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(Petersburg, Alaska - 2/25/2009)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We'll call the meeting to order. We just got some sad news this morning. There's a couple gentlemen from Hoonah who passed away. Charlie Wright is.....

MR. SEE: Frank Wright's brother.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Frank Wright's brother. And then Charlie Hinchman.....

MR. SEE: That's Johnny Hinchman. He's one of the original Hoonah fishermen from way back when. He died this morning. Charlie Wright is Frank Wright's brother and he died this morning too, also.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mike. Then we just found out that John Littlefield was taken to the hospital. Was it a stroke? He had a stroke. It was a mild one and he seems to be doing good.

Brother Dick Stokes, if you would give us a prayer on their behalf. Please, everyone stand.

(Prayer)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Dick.

Okay. Looks like Neil Barten is all ready to go. The floor is all yours, sir.

MR. BARTEN: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Council and everybody else. I'm just going to give a brief overview of the status of our current assessment and monitoring activities.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Neil, can I interrupt you for just a second.

MR. BARTEN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I certainly want to thank Robert for the fine invitation to go to his home last night and enjoy one another's company and some good food. I'm sure everyone appreciated the invitation there. Gunalcheesh.
Go ahead, sir.

MR. BARTEN: Thank you. Again, this is going to be fairly brief. You can ask questions at the end if you want, but I think we covered some of these topics yesterday. I'm going to go over some of the monitoring and assessment activities we're doing. A little of the explanation and rationale behind what they're all about. It's only going to be like a six or seven PowerPoint slides.

I'm going to talk about the deer pellet program a little bit, the deer harvest survey program we have. Unit 2 deer harvest program that Larry talked about yesterday I'll briefly describe that. Then the deer mortality transects and some of the beach and road surveys that mostly are going to be taking place on northeast Chichagof area.

Just as an overview because I think a lot of people don't know this kind of information, but we only started this deer pellet group survey stuff back in 1981 and it was kind of perfected so to speak with a number of deer that were put on Portland Island, right to the side of Juneau, and Matt Kirchoff and Ken Pitcher, I believe, were the ones who put the deer on and looked at how many deer were on the island and started doing transects and used that to kind of get a gauge for how many piles of pellets a deer leaves in a day and how many deer are in an area given the number of pellets piles you find on a transect.

Once that was figured out with the help of the Forest Service and Fish and Game working together over the years we've established these routes that we've done in different watersheds sometimes every two or three years in areas of concern.

Again, it's used to monitor deer population trends on winter range. That's what the pellet program is all about. We try to have three transects per watershed in selected areas and, again, we don't get to these every year. In some cases on Douglas Island, which is real easy to get to, we do, but in a lot of cases we can only get to them every two or three years.

The transects are basically one meter wide from sea level to 1,500 feet, if we can get that high. Some years the snow keeps us down below that and
some years you can't even get close. Each transect is
divided into plots and a plot is one meter wide by 20
meters long. Again, it's really a piece of cable
that's dragged through the woods and you go a half
meter on either side.

The pellet piles that you find, if you
find one pile of pellets per plot per 20-meter section,
based on the work they did on Portland Island, they
estimated that to come out to a density of about 32
deer per square mile. That's what we use as a rough
estimate.

Our survey areas, a lot of it is based
on the habitat characteristics and how much harvest
pressure there is, management concerns and obviously
accessibility is a big part in southeast Alaska. Snow
depth and duration of the snow are major factors in
deer pellet deposition and detection. That's the major
thing you have to use to really interpret the data
you're getting.

In spring 2009 we're going to do pellet
transects again. I'm not in charge of that program, so
I do not know which areas we're going to do. Karen
McCoy, who is not here, is the one that sets that up,
but we are going to be working with the Forest Service
to get to certain watersheds and do the pellet program
as we've done in past years.

One of the things, research by Todd
Brinkman, he spoke yesterday and had a very good
program and we have a lot of optimism for where that's
going to take us with additional efforts toward
understanding what deer populations are all about using
deer pellets. I think there's a lot of positive things
that can come out from his work.

The deer harvest surveys, you've
probably all have gotten one in the mail over the
years. Approximately 35 percent of the hunters who
actually get harvest tickets in each community receive
a survey. Of these, about 60 percent of the people
actually respond. We send out reminders and we get
about 60 percent of them. The total deer harvest is
extrapolated from the results of that survey
methodology. That's something we do every year. I
would guess most people again have probably gotten one
of those from the state.
Then Larry talked yesterday about this Unit 2 deer harvest report. I'm not going to spend much time on it, but again that's a cooperative effort between Fish and Game and the Forest Service. The goal is, I think, to get everybody who hunts in Unit 2 to report their activity, their deer hunting activity and the harvest to really get a handle on how many deer are coming off Prince of Wales, where they're being taken, et cetera. That's been, I think, a pretty successful program up to this point.

The deer mortality transects. I've been in Juneau 11 years. They were established many, many years ago and literally we have maps with these one mile sections of beach. Back in the late '60s, early '70s when we had the hard winters I think is when a lot of them were established. We tried to get to them especially after hard winters and walk these one-mile stretches and especially above the high tide line into the beach fringe timber. We walk and zig and zag and look to see what we're finding for deer and if we're finding dead ones, are they males or females and are they adults or young.

Again, we've not traditionally done these intensively except after hard winters we try to get out and really get a better look because those are the years we're really concerned. Phil Mooney, out of Sitka, who has been really passionate about learning more about the deer in Unit 4 and especially the northern part of Unit 4, he's been out many times this fall and he's going to be doing a bunch of efforts to get a better handle on what's going on with the deer there.

Then the beach and road surveys, that's also mostly Unit 4. Phil spent a lot of time on the road system near Hoonah to get a sense of how many deer he's seen along the road as well as boating in and out of the bays to try to count deer on the beaches and get a sense for what percentage of fawns and yearlings there are in the population and basically what the deer look like. For what it's worth, the last couple of days he's been out a lot and the deer seem to be in very good condition. There's a lot of deer on the beaches and hopefully we're not going to get a lot of snow in March.

Anyway, in conclusion, our inability to count deer across large areas anyway lends importance
to these methods of the pellets and the harvest, et
cetera. The pellet harvest data over long periods of
time gives us good trend information. The better
techniques hopefully will lead us to a much better
understanding of what's going on with deer.

So that's all I have to say.

Questions by anyone. Neil, one of the bullets said
that these surveys are done only after severe weather
storms. The reason for that and why not be consistent
with it.

MR. BARTEN: That's a very good
question. The reason we're not consistent with it is
just it takes a lot of time and energy and expense just
to get around to these spots. In years when we don't
have much snow, you obviously don't find much because
the deer aren't spending much time on the beaches. So
it's not a very robust method of sampling because,
obviously, some deer die up in the hills that never get
to the beach and some deer die on the beach and are
swept away in the tides. It does give us some
information in general about what's going on. We try
to focus on the heavy winters when we know deer are
down on the beach.

MR. BARTEN: That's actually a very
good question and a good thought because as I mentioned
yesterday some of the hunters we talk with and a lot of
the people that come in our office that's a good source
of information as to what's happening. That's
certainly possible to put those kinds of questions on
there because obviously we can't reach out to
everybody. We don't even know where half the hunters
are hunting to actually talk to them, so I think that's
a good idea to put on questions like that and get a
better insight into what's going on with the deer
populations.

MR. BARTEN: That's actually a very
good question and a good thought because as I mentioned
yesterday some of the hunters we talk with and a lot of
the people that come in our office that's a good source
of information as to what's happening. That's
certainly possible to put those kinds of questions on
there because obviously we can't reach out to
everybody. We don't even know where half the hunters
are hunting to actually talk to them, so I think that's
a good idea to put on questions like that and get a
better insight into what's going on with the deer
populations.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Anyone
else. Donald.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two questions. Neil, talking about the deer transects, have you over the years altered where these transects take place in watersheds as watershed habitat changes over time?

MR. BARTEN: Yeah, you know, again, I'm not in charge of this program, but I have a pretty good sense of that in my tenure here, which has been about 11 years. We have dropped some transects that initially were an old growth forest and then it became clear-cut. We continued to do them and then we got into that heavy second growth. As you all know, you can't hardly get through that stuff without killing yourself. In general, if it's an undisturbed habitat, we run the same transects over and over. If it's an area that gets clear-cut and becomes a heavy second growth, we simply can't get through it. Plus we can't even see the ground to really detect pellets, so we do change some of those.

One of the effects we've talked about in other meetings is the habitat changes, even if your transects aren't actually having to go through clear-cuts, habitat changes also help the deer distribute themselves.

