 44 percent non-Native. The percentage of non-Native participants in the study was slightly higher than the population average (39 percent). This higher participation from non-Native residents was because many of the businesses in town were owned by non-Native persons. More than half the interviewees (53 percent) had lived in the community all their lives. Another 26 percent had lived in Hoonah more than 10 years, whereas 20 percent were relative newcomers, having lived in Hoonah for less than 10 years.

Appendix 3: Interview Guides

General Interview Guide

This study is being conducted by the Pacific Northwest Research (PNW) Station in Juneau. The PNW Research Station is part of the research branch of the USDA Forest Service. The goal of the study is to understand the effects of tourism on (a) local residents' everyday lives and decisions, (b) community life and the local economy, and (c) local use of natural areas. Through this process, we also hope to be able to gain an improved understanding of the unique qualities of the visitor experience in [community].

I. Background Questions

A. Years in [community]/Alaska

B. Previous residences (Where from originally/school/other places lived)
What brought you to Alaska?

C. Resident status (Year-round or seasonal/neighborhood)

D. Household economics: How do family members contribute to household income in 2000?

II. Community Life

A. Why did you decide to move to [community]?
(Why have you decided to remain in [community]?)

B. How would you describe [community] when you first moved here?
(Or, how would you describe the [community] of your childhood? (note years)

C. What changes have you observed in the time you have lived here?
How would you explain the causes of these changes?

D. What do you value most about living in [community]? What do you value least?

E. What characteristics, if any, do you feel [community] residents share in common?
What differences do you see among people living in [community]?

F. What would you hope for the community in the future?
What industries would you like to see grow in [community] in the future?
Why?
What are your biggest fears or concerns for the future of [community]?

III. Tourism

A. Background

1. When did you first notice the appearance of tourism in [community]?
2. What changes, if any, have you noticed in the shape of tourism in [community]?
3. How do you know when you are looking at a tourist?

B. Tourism Attitudes

1. What kind of contact do you have with visitors to [community]?
   a. What types of visitors do you see?
   b. What are they doing?
   c. How often do you see visitors?
   d. Where do you see them?
2. How has tourism in [community] affected your life, personally?
3. What aspects of the tourist season do you look forward to?
4. What aspects of tourism concern you?

C. Impacts of Tourism

1. In your view, how does tourism benefit [community]?
2. In your view, what are the most significant negative effects of tourism for the community?
3. Does the tourism affect community life? If so, how?
4. Does the presence of tourism affect the way natural resources are used? If so, how?
5. [HAINES ONLY] Tourism obviously is a controversial topic in Haines. What makes it so controversial?
6. How much tourism would you like to see in the future–say in 10 years? What sectors of the tourism industry would you like to see grow, decline, stay the same?
7. What are your biggest fears or concerns for the future tourism of [community]?

Interview Questions for Tour Operators

Introduction

This study is being conducted by the Pacific Northwest (PNW) Research Station in Juneau. The PNW Research Station is part of the research branch of the USDA Forest Service. The goal of the study is to understand the effects of tourism on (a) local residents' everyday lives and decisions, (b) community life and the local economy, and (c) local use of natural areas. We are interviewing many tourism businesses to understand both the nature and extent of tourism activities in [community] and the use of local areas by tourism operators. Through this process, we also hope to be able to gain an improved understanding of the unique qualities of the visitor experience in [community].

A. Background and Community Questions

1. Years in [community]/Alaska
2. Previous residences (Where from originally/school/other places lived)
   What brought you to Alaska?
3. Resident status (Year-round or seasonal/neighborhood)
4. Household economics: How do family members contribute to household income in 2000?
5. What do you value most about living here?
6. How would you describe [community] when you first moved here?
7. What changes have you observed since living in [community]?
8. What are your hopes for the community's future? What concerns do you have?

B. Early Tourism Business

1. Tell me about your professional history.
2. How did you get involved with the tourism industry?
3. How many years have you been working in tourism?
4. For business owners…
   a. What year did this business begin? What inspired you to start the business?

b. What was the original idea or vision for your company?
c. What products and services did you originally offer?
e. How many employees did you start with?
f. What equipment (or capital resources) did you start with?
g. What changes has your company experienced?

C. Current Tourism Business

1. Employees

a. Number of employees: Full-time _____ Part-time _____
Year-round _____ Seasonal _____
Local _____ Nonlocal _____

b. How do you recruit employees?
c. What percentage of employees typically returns for the next season?

2. Products and Services

a. What products and services do you currently offer?
b. What places in the Chilkat Valley does your company visit? (Has this changed over time? Why?)

3. Mission

a. What is your current mission?
b. Has it changed from your original mission?

4. Equipment

a. What equipment do you currently use/own? (vans, buses, etc.)

5. Marketing

a. How would you characterize your marketing strategy?
b. What percentage of your business comes from cruise ship passengers?
c. Do you have formal/contractual relationships with cruise companies? If so, how many cruise lines? Which cruise lines?
d. What percentage of visitors on your trips originates in Skagway?

6. Volume

a. What is your total visitor capacity?
b. How many total visitors will you serve this summer?
c. How many trips do you run per week in the peak season (for each location?)

7. Competition and Market Share

a. Who are your biggest competitors?

b. What is your approximate market share? How has it changed?
c. How has price been affected by increasing competition?
d. What does it take to survive in the tourism market in [community]?