MR. HERNANDEZ: The other question, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, Neil, I think you mentioned and again this morning Marty had brought it up as well, the type of information you get talking to hunters that are out there and in a subcommittee we always stress -- we ask for these scientific projects to be funded, but we always stress about that process. Some of the best information we'll get is talking to hunters. I think you mentioned yesterday there was some talk about actually instituting a log book program, a system where people keep track of hunting activities. You mentioned some people hunt in the same area for 20, 30 years and it's good, consistent information on what's happening in that area. Do you know of any efforts that are underway to institute a log book program? Larry, I'd put the question to you as well.

MR. BARTEN: Yeah, I do not. I think all of us biologists recognize the value, especially for a species like deer and in some cases like furbearers where you can't count them, but the hunters and trappers who come in are an incredible source of knowledge of what's going on out there, but we don't
I have a methodology at this point for getting at that from the average hunter other than our survey sources, but on our survey we ask for comments and we get some really good information from hunters.

MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Hernandez. We haven't implemented that. We have done a lot of education and providing hunters a call-in number in all of our efforts that we've done with the radio comments and also in the newspaper. Everyone who calls in I have an Excel spreadsheet developed and at the end I have comments. We talk about everything we can. The same with the front desk. We've not developed a log book and I have seen it there. It would be a good idea if we can get some people that would give us long-term information and this continues, but we haven't pursued that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Mike.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question and a follow-up kind of question about the hunter survey that was conducted in Unit 2 when you receive your deer tags. I'm wondering if you felt like you got a lot of good information from that survey and if that could be applied to all the units in southeast if it was worth the effort and expense to compile the information from those surveys. I'd like to see some sort of movement in that direction if you guys feel like it was valuable enough information.

I was a proponent of moving that forward to all hunters in southeast, but at the time they felt it was maybe an experimental thing. I'm just wondering what your take was on the information that was gathered from that.

MR. BARTEN: Yeah, I'm certainly not the best person to ask. I don't know if our standard survey in comparison to this more intensive effort on Prince of Wales if the data is increasingly better and better with a higher sample or not. It's certainly an idea to consider. Larry, you can probably talk a little more on that than I can.

MR. DICKERSON: I think it's really helped us, Mike. What it's done is we get information from hunters really how they're using GMU 2, right down to the islands and the specific roads they're hunting. Where that helps us, it makes decisions on the limited
money we have for restoration efforts and also our proposals where we want to go to the next year. It also shows us very good information on everything from the sex of the animals that are harvested and unit per effort. We're getting the last two years and we expect to this year over 90 percent respondent from those hunters that are out there. I feel it's data we can put some good stock in and move forward. It's not been extrapolated a lot, so we know more what's going on the ground.

What we don't know, because there's a different type of harvest reporting, if someone says they're not hunting in Unit 2, like if you're from Petersburg, and you don't get the Unit 2 card, we really don't have a good grasp on exactly what percentage of the hunters from Petersburg go over to Unit 2. So it would be nice in a way if there was an option that everybody is getting the same report card here in the southeast so we'd really know how many people are using Unit 2 from here or at least a percentage.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Follow up, Mike. Go ahead.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I was trying to get at and I guess I didn't make clear. I was considering that program extended to -- when you get your tags, you get the report card. Regardless of what unit you hunt in, it's recorded. Every hunter gets the card. I'm just wondering if it's worth the expense versus the mail-out surveys, which is a random thing. I've gotten the surveys and they're big envelopes and it seems like that's a big expense. I'm wondering if we just had a self-addressed card like you get for Unit 2 that you just fill out. Every hunter gets it regardless of what unit he hunts in. He puts what unit he hunts in, how many deer. Basically whatever questions you ask on that form, whether that would be a good direction to go. That's what I was getting at.

Thank you.

MR. DICKERSON: A quick response to that. Personally I think you would get more responses across the board. However, your response rate still could be, as Neil mentioned, 60 percent. That's
normally what we get, about 45 to 60 percent of the
people that send in the original harvest tags that they
have. It's the second and third reminder letters and
certified letters where we get harvest reporting up to
90 percent and plus. So I think that probably is a
good idea, but I also believe after two or three years
now that it may take more efforts to get that response
rate up.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Anyone else with a
question. Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
know we have diversity of geography in southeast Alaska
and that certain areas are straight up to 2,000 foot
elevation and there isn't going to be really a carrying
capacity there. For the certain watersheds, is there
like a formula for carrying capacity? In my opinion,
prior to these last heavy snowfall winters that we were
at carrying capacity because you were seeing the browse
all the way down. For the next winter there wouldn't
have been browse anyway. Is there an established
carrying capacity formula?

MR. BARTEN: Sorry to say again I'm not
the expert on that at all. I know Matt Kirchoff has
spoken a lot with Tom Hanley, but it isn't something
that I have much familiarity with.

MR. DICKERSON: Patty, the Forest
Service does have something inside of each WA is broken
down into VCU's, which is a smaller measurement of
unit. We have something called the habitat suitability
index, HSI. It's a scientific formula that breaks down
how much timber harvest has happened, potential old
growth and the suitability it provides deer. It comes
out with an equation that the carrying capacity will
hold 17 deer per square mile or 32. That science has
been challenged before and it's been updated. It's
what we've held up in use in our NEPA documents for
planning if there's a timber harvest sale.

There's some new science coming. I
talked with Mr. Jim Brainard here today. So that is
out there and it's being used and has been used.
Inside what's called a VCU, which is just a smaller
area that we look at other than a WA, so we do try to
use that and use the science there.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I know
there's a lot of variables that affect the deer productivity. I want to recognize that the Regional Council provided input into the Tongass plan revision. Not the most immediate one, but like 10 years ago or so. It's because of our input that the 1,500 foot beach fringe was put into the Tongass plan because we recognized that was important deer habitat in the winter season. You've got private lands where that 1,500 foot beach fringe buffer isn't in existence, so that will effect some of the variables that will affect deer productivity.

I guess I'm just saying a comment more than a question. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Anyone else.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, gentlemen. I'm going to ask Harvey if he would do something for me. He's got a list of proposals that were considered at the State fish meeting yesterday. If you would give us a little update on what happened with that.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like Mr. Baines to give me a hand here. As of yesterday, Proposal 199, which was brought up by Ketchikan Herring Association, which basically would close all herring fisheries in southeast Alaska. That one failed.

Proposal 200, which was put in by a person that stated that Salsbury Sound was a distinct stock from the Sitka herring. That one failed.

Proposal 203 as of this morning was still on the table. Proposal 204, which has to do with test fishing in the herring, that one failed.

Proposal 234, which was put in by Sitka Tribe, which was allow the higher subsistence total. It was a number put in by the tribe and the state back when they first started. It was really incomplete at that point and they didn't have enough information, so they just grabbed a figure. Over the years they found out they harvest more than that. So they raised that, I believe. It was adopted with an amendment. I'm not too sure what part of that they amended or which one they took.
Proposal 235, which was put in by the Sitka Herring Association or something like that, commercial fishermen, which would require herring harvesters for subsistence to get a permit to harvest herring. That one failed.

Proposal 209, which was equal split, put in by some of the herring fishermen, failed.

Proposal 217 put in by the State of Alaska Fish and Game, that stated that all herring stocks in southeast Alaska were one stock, which allowed them to fish Salsbury Sound as part of Sitka stock. That one passed.

That's as far as what I know it is.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Harvey.

Mr. Baines, did you have anything to add? This pretty much covered everything?

MR. BAINES: That's it.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Before we go any further on the deer issue, I'd like to acknowledge that Tricia is leaving this morning. What time?

MS. O'CONNOR: 10:30.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's pretty soon. We want to show our appreciation to your attendance here. She's going to the roundtable in Juneau with a message from us that we'd like them to participate in this meeting in the future. We wish you well. Would you like to come up and say something, closing remarks for your presence here. After that we're going to have Carrie Sykes do her testimony.

MS. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members of the Council. I do appreciate being at these meetings. I'm always amazed at what I learn just listening to this group. I'm always appreciate hearing every Council member's reports because I think those are important. I feel pretty strongly about taking that information back and sharing that with my boss because he does not always hear from everybody in all the communities, so I will definitely commit to doing that. Again, I apologize for leaving, but I will take the message to the roundtable and hopefully we'll work
towards getting a better connection between that group and this Council.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Tricia.

(Laughter)

MS. SYKES: Good morning. My name is Carrie Sykes. I work for Tlingit-Haida Central Council. I'm the subsistence and sustainable development specialist and I appreciate the opportunity to be here and provide some comments.

At the last meeting in September in Juneau I reported that we would be holding a Southeast Alaska Native Summit and the focus was going to be regional energy and economic development solutions. That summit was very successful. Central Council is planning on that being a yearly event. One part of that summit was my presentation on subsistence fuel costs and impacts to subsistence gatherers. We heard a lot about the harvesters having to make a choice between paying for heating fuel or taking a chance and buying gasoline for their boat and trying to get subsistence food. It's a very big issue.

After that summit I was also asked to go to the BIA provider's conference and I did a similar talk and it was also again very well received. It is an issue of major concern to all of the Native people who are out there trying to make these decisions about whether to buy heating oil or whether to go out and get some food for their families. It's an ongoing issue that we need to consider, particularly when we make decisions about any further restrictions to subsistence activities. I'd like you to keep that in mind when you review proposals.

Another thing I wanted to bring up is that at the last meeting I did testify about the five proposals that were in front of the RAC. I was kind of upset to find out that after all of our work at the September meeting that those proposals did pass at the Federal Subsistence level and that really causes a major concern. We took a lot of time to prepare comments and Central Council does represent over 27,000 tribal members and subsistence is a significant
importance. I was really upset to find out that those proposals did pass at that level.

I have a question for the Council. I'm just wondering, does the Federal Subsistence Board provide rationale when they don't follow the advice of the Regional Advisory Council? Mr. Chair, do they send anything back with rationale when they don't follow the recommendations of the Council.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Carrie, we're concerned about those same issues, too. In fact, the Federal Subsistence Board is supposed to give deference to the Councils. We work real hard on these proposals and the field work is done, of course, by Staff, so the real work is there right on the ground. When we accept a proposal, I've always bragged at the fact that there was a 99% chance it would get accepted by the Board. It hasn't been so lately, particularly with rural determination for Ketchikan and Saxman, Sitka and some others pertaining to C&T.

The handbook for RAC's, there's some guidelines that we follow in order to determine how the process goes. One of the things I noted in there that even though the Federal Subsistence Board will give deference or may give deference to Councils, it also says in there that it doesn't really need to. So that's the stumbling block there. As far as I'm concerned, that's a real bad policy that they have developed.

I think, you know, we just need to keep plugging away with the rural determination for Ketchikan and Saxman and the Makhnati Island closure issue and some of those others. But those are two that I really think that the Board needs to really listen to us on.

The thing about the Makhnati Island issue, it is on Federal waters. They can close it and open it. They need to listen to the people that are most affected by it and they haven't been. Another thing too, we're not allowed anymore to do an RFR, request for reconsideration. I keep plugging away at it. Every time I go there I remind them this is something that I don't think is right. So there's a lot of work we need to do to change those issues, but we need to stay on it and don't let them forget.
As Chairman, going to those Federal Subsistence Board meetings, I do my best to try to keep that on the table. I really appreciate Diane McKinley because she reminds me a lot about these things. We're doing our best. That's the way it is. They don't have to listen to you if they don't want to even if it makes a lot of sense.

MS. SYKES: I know in my letters I always do mention the due deference and I really think that this is important. As part of ANILCA, this Regional Advisory Council exists and it's an avenue for public participation and comment. I think that if they're not at least providing rationale about why they didn't take the recommendations of the RAC, it seems to be a problem with the process that all of us need to continue to bring to their attention.

The Regional Advisory Council does a lot of work at these meetings and it costs a lot of money for people to participate. For me to travel here, I have a very small subsistence budget for travel, so I really have to select what I go to. There's a lot of tribal members who can't travel to provide testimony.

It seems to me if they're not going to give due deference and they're not going to be providing more weight to the advice of the Council, that they're, in effect, eliminating a part of the public process and that's a very important part of a Federal process that I think we need to bother them more about and I really want to do some follow up on that with the Council. I think it's a problem with the process, so I'm going to continue to work on that too.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Carrie. Before you go any further I'll bring your attention to a letter we received from Mr. Fleagle, Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board. We have a copy available for you. It talks about Section .501 in ANILCA. The Southeast Region's position on various proposals and everything. Of course, the Federal Subsistence Board does give some rationals as to the reason why they acted the way they did.

We do need to keep reminding them of the hard work that is done on the local level and that they shouldn't just arbitrarily disregard it when it gets to their level because it's very important to us and to the people whom we serve.
Go ahead. Continue.

MS. SYKES: Okay. I'm glad to see there is a response, but I really do agree that people at the local level know more about their local resources and I think there needs to be more due deference given to the Regional Advisory Councils.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Before you go any further on that issue, before I forget it, particularly with the Makhnati Island issue, and rural determination, those are going to be coming up, I think, at the next Board meeting. We need to get as many people from southeast Alaska to go to that Board meeting and testify on behalf of these proposals.

I'm going to give you an example. When they were doing the rural determination for Ketchikan, they did the same thing for Kodiak. Of course, Lee Wallace and a couple other people from southeast Alaska were the only people there to testify. Lee didn't know they were going to combine Saxman and Ketchikan together, which brought their population threshold up higher and that's how come the Board voted to make it non-rural.

On the other hand, Kodiak had 30 people come from that community to testify on behalf of their proposal. They had people even come from the Coast Guard base. They said we're transient, not permanent, so we shouldn't be counted as part of the population base. As a result of that testimony Kodiak did get their rural determination. It's just identical to Ketchikan and Saxman. We need people to be there. As many people the tribal governments can send to that meeting, the better it will be for us.

Thank you. Go ahead.

MS. SYKES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, it was unfortunate I didn't get to go to that meeting. It was due to medical reasons, but I really understood the importance of people being there. I think other people have funding constraints to be able to participate. But I will be at the next one. As part of the whole thing too in getting more people to testify about these issues is educating them more. That's another thing I'm going to be working more with the tribes to educate them more on process so they can be effective in getting their concerns brought to the
table. That's very important.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And while you're on that issue let me just say something before I forget again. The Central Council is the vehicle on how you can get all of the tribes that are under your umbrella together. I know that you're really overloaded at times with the job that you do and I hope they'll be able to take some of the pressure off you so that you can get other people to help you in that effort. Just a thought of mine. Those tribes that are not self-governing and under Tlingit and Haida, you people are going to represent them and if you can get as many people from those areas who can testify, that would be a big plus as well. Just food for thought. Go ahead.

MS. SYKES: That's part of what I want to do with education. I do send a lot of this information out, particularly when it comes to request for proposals, but I think a lot of the tribes don't know how to proceed to get the proposals forward, so I really want to work on that. You are right, there's more work than I can do. I just had a meeting last month with our President Martin and with Bob Loesher, who is the chair of ANBA, Grand Camp, their subsistence committee. There are concerns that there's not enough work being done on subsistence. There are so many issues that it's really difficult to keep up with all of them.

Right now we're going to be developing a working group so that I can get more assistance to get all the issues out and to educate people and make sure we have a coordinated response and that we can get people to agree on the issues and come together to try to get our voice heard. That is very important and that is something that I am working on. Hopefully I can get more support from the other tribes.

Back to the process and some of the concerns. I've mentioned before, I think it was at the Sitka meeting, in August 2007 I sent out a ballot to all of the tribes in Alaska and it was to prioritize all the top subsistence concerns. We did get quite a few responses. I think I got almost 60. I've shown this pie chart before about what the top concerns are. I wanted to mention again my concern about the memorandum of understanding that was signed
between the Federal Subsistence Board and the State of Alaska. There's great concern that the Federal Subsistence Board is taking a lot of the State of Alaska positions. This was shown by this ballot. For the number one priority, 12 percent of the people that responded stated that is their top concern. For the second priority, 26 percent stated that was their second priority. It's really a concern to Central Council. I received a copy of a letter that AFN sent out and I did a letter also.

We were concerned that there wasn't RAC involvement in the review of that MOU before it was signed. I did get a copy and I haven't had a chance to look at it because I've been out of the office, but that's of great concern that that didn't go to the RAC and there was no public participation or any opportunity for any kind of input of concerns for that. If we're going to be effective, we should be able to look at that kind of document before it's signed. I know there was a proposed MOU out that didn't get signed and then this one was quickly pushed through and I don't think that's right. It's an important document and it should have had better review by the Councils statewide.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And while you're on the subject, there were several other RAC Chairs that were concerned about this and we were emailing back and forth. We all felt that the Board overstepped their bounds by not allowing us to look at it. It was addressed at the Board meeting by some of us. It was all after the fact, as you said, and found out, you know, that -- oh, I can't remember -- the guy's name is Neil somebody who represents the Secretary of Interior, was really trying to push it and have it all signed off before the new administration came on board.

MS. SYKES: So you say it was addressed. Is there going to be any action?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I really can't remember, but I don't think so.

MS. SYKES: That's still a great concern. I don't know whether there will be any changes with our new administration, but that was very concerning to the tribes and to Central Council.

I also wanted to mention, too, that
Central Council has been supporting Sitka in their herring issue. We did do a letter to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and we provided resolutions of support for the proposals that were submitted by the Sitka Tribe. Proposal 203, which was requesting changes in the harvest level for the Sitka sac roe fisheries. We supported 204. That was to decrease the test setting in traditional subsistence areas. We also supported Proposal 234 to increase the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence.

We did oppose 235, which was going to expand the permitting and reporting requirements for the herring spawn. This is of really great concern. People have been calling me a lot about the Sitka herring. This is the last real spawning area. The resources are relied on by people throughout the state and even in the Lower 48. The herring eggs are shipped out. I really am concerned. Like I said, I continue to get phone calls about this. I just want to mention that Central Council did do resolutions to support the tribe and it will continue to follow this issue and provide support for that wherever we can.