8. Impressions

a. What do you like about working in the tourism industry?
b. What do you not like about working in tourism?

9. Future

a. Where would you like your company to be in 5 years?

D. Customer Demand and "Touristic Experience"

1. Expectations

a. What expectations do visitors have about Alaska before they arrive?
b. What expectations do visitors have about their tour?

2. Visitor Characteristics and Customer Demand

a. Have you noticed any changes in either the types of visitors coming on your tours or the expectations of visitors over the last 5 to 10 years?
b. What do you hope visitors experiencing your tour come away with? (What do you hope they remember most about their experience?)
c. What factors are influencing visitor demands for services they desire?
d. What new demands have you encountered? How have you met these demands, or how to you plan to address them?

3. Wilderness Experience

a. How do visitors conceptualize "wilderness?"
b. Does this differ from the way a resident would see it?

E. Tourism Impacts

1. In your view, how does tourism benefit [community]?

2. What are the most significant negative effects of tourism for the community?

3. [HAINES ONLY] Why is tourism so controversial in [Haines]? What is it like living in a community where tourism is so controversial?

4. How does the growing presence of the tourism industry affect community life?

5. How does the presence of tourism affect the way natural resources are used?
6. How would you describe your ideal vision the future of tourism in [community]?
7. What concerns, if any, do you have for the future tourism growth in [community]?

Focus Group Interview Guide

Background

We are about to begin what is called a "focus group." A focus group provides a safe and structured environment for a group of people to share ideas about a given topic. Today we are meeting to talk about current tourism activity in Hoonah and the community's future relationship to tourism. This is one of several focus groups that will be held in the next few weeks with different segments of Hoonah's population.

A. Community

1. First, let's do a little warm-up exercise. Let's go around the room. Using a few words or short phrases, how would you describe Hoonah to someone who had never visited?

2. Hoonah has been affected by changes in the commercial fishing and timber industries. Many people feel that there need to be new sources of economic growth. What kinds of jobs would you like to see grow in Hoonah? What is next for Hoonah?

B. Tourism: Part I

Now let's talk about tourism in Hoonah and the nearby area.

Current Tourism Levels

1. First, how do you know when you are looking at a tourist?

2. When you see tourists in Hoonah and the surrounding area, what sort of things are they doing? [fishing, hunting, boating, ferry, etc…]
   What activities are visitors involved in?

3. Are there places you often visit in the area of Icy Strait/Chichagof Island where you have seen an increase in visitors or tour operators?
   3a. How (if at all) does it change the way you use these places?

Future Tourism

In the summertime, there are more than half a million people going through Icy Strait on cruise ships, whale-watching and sightseeing tours, charter fishing boats, yachts, and catamarans. Some people talk about bringing more of these visitors to Hoonah.

4. What features does Hoonah offer that would attract visitors? Why would someone want to visit Hoonah?

5. Given all the tourism activity happening close by, why don't we see more visitors in Hoonah?

6. Why would the tourism industry be good for Hoonah?

7. When people think about tourists coming to Hoonah, what concerns might arise?

8. How does tourism affect people's ability to hunt, fish, and gather items for customary and traditional use?

One thing we want to do is establish whether Hoonah residents see tourism as an option for growing the economy and creating jobs. There are many kinds of visitors to attract and visitor activities to promote.

9. What sort of tourism activities, businesses, and attractions do you think would be most desirable in Hoonah? Try to consider realistic options.

   a. Now, let's rank these based on desirability. Pick three top choices and write them down on some paper. How many people put "X" on their list of top three? (It doesn't matter what order.) Go down the list.

By using the list of ideas people generated, make a "top-five" list.

10. Now let's talk a little more in detail about each of these items. (10 minutes)

    Pick item #1, #2, #3 (depending on time)
    Why would this be good for the community?
    What concerns might people have about this?
    Where would this take place?
    Volume. How much?

If not on the "top-5" list do 10a, 10b, 10c.

10a. In many areas of the world, visitors travel to learn about Native culture. Do you think it would be a good idea to promote something like this in Hoonah? Why? What are some ways Tlingit culture might be shared with visitors?

10b. A number of southeast Alaska communities are bringing in cruise ships. What would be the benefit of having large cruise ships dock or anchor near Hoonah? What concerns would you have about this?

10c. Smaller ships typically bring fewer people and stay longer in port. What are the benefits of small cruise ships? Drawbacks?

Local Capacity

1. What things need to happen for tourism to grow in Hoonah?
2. What improvements need to be made in local infrastructure to accommodate future visitors?
3. What could be done to prevent any unwanted changes future tourism might do to Hoonah?
4. What agencies should be involved in talking about tourism? What should they be doing?
5. What should the Forest Service be doing with regard to recreation and tourism?

Pacific Northwest Research Station

Web site	http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw
Telephone	(503) 808-2592
Publication requests	(503) 808-2138
FAX	(503) 808-2130
E-mail	pnw_pnwpubs@fs.fed.us
Mailing address	Publications Distribution Pacific Northwest Research Station P.O. Box 3890 Portland, OR 97208-3890

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Pacific Northwest Research Station
333 SW First Avenue
P.O. Box 3890
Portland, OR 97208-3890