I think the last thing I wanted to mention was this bear working group. We want to make sure that we include the tribes in that also. That's all I have for now.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Carrie. It's always good to see you come to these meetings and we look forward to your future participation.

Harvey, do you have a question.

MR. KITKA: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Thank you, Carrie, for your kind words about Makhnati and Sitka Tribe's stand on this.

On one of your talks there, educating the people to come up and testify, we not only need the people to come up and testify, but we also need the Native community to find a way to get more Natives out there, even if they don't testify, to show that they're backing the people that are talking.

When the Fish Board came to Sitka and they looked at the audience and saw who they were talking to, there probably was maybe 10 Natives within the Board area that were going to testify. If it was
such a big concern of the Native communities in southeast, we should have had more. We should have had enough to where when the Board looked out at the audience they would have seen a Native community that was really ready to support. Some of these things need to be brought to the Native communities so they understand. They don't necessarily have to testify, but if they're just standing there. This is something Floyd brought to my attention. It made a lot of sense to me.

Thank you.

MS. SYKES: I agree, Harvey. I think we do need more people there. Like I said, I'm trying to figure out ways I can get more people educated. One thing that my boss is working on right now is a web program he's developed called My Tribal TV and I'd like to be able to start having videos of different meetings that people could access through the web. So we're looking at ways we can get more information to the tribes where it's not going to cost them money to have to travel to meetings.

I did want to mention too that we also went to the legislative hearings on the Sitka herring issue. That was the Fisheries Committee. That happened on February 10th. I did make that meeting and brought our resolutions up and made sure they were a part of the record. We are trying to be there whenever we can and make sure the Native concerns are heard.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Floyd.

MR. KOOKESH: Hi, Carrie. Thank you very much for bringing those points up. I think they're very valid points. To talk a little about the Maknati issue, they have the signs out there. I don't know why they're not applying it and listening to what people are saying. We know for a fact that the fishery is in trouble.

The one thing I keep hearing from the Chair to Carrie is that you need to do the work for us and that doesn't make sense to me. All of a sudden we need to go and testify. I don't know where the break is here. I believe we have BIA and BLM personnel here that can probably tell us about their voting record so that we can at least be able to address it here, find out how the Bureau is voting. How both of them are...
1 voting. See how they're voting on the issue of
2 Makhnati and Saxman, and C&T just in general.
3
4 We really need to have this system work
5 for us. We can't be, like our Chairman is alluding to,
6 to just forgive them and just forget this. This is not
7 how this process is supposed to work. We're all going
8 to lose in this if the Federal Subsistence Board
9 doesn't start following our recommendations. I'm sure
10 they can discount us as advisory only and throw FACA at
11 us, but that still doesn't solve our problem. I know
12 when you mentioned the MOU seven years in the making
13 and it never once crossed our table. I've been here
14 nine years, going on ten, and we haven't even seen an
15 MOU. Something is wrong here. Somebody is not doing
16 their work. I also believe that, as I mentioned
17 earlier in my testimony to the Board of Fish, that the
18 Federal Subsistence Board along with the State Boards
19 of Fish and Boards of Game are all failing in their
20 duties. If anybody knows this process and what's wrong
21 with it, it's the user groups and nobody is listening
22 to them.
23
24 We shouldn't, Mr. Chairman, just depend
25 on Carrie. Something has to give at that level. We
26 can't just say I don't think anything is going to
27 happen after they talked about their concerns about the
28 memorandum. Something has to happen. We just can't
29 waste our time. I'm sitting here for nine years and
30 somebody is telling me you guys are just an Advisory
31 Committee and your opinion doesn't matter, am I
32 supposed to sit here for nine more years and waste my
33 time? Is that what I want to do with my life? I don't
34 think so. Mr. Chairman.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Floyd. I
37 think what I'm really alluding to, Carrie -- I'm not
38 trying to put more work on you. It's just the fact
39 that you guys are catalysts where you can influence the
40 tribes that you're responsible for and you get them
41 more and more involved in the process. If we can
42 accomplish that somehow, that would be a great plus to
43 us. I'm not trying to say that it's all on you, no.
44 It's on individual tribes, communities and so forth, to
45 step forth and make their wishes known. Bring it to us
46 and then we can take it to the Federal Subsistence
47 Board. Whether they give us deference or not, it's
48 their problem. We have done our work. Maybe we have
49 failed on certain issues, but at least hope that we
50 have done our best to take that issue to them for their
consideration.

As far as how the Board votes and so forth, there's a lot of political goings-on that takes place even before that happens. We know where some of those Board members stand on certain issues and to try to influence or change their way of thinking and so forth is very difficult.

I just wanted to clarify that. We do have an important part to play here. I really believe the Board should give us deference. It's interesting to see how they combined Ketchikan and Saxman together in order to bring the population threshold up. Both of those communities have characteristics of being rural communities. So our effort is to try and separate them again. It was done at a very short notice. Lee Wallace didn't even know this was going to happen. Then he was taken aback and he couldn't respond. So we've had to try to play catch-up on that. I just wanted to share that with you.

Thank you.

MS. SYKES: I realize that Central Council's input is very important. We do represent a lot of tribal members. 27,000 is a lot of tribal members. We're one of the largest Federally recognized tribes. Tribal consultation and Federal processes is very important. We have a government-to-government relationship with Federal agencies. That was put in place by Clinton's initiative and it's really very important. I think sometimes some of the Federal agencies think that they've come and had a meeting with us that they've done their tribal consultation and that's not enough. It needs to be an ongoing discussion and negotiation of issues. The tribal input is very important. I think the tribe really should have more weight as far as getting the recognition these issues need.

About the MOU. I did get an email that I was going to get a response letter and I don't believe I received that yet. I would like to see what their response to that is. About the Ketchikan/Saxman issue, that really upsets me too. I grew up in Ketchikan. I know that Saxman does a lot of subsistence. They really rely on it. Some of our communities who are economically disadvantaged it's critical to their survival.
When the Ketchikan issue was being discussed, I did talk to Denny Bshor, particularly because we just got through with an acknowledgment ceremony where they acknowledged that they removed smokehouses and other structures from the Tongass, which a lot of the tribes will disagree who's right it is to have structures there. The tribes will argue that that's their traditional use areas they've been using for years. Denny's response to me was that although he was sympathetic to the concerns, he had to go by the letter of the law and make sure that the Forest Service wasn't going to be opening themselves up for possible litigation. That sympathy didn't help with that rural status and that's really upsetting to me.

I grew up in Ketchikan and I grew up in a subsistence lifestyle, so when I see that kind of stuff happen and when I see the Sitka herring issue that's going on and the resource that's in danger, it's really upsetting. My grandbabies love herring eggs and I want them to be able to have those herring eggs when they grow up for their children. So I really am concerned about these major issues and I will continue to come to the Board and bring those up.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Carrie.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman Adams and Ms. Sykes for your testimony. It's troubling to me that after 14 years as a Regional Advisory Council meeting on a twice yearly basis and sometimes more that there still is a lack of ability to participate in this process, the lack of being able to know what to do to participate in this subsistence advisory process. It's something that we, as a RAC, have addressed over the years is that there needs to be more of a public outreach to the communities. Our process here is open and available to every citizen of the region, of the nation, to come and participate in. We get a good showing in our rural areas. When they leave, they say, wow, we have a much better understanding of the process.

So we're glad you're here and you can see this process and get a better understanding of it. That being said, it's not to diminish what you've presented to us. What you said is really important.

ANILCA, you know -- if you know the
statement my ways are not your ways and you may not
understand my ways, but what I'm trying to say is that
my way, subsistence way, are not your ways. The greater
powers that be may not understand our subsistence way
of life, so Congress, invoking its constitutional
authority, implemented ANILCA, Title VIII. There's a
lot of provisions in here that we need to focus on and
we do. If you go to like Section .812, it says the
Secretary, in cooperation with the State and other
appropriate Federal agencies, shall undertake research
on fish and wildlife and subsistence uses on the public
lands, which we have. This is mandated by Congress.

If you go on to Section .813, it says
in number six, the Secretary, within every three-year
period in consultation with the Secretary of
Agriculture, will prepare and submit a report to the
president of the Senate and Speaker of the House. Six
is a description of those actions taken or which may
need to be taken in the future to permit the
opportunity for continuation of activities relating to
subsistence uses on public lands.

We're supposed to continue. We're not
supposed to be regulated out of existence. We're
supposed to be regulated into existence. We came into
this with subsistence being minimized and we're
bringing it back up. There was controversy through the
years and there continues to be controversy, but we're
trying to do it. We're here. We're meeting.

I don't know. You got my blood going a
little. I just wanted to say we're trying. We're
working on it. Thank you.

MS. SYKES: Thank you, Patty. I agree,
there is a lot more data that is being brought forth.
I was particularly happy when I went to the legislative
hearings for the Fisheries Committee about the herring
that there were three scientists there who were very
concerned. These are scientists who study herring.
Sitka Tribe has been getting a lot more data together.
I agree with you too about being regulated out of
existence.

Of particular concern to me, especially
with the high energy costs, were the proposals that we
discussed at the last meeting about subsistence in a
Juneau road area. People don't have the money to go
fill up their boat and run 50 miles. If they can
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subsist from a road system, then why not. Bob Loesher brought up a very important point during that meeting too. There's more and more roads that are being put in. Does that mean we're going to get pushed further and further from subsistence and have to go farther? There's a lot of concerns.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Carrie.

Anyone else.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Gunalcheesh. We'll see you next time.

MS. SYKES: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We'll take a 10-minute break. We'll be back to continue on with the deer issue.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We're back in session now. Mr. Baines just left here a few minutes ago. I guess there's going to be some action items done by the Board of Fish that will be interesting to us and he's going to come back and give us a report and keep us updated.

We're going to move on to item number 12 now, recommendations on deer management issues. Each of you should have in your packet a couple papers like this. One says Southeast Alaska Subsistence Deer Management Recommendations and then there's another one that says Southeast Alaska In-Season Recommendation for Subsistence Management of Wildlife.

The first sheet I alluded you to are principals that will be taken into consideration and some guidelines. We want to express our appreciation to the committee that worked on this, Mr. Bangs, Mr. Douville, Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Kookesh. We'll take a look at these now.

Mr. Bangs, would your group like to make a report. I'm kind of at a loss where to go, how to proceed. Let's just go over it.
It says recent events affecting management of the subsistence deer harvest in Southeast Alaska have highlighted the need for the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to provide recommendations for guidelines to use in managing this important subsistence resource. The extreme snowfall events in the 2007 and 2008 seasons have resulted in special actions to restrict deer harvests in northern southeast the State Board of Game has reduced the harvest limit of deer in Cleveland Peninsula and the December subsistence deer season in Unit 3 was not opened. The Council continues to support the findings of the 2006 Unit 2 deer planning report and finds that some of those same recommendations are applicable for subsistence management of deer in the remainder of the Southeastern Alaska Area.

These are Council recommendations. Again, these are principles that we have come up with. Recommendation number one. Current conditions concerning harvest, population status and subsistence uses must be adequately identified.

The estimates of deer harvest must be accurate enough and to the appropriate geographic scale to detect real changes in deer harvests. Sufficient knowledge of deer population status and trends is necessary to address future proposals that suggest changes to hunting seasons or harvest limits. Deer uses and needs must accurately describe the current situation.

Two. Support research projects required to address information deficiencies. Information needs may include evaluation of various methods to determining deer population levels and trends. The Council will identify specific geographic locations with special information needs.

Three. Maintain awareness of decisions regarding use of the land that could affect access or the habitat of deer on Federal public land. Knowledge of planned activities such as the road access management plan, changes in land ownership and timber planning will allow the Council to make meaningful comments for the protection of subsistence deer harvests.

Four. Coordinate management with the
Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Council recommends an annual meeting between the Federal subsistence management Staff and ADF&G. Collaboration between the agencies will facilitate review of available information about harvest, deer population trends, and subsistence use and needs. The Council requests a Council representative attend Board of Game meetings where Southeast Alaska wildlife issues are discussed.

So why don't we take those principles and maybe talk about them a little bit and see where we want to go. Any comments.

Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think what we attempted to do in this little subcommittee that we worked on this winter was to try and bring to the entire region some of the ideas and principals we talked about in the Unit 2 subcommittee. I think that's been fairly clear.

Then the second document, the recommendations for subsistence management of wildlife, that is a little more specific towards what's happened here most recently with a lot of the in-season actions and special requests. We felt we needed to have a discussion on how we were going about some of this in-season management and can we do a better job of responding to some of the recent conditions that we've had, particularly in the northern end of the region.

So going back to this first document, overall deer management recommendations, I think we've done a pretty good job here in the last day and this morning just getting a good understanding of where the Council has progressed in its information gathering in the last several years. If we can bring some of that new technique and knowledge and cooperation with the State to the region as a whole, I think that would be pretty beneficial.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh.

MR. HERNANDEZ: So we can discuss these individual points and see if that Council as a whole would agree with them. Also, I think we really need a more detailed discussion of what we're going to do with this in-season management and also concurrently if
there are any new proposals that need to be developed
to deal with the current situation.

That's what we attempted to do.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Donald. I
should have called on your first since you were the
chair of that committee. What's the wish of the
Council. Any more comments or questions on the
principles that he identified in that first paper.

Harvey and then Floyd.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
just have a question and it's more for you and Bob, I
think. What kind of voice would this Council person
have at the Board of Game meetings? What kind of
topics would he be allowed to talk to? It seems like
there's some very strict guidelines on what they can
say. I wonder about that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I can shed a little bit
of light on it and then maybe Bob can fill in the rest.
The Council would not be allowed to address anything at
any public forum if we hadn't already discussed it in
this forum here and made our wishes known through a
proposal or letters. Bob, do you have anything to add.

MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.
That agenda or that sentence actually references an
invitation from Denby Lloyd, who is the Commissioner of
Fish and Game for the State. At the January
Subsistence Board meeting, he provided some testimony
to the Board and in there he said that both the Board
of Game and Board of Fish would appreciate input from
the Regional Councils. He would encourage Regional
Councils to spend some time with the issues that both
Boards were going to be discussing at their meeting and
to send a representative to their meeting to provide
this really unique perspective provided by the
Councils.

Now, that being said, Mr. Chairman is
correct. In those meetings, only the action items the
Council has adopted as a position statement you can
present to the Board of Fish or Board of Game as a
position of the Council. You would also be there as a
representative of the Council if there was some
exchange or questioning by the Boards themselves.
At this last Board of Fish meeting, Floyd Kookesh provided some testimony and sat in on the committee process. I've had some discussions and his testimony was very well received and certainly is valuable in promoting the interests of subsistence users at the Board level, which is something that's been lacking, quite frankly.

The next time we will have the opportunity to go to the Board of Game will be in two years and the next time we will discuss Board of Fish issues is three years. So we'll have time to develop some statements or some action items regarding positions or issues that we think is important that are going to be discussed.

The Office of Subsistence Management has said that they'll provide funding for this person to attend and participate fully. This is a terrific opportunity I think and somewhat of a departure from the State's positions regarding input from the Council and it's something we should take advantage of.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson, did they provide per diem and funding for Floyd to attend the meeting?

MR. LARSON: Yes, they did.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: He didn't get it though.

MR. KOOKESH: They cancelled my check.

MR. LARSON: We'll send a different person next time.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No, I trust Floyd when he goes to those meetings. I think the tide is changing where the cooperation between State and Federal is getting a lot better. At the Federal Subsistence Board meeting, you know, Denby Lloyd sits next to me and I'm always kicking him in the shins all the time. No, I don't.

Floyd, did you have a comment. Go ahead.
MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. I don't know if you all had an opportunity to read my statement that I made to the Board of Fish, but I did try to stick to the guidelines I was told about.

To talk about the deer management issue here, I don't know where you'd like to go with this, but I know where I'd like to see us go.

Last year I printed out all the minutes and I have a comment from Bill Thomas, the representative for Angoon. I believe Neil was there at the time. Bill's recommendation was, if it was up to me I'd make it a local hunt only because I spend a lot of time in Hoonah. That is their primary food source. To me, I live in Haines. If I want subsistence, I go to the food houses. If I lived in Juneau, it would be Fred Meyer. But that is their Fred Meyer to them. And this was Bill. My comment was, Neil, did you get that. That was my comment to Neil last year.

Because of the harsh winters we had and based on the approach we took at the time the State had made a recommendation to close, I believe it was December 14th, they wanted us to close it along with them.

I'll bring out a few points here. One of the things that was done in this process was the call was made to individual Council members without us coming together as a body and asking our opinion. That was one thing that was wrong that we didn't do, was come together as a body and address the issue.

The other thing that wasn't done was that when the issue was being decided they had known prior to August 1st of the season opening that we had a harsh winter and to shut it down would have been the right thing. To wait for this long on the State's part was wrong and for all of us just to have this reactive instead of proactive position to me is not the way we should be doing management. That's not good management. If we're really going to do this right, we need to make these decisions prior to August 1st. If we're going to decide to get some in-season regulatory authority and a consultation process, it needs to go to the affected user the closest instead of just calling, for example -- no disrespect, Mr. See -- calling Hoonah and saying what do you think and they say close it, but Angoon says why. We're on different systems.
My point on that one is we got to break up Unit 4 into a system that works for all of us. I have a lot of respect for you, too, but calling the Chair and asking him to close Unit 4, the consultation process needs to be bigger than you. We all need to be part of it. Hoonah needs to be part of it. I guess Harvey. And Angoon, those affected, and Petersburg and Pelican.

See, the points I'm bringing out is if there's a concern for the stocks, then we need to properly address it if is what we do is say that subsistence is our highest priority, then let's vote rural. We're talking about a rural hunt here. If we affect the urban hunt. This is because of the conservation concern. I believe, if I'm correct, there's a conservation concern that's being addressed here. We've seen the solid data, the pellet count that was put in front of us yesterday. That's one thing. Because of the record snowfalls we've had in the past two years something needs to be done.

My other recommendation on that regard, if you really want to do conservation and I know we all like to hunt, but we also like to believe and respect that the resource is going to be there for us and I know for a fact from my position I'd be happy to take a back seat and cut back our harvest limit, reduce our ability to take five or six, whatever we're allowed by the area, and reduce those amounts. Also shorten our season if that's what it's going to take.

As I stated, I came out of Sitka and it was unfortunate for someone who lives a subsistence lifestyle to hear that last year we might not get any herring eggs this year. I think I was telling Harvey we might have to eat last year's herring eggs next year. We shouldn't have to go there. Maybe in the fishery with the politics being the way it is, that's the way it's going to go down in Sitka. But we have a chance here to address Unit 4 and fix it.

I tried to go through the 50 pages of your Unit 2 stuff and I said forget that. I had asked the gentleman that was here talking about the deer pellets, they should have just made a cheat sheet for us so we could skim through it fast. I'd like to see us do this the right way and take an approach that addresses it at both State and Federal.
I don't know what more I can add to this. I'd just like to see that population be strong. I don't know what's going on out there, how much deer are out there, but we certainly need to look at it right now and not wait until December 14th.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kookesh. I think we're trying to do what you're alluding to. Later on we're going to be looking at the proposals we're going to propose and also some of the special actions that we anticipate will take place.

I think you hit upon exactly a couple things under the guidelines, the Southeast Alaska in-season recommendations, items number 2 and 3. You adequately and expertly identified the situation here. Let's go through it together.

Number 2 says: Whenever the Council meeting schedule permit, recommendations will be sought from the Council prior to implementing either an emergency or temporary special action. If the Council is not meeting in a relevant time frame, the Board or delegated in-season manager will consult with the Chair of the Council prior to implementing or extending the proposed action. The Chair of the Council shall consult with affected Council members or others, with knowledge of that particular location or resource prior to making a recommendation on the proposed action.

And then item number 3 also I think addresses your concern. Preseason planning and post-season evaluation are important components of an effective coordinated in-season management program. Federal Staff will report to the Council and Federal in-season managers at the winter Council meeting, any special circumstances that may require either a wildlife special action or temporary action. In addition, the report will include an evaluation of the effectiveness of any previous year's special actions. The Council will schedule time to review Federal wildlife management plans during the winter meeting.

I think you addressed those issues and I think these are some of the answers that has come as a result of that. Hopefully this addresses your concern. Is there any more comments or concerns that you want to bring up on this issue.

Floyd, go ahead.
MR. KOOKESH: On the Federal part we do have a January hunt and if we give the hunters enough time -- you know, they have intelligence like the rest of us, give them enough time, let them know that you're going to have a shorter January season if it means preserving the stock because all the bucks are running around without racks anyway. I know Mr. See had a concern about the January hunt and I don't hunt January.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think one of the discussions we've had is the fact those late in-season hunts take place when you can't tell the difference between a deer and a buck and that's been a big concern.

I also know that Hoonah has been self-regulating themselves. They decided they were not going to hunt any deer that year because there was a shortage, so they started supplying themselves with other sources of food. I think that's a good example to follow.

Any other comments. Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had to go back to Unit 2 deer. Maybe we need to go back and look at what they had to do with the non-rural hunters that are coming in. I saw in the graph that the State put out where the non-rural people are in Unit 4 in bigger numbers than the local users. When you start having a problem within a local area, which Floyd alluded to, they should be allowed to hunt what they need first. If they're going to regulate a season, at least they should be allowed to get theirs.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Harvey.

Anyone else. Floyd.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. In order to bring this together properly, I believe there needs to be an education process that says everyone needs to understand all the deer are in the rural areas, all the fish are in the rural areas. We need to do it so that the urban hunter understands there's a concern in the rural areas and this is the Southeast Regional Advisory Council's job to address it and to let them know we're not just picking on them, but in order to conserve the
stocks we have to take this approach. I know they're
understand if they know we're not out to get them.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any more comments.
Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. My observation is if we, as a Council,
wanted to change any regulation that would affect the
non-subsistence users, that would have to be done with
a proposal, is my understanding. That would have to go
through the full public process.

If we want to do in-season management
actions, it seems like those types of actions would
have to be restricted to probably just the subsistence
users. I don't know if I'm correct on that. Anybody
could comment.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Donald.
What I'd like to do right now is go back a little bit.
If we want to move on any of these, we need a motion to
adopt and then we can discuss the heck out of them some
more.

MS. PHILLIPS: What are we adopting?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: This and this. We've
kind of gone over it already. Do you have this in your
packet?

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. That's what
we're talking about. Mr. Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
think there's several issues that are all tied with
this. One of them has to do with the collaboration we
discussed about trying to be aware and have the pulse
on what the State is doing, whether it's moose, deer,
whatever.

As to their emergency, what they call
an EO, to stop in-season hunting, fishing, whatever
because of conservation concerns, one of the things
that came up is we don't have a clear precise protocol
on what to do. I think part of it has to do with the
lack of communication between the Board of Fish, Board
of Game, their system and the Federal system. We
talked about how we can make, say for instance, a deer in-season management decision. Do we subdivide a unit, like what Floyd was alluding to, Unit 4. It's hard to do a blanket thing.

Anyway, what I'm getting at is I think if we're going to come up with a product from these recommendations and guidelines, we need to make sure that we include some way that we can stay on top of what's going on. Just for instance, the Board of Fish is meeting in Sitka at the same time we're meeting here. That's not a good decision. These things need to be looked at. I think it's important if we're going to come up with a product, we need to figure out what we want to do and what this Council feels is important to manage the resources.

I'm not sure where we want to go with this, but I think this was meant as a guideline for some way we can come up with a product of a statement and a direction we can follow in-season, pre-season. Floyd said December 14th is too late, but in a lot of cases that's when the decision has to be made. If you have 24 inches of snow in a few days, all of a sudden you have an issue. I just think we need to collaborate and have a way to communicate with the state and figure out what we need as subsistence users and be able to follow up on the subsistence needs.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bangs. What's the wish of the Council? Would you like to adopt these two recommendations and then work off these two pages and tweak it the way we want it and then go from there? If that's the case, then I think we need a motion to do so.

MR. SEE: I so move. I move to adopt.

MR. KOOKESH: Second.

MS. PHILLIPS: Adopt what?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: To adopt the Southeast Alaska subsistence deer management recommendations and Southeast Alaska in-season recommendations for subsistence management of wildlife. It's been moved and seconded.
Patty, do you have something.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I understand you want to move forward and have a motion on the table. I'm uncomfortable with the casualness of the motions being made. I think we should be more formal. We've agreed we would follow Robert's Rules of order. If there is a motion to be made, I would prefer it be stated what that motion is.

Thank you for clarifying what the motion was. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Mr. See, you know the procedure.

MR. SEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So in the future. Go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Are we in discussion?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MS. PHILLIPS: I appreciate the effort that the subcommittee went through to bring forth recommendations to the Regional Advisory Council on the Southeast Alaska subsistence deer management recommendations, Council recommendations, number one on the deer harvest reporting. In my opinion, the 60 percent return surveys on the mailouts is enough of a return to get valid harvest data. I think it should be a voluntary return like it is now. The mailout could be expanded upon to ask more questions of the deer hunters.

As far as the Southeast Alaska in-season recommendations for subsistence management of wildlife, number 2, The Chair of the Council shall consult with affected Council members. Previously, when we've had the Regional Coordinator also contact various Council members and there may be times when you're not able to get a hold of you and you can't make those calls, so it would be good to put in there or the Regional Coordinator.

I have to comment about Hoonah is self-regulating themselves. We're about providing subsistence opportunities. The special action to close
the northeast Chichagof use area, that was to follow
the State Alaska Department of Fish and Game closure,
so they closed Federal also. Hoonah is self-regulating
themself if the loudest voice speaking is being heard.
We're here to represent those minority people who
aren't going to stand up and say, hey, gas is $8 a
gallon. I don't have any income. They're not going to
stand up there and say, hey, I need this hunt. But
somebody who is really loud and vocal saying we've got
to shut this just because I don't agree with the
January hunt. Well, there's going to be guys and gals
that go out there and do it anyway because they need
it. They need to eat. They don't have anything in
their freezers. This is what we heard on POW. People
don't have the resources to go to Fred Meyers, so
that's why we're providing that opportunity.

I agree with Don, we need to change the
regulations that affect the non-subsistence user if we
do have a conservation problem in a specific area. I
live in an area that's wilderness and so I have a
benefit of a non-timber harvest area. But, like
Hoonah, they're surrounded by timber-harvested areas,
so they have different land management issues that are
affecting the deer productivity. I don't know. Non-
rural hunter harvest should be addressed and we should
be not restricting subsistence use. There's my
comments.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Floyd.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. To talk to
the document that was put on the floor by Mr. See. To
go back to the Council recommendations on number one
about the fact that it's voluntary. If you really want
to get to 100 percent, it might be a good idea that
Regional Advisory Council, State of Alaska and the
tribes all work on this if you want to get your numbers
right. The tribes always want to be involved in this
process. This is an opportunity to involve the tribes
so we can get 100 percent outreach and get those
surveys back.

I do know from being in Sitka that
Helen Dangle said that they were very aggressive about
their data acquisition, getting stuff back, and they
are almost in the 100 percent range for that. I might
be wrong.

The other thing is on number 4, to
coordinate management ADF&G. I spoke earlier about it and I'll just give you the shorter version. Shorter seasons, reduce bag limits, address the non-rural hunt. To go to your number 2 on subsistence management of wildlife, Patty talked about if you can't get a hold of the chair and following our Robert's Rule of Order process, it's probably best to go to the vice chair. We also need to include the coordinator and the in-season manager. I'm sure we have some technology where we can get four phones on the same line talking at the same time.

I just want to say one more thing. The one thing about the December 14th issue that was brought out for the Angoon area was that it's not timely and there's a conservation concern. It's not timely in the sense that the Angoon hunter was waiting for the snowfall and banking on the January hunt because nobody had told them August 1st we're going to shut it December 14th. They would have been prepared for that, but nobody told them that. The price of fuel was a factor. It was over $5 a gallon at that time. These guys weren't prepared for that. They wanted to get their deer.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Mr. Kitka, please.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had maybe one comment. Neil, in his report to us, he did say there was a difference in Unit 4 between the mainland and Juneau and Douglas, so they must already have a vehicle in their works that would kind of address this issue if they would look at it as the subsistence and non-subsistence area.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Harvey. Did you have something to add.

MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to clarify one issue. It is possible.....

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Would you please identify yourself.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Maureen Clark with the Office of Subsistence Management. It is possible to restrict non-Federally-qualified users,
non-rural users, with in-season actions.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Anyone else. Cal, come hither.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Cal Casipit, acting Interagency Staff Committee member for the Forest Service. I just wanted to add to what Maureen said. She's correct that if the in-season manager is delegated the authority like we have for fish, we can close for conservation purposes or to continue subsistence uses.

I think what you're trying to get at here, especially this one here, the in-season recommendations for subsistence management of wildlife. Since there hasn't been a delegation except for Unit 4, if you want to extend that delegation to all the other units, your recommendation could include whatever you wanted. If you don't want to delegate closures, that could be in your recommendation as well. What I'm trying to say here is that you're trying to build a recommendation to the Board for what you would like to see for in-season management of wildlife. It's under your authority to decide what that delegation would entail and what would be there.

I just wanted to say at least for the fisheries stuff the in-season managers are delegated the authority to close for conservation and to continue subsistence uses.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Cal. Maybe we need to talk about that. Do you want to expand that to other in-season managers as well. Right now I guess it's just addressing that one unit.

Mr. Larson, do you have something to offer.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. Maybe I could speak to item one and what is in this document in the in-season recommendations. Item one, it asks to revisit the delegations of authority and to grant the same delegation of authority for wildlife as what is currently being offered for fish and to those same positions.
So right now if you would look back in this document on page 2 and page 3, you'll see the current mix of in-season management authorities for wildlife and you can see that it's a variety of different delegations and different authorities to different people for different species.

The recommendation is to simplify that and have the same people that currently hold in-season management authority for all fish to have the same authorities for all wildlife. That's a different scenario than what we have right now. What we have right now is not built on a plan or a recommendation to move forward. What we have right now is a matter of dealing with issues as they come forward over the last 15 or 20 years. So what this does is provide a strategic plan and a recommendation to the Board for in-season management authorities similar to fish for wildlife to the same people.

Item 2, if we look at the regulations regarding the role of the Council in in-season management both in Federal regulations and in ANILCA, the role is not clear. It references that the Council should be involved, but there's no regulations that say how they should be involved. What this does is provide the Board and the Staff an expectation of how the Council is going to be involved in in-season management.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.

Patty, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's clear to me that we have two different sets of recommendations that are in one motion and I would prefer that we have a motion for each separate set of recommendations. It's getting confusing jumping back and forth. I'd rather focus on one set of recommendations, deal with that and then go to the other set of recommendations. I do appreciate the clarification that Robert just gave us on the in-season recommendations, but which one are we focusing on.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We are bouncing back and forth. Why don't we just go ahead and -- what I was trying to do earlier was take this one right here and address it and work off of that for now.
MR. KOOKESH: Which one is that?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The principles, Southeast Alaska subsistence deer management recommendations, the one page one.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. In following this process under the recommendations for subsistence management of wildlife, I really felt that we should focus on number 2.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I apologize for not handling this properly, but let's do this one first. I'll name it. It's the Southeast Alaska subsistence deer management recommendations. That's the principles that we're going to follow. If all of those things are appropriate, then we can have -- I'd like to have the motions for accepting both of them rescinded or taken back and then we'll take them one by one and go from there. I apologize for that oversight. So if it's okay with the first and second of that first motion to take it off the table, then we'll start a new motion to adopt this one.

MR. SEE: Mr. Chairman. As the maker of the motion, I ask that we rescind the motion and move that we accept this Southeast Alaska deer management recommendations.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Just a minute. We'll do one by one. Is that okay with the second?

MR. KOOKESH: The second withdraws the second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So now it's all done. We can now address this one.

MR. SEE: Mr. Chairman. I move that we accept the Southeast Alaska deer management recommendations for discussion.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We need a second.

MS. PHILLIPS: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Now we can discuss it. Thank you.

Michael, go ahead.
MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What weight does the Chair have or a RAC member should we adopt this? If the in-season manager wanted to close something and you and I disagreed, what weight does that carry? He could close it anyway. How is the power delegated? Do you know what I'm asking you? So it's possible that I would disagree.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Well, I think your point is well taken. In the spirit of cooperation, we would do our best to do what we think is right, but it doesn't mean that they're going to follow our feelings about any particular issue.

Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bangs pointed out I'm on the wrong piece of paper here now. I'm thoroughly confused now. In any case, I'll ask that question again when we get to the proper sheet.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Why don't we take a five-minute break and get our thoughts collected here.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: People, let's gather to get started again. We are on this issue that we moved and seconded the issue of Southeast Alaska subsistence deer management recommendations. Actually these are principles that we want to implement here. If there's no real further comments that we need to make on this, I think we can pass it and then move on to the next document. I want to open it up for your discussion at this point.

Mr. Kitka, please.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was under the impression that we were going to use this as a guide. Maybe some points of clarification. Under number one, I'm not sure what this is really saying. I was wondering if this is a disguised way of saying they would like to break up some of the units so that they have some areas where the weather is different geographically and things. So different that it would make management a little different for those areas instead of a blanket type of closing off an area.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think that's a good question and concern, Mr. Kitka. Is there anyone that would like to clarify that? Robert, would you do so.

MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. No, you're reading way too much into this statement. What it says is that quite literally prior to making decisions the current conditions should be known at whatever scale is appropriate. If the question is deer harvest, then we should be able to know what the deer harvest is. It's just the current state of affairs. It's important to know where we are right now. It's important to know it at whatever scale the question is. No, there's nothing that leads into some other proposal. This is just a statement saying knowing what the current conditions are is important to the Council.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Does that answer your question, Mr. Kitka?

MR. KITKA: Clear as mud.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Both items, 1 and 2, talk about specific geographic location, special information needs. I think that's just an attempt to recognize that throughout a unit there may be specific needs to address that subunit. We're not making the suggestion it should be divided up into subunits.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Michael.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you explain to me number 4, it's kind of a broad statement, coordinate management with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I mean sharing information is one thing, but coordinating is a little bit different as we operate with a different set of rules.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. Item 4 is a recognition that we all bring strengths to the table that are different. Monitoring activities, deer harvest reporting, those are really the strengths of where the Department of Fish and Game has. They have an ongoing research project. The management of
wildlife on all lands is done by the Board of Game.

It's just an acknowledgement that we use each other's strengths appropriately and that the Council expects and will move forward to become involved in the Board of Game process.

It's also an acknowledgement of the memorandum of understanding that's been recently signed that says essentially we'll do this through the Staff. So it's an acknowledgement by the Council that they will participate. There's nothing in here that would diminish the authorities of the Council.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Michael and Robert. I'm going to call Cal up here. In line with what you asked earlier, Mike, you know, what if there's no agreement between the agencies and Cal came and kind of explained it to me. I'd like him to do it to the public now. And if you can shed some more light on what Bob had already said, please do so.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, my name is Cal Casipit. I'm the acting Inter-agency Staff Committee member for the Forest Service. What I had talked to you earlier about, there was a question on -- actually, I'm skipping ahead of what you guys are actually discussing now.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's okay.

MR. CASIPIT: But it may help you out with this discussion. No matter what, the provisions of ANILCA still apply to any delegated authority that comes from the Board. For instance the in-season, if so delegated, would still have the .805(3)(c) stuff there about deference to the Council. If we were to reject a recommendation from the Council, you've made a recommendation to do something and the decision-maker doesn't follow that recommendation. He or she still has the responsibility to report back to you as to the reasons. The only reasons they can reject is to continue subsistence opportunity, it violated principles of fish and wildlife conservation or it was detrimental to subsistence users.

ANILCA doesn't go away with any kind of delegation to an in-season manager or local manager. All that stuff still applies. When it comes to that delegation, they are the Federal Subsistence Board in that instance and they still have those
responsibilities that are outlined in ANILCA, so I just
wanted to make that clear.

Is there anything else you wanted?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Cal. Mr. Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In regards to the question about coordination of the management, I think it's a pretty broad statement, but I think it's important that we look a little bit into the reasons why this came about. Part of it is because of why Federal users have antlerless deer instead of female deer, why we have a difference in evidence of sex. The regulations are confusing and coordination in management would go a long ways.

Whether we adopt a closure or not, the coordination in management goes a lot further than that and I think it's important that we recognize and coordinate a little bit. These are all management concerns and I think it's important that we read into that a broad statement that it's important that we adopt specific things and look into it so we don't have antlerless deer in January. Well, what is that? That's all deer basically.

These kind of things are something that I think is why this statement is there to coordinate management. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Michael. Anyone else like to stay something.

MR. KITKA: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called for. Let's do it different. Let's do roll call on this here, Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.
MS. HAWKINS: No.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Mike Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, we have a majority vote in favor.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

Okay, now we are on the next one that we need a motion on. This is called the guidelines for the Southeast Alaska In-Season Recommendation for Subsistence Management of Wildlife. So if we can get a motion and a second to adopt, we can discuss the heck out of it some more.

Mr. Hernandez, please.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt the Southeast Alaska In-season Recommendations for Subsistence Management of Wildlife.

MR. STOKES: I second the motion.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Stokes. It's been moved and seconded. Now we are into discussion. Let's start talking about it. Any comments.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chairman. Thank you for allowing me to talk. I was just wondering about this in-season management. Maybe I need to go back a little further before I mention it, but I was wondering about where he gets his information for closure of an area, whether it comes from the State Fish and Game or whether it would be from the local users. Local users in the area might have as much say as State Fish and Game.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson, maybe you can address that as well.

MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The in-season management actions are initiated by a request for in-season action, so that's a formal document and it can be made by anyone, any user, member of the public, the Council, the Department of Fish and Game. The initiation of the process is the same in all cases where there is a request for in-season management, a request for actions.

What we see in this document, in the first item, we have a change to who the in-season managers are and the extent of their authority. If you reference Page 2 and Page 3, that would be Table 2, you'll see the in-season managers and their authorities as delegated by the Board and that is what's currently in effect.

The item in number one is to consolidate those in-season managers and their authorities to six people and have them for all species of wildlife. So that's a current change and a simplification, but it's also an expansion of their authorities.

In item two, the ANILCA Title VIII does not specify how the Council will be involved in in-season management. In implementing regulations from the Fish and Wildlife Service, again, does not specify exactly how the Council will be involved in in-season management. What this does is your recommendation for...
how you expect the Council to be involved in in-season management recommendations.

You need to remember that the Council can recommend actions, but for in-season management authority it does not have veto authority. With this protocol, it does specify how you would provide input into the decision-makers and who the decision-makers are going to be.

In item three, it is a follow up for coordination with the Department of Fish and Game. That is that you expect a report at the winter meeting every year on wildlife special actions and whether or not they were truly needed or effective.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Let's take these one by one. Let's look at item number one. If there are any issues or discussions to be brought up on that, we'll do that and go on down the line and tweak it if we have to and come up with something we can all live with.

Any comments about item number one, in-season management authority? Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Number one sort of is addressed in number two as well. It says the Board or delegated in-season manager. So if you go to Unit 4 on Page 3 for deer, then you have Admiralty, Hoonah, Juneau and Sitka District Rangers. Who is the in-season manager? Who can answer me?

MR. LARSON: I can answer that.

MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Can you answer that, Bob?

MR. LARSON: Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

MR. LARSON: According to provisions of number one, then their management area would be the same as the fish management areas. So in the case of Unit 4, the Juneau District Ranger would have management authority for Admiralty Island and the Sitka
District Ranger would have management authority for all wildlife on Chichagof and Baranof. That is how they've got it divided right now for fish and that's how it would be divided for all wildlife.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Does that help you, Patty?

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Floyd.

MR. KOOKESH: On number one, in-season management authority will be for that area. That's the language, right, for that area. That's the language we're going to be using, right?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's how I would interpret it.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead. We're still on number one.

MS. PHILLIPS: So even though there's a Hoonah Ranger District on Chichagof Island, the Sitka District Ranger is the in-season manager?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Bob.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. Yes, that's correct. That's the way for all fish is set up right now. That also is true for on Prince of Wales Island the District Ranger for Craig has in-season management authority over the Thorn Bay Ranger District. In Unit 3, the District Ranger for Petersburg has management authority over the Wrangell Ranger District.

The expertise involved in managing and understanding the process is in the hands of six people. For fish and your proposal, if you want to go that way, is to do the same thing for wildlife.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Some more comments. Mr. Bangs and then Mr. Hernandez, please.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
think it's important to recognize that this authority we're trying to identify is not necessarily the expert in what's going on. I mean a District Ranger might have an idea of -- to me, I look at this as the go-to person that you contact, but the expert is the person that is out there in the field, the biologist and all that, but I have a tough time looking at that as that's the expert that's going to carry the weight.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Point well taken.

Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I was going to ask Bob to explain the reasoning why those six people should have that authority and he kind of touched on it, I think. Maybe he can make it a little more clearer. It's my understanding that in those ranger districts that is where the wildlife Staff is centered and the fisheries Staff, the biologists basically that have to make these decisions are staffed in those particular ranger districts.

Is that correct, Bob?

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. This was actually the -- I was a proponent of this position. Those positions are trained in the process. Those are not subject matter experts. The subject matter experts are in the Forest Service, distributed throughout the forest. The process is important and there's a high degree of training and understanding of ANILCA and their responsibilities. Those same positions have associated with them subsistence biologists to guide them through the process.

If there was, for instance, an issue on either of the Wrangell or Petersburg Ranger District, although the Petersburg Ranger has the management authority. He would certainly involve whatever subject matter experts from wherever they are to provide him guidance and counsel. It's primarily to facilitate the process and the understanding of their responsibilities.

One other thing. It also matches up very well with the companion managers either for fish or wildlife in the State system. For instance, the
manager for fish and the manager for wildlife for both the Wrangell and the Petersburg Ranger Districts resides in Petersburg. The manager for the Unit 1 and all of the Prince of Wales Island and the mainland associated with Ketchikan, resides in Ketchikan. The manager for the northern southeast resides in Juneau. The manager for Unit 4, that portion westward, including Baranof and Chichagof, they reside in Sitka. So it matches that way and you would facilitate communications with people of a similar responsibility.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Bob. Mr. Pappas was going to come up here and say something, but it looks like Bob answered all your questions because you're going like this.

(Council nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any more comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Let's do number two then. Comments. Mr. Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd maybe like to add to it along the lines of what Mr. Kookesh was saying, that if you're unavailable that we have another person to contact on the Council.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That person would naturally be the vice-Chair and the coordinator suggested the coordinator be included in that process as well. The coordinator works for the Council through the Chair. So if the Chair is absent for some reason, then that would be passed on to the vice-Chair and he would work under your direction. That's the way I think it should work.

Any more comments. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The reason I asked how much weight the other parties than the in-season manager would have is a situation that occurred in Craig. Before the steelhead season opens they have a little consultation with the Department and hopefully the resident RAC member, which is me, and sometimes it's hard to put all three
So the District Ranger took the bait provision out of the permit for the winter steelhead and this was acted on by this Council and went to the Federal Board and was passed and it was legal to use bait, but in consultation with the Department, they brow-beat him if you will into taking the bait out. I protested it and they told me it's too late, they went to print. I said, well, you could pencil it in and they wouldn't do it. So bait was just not allowed for that portion of the season. That was one of the concerns I have for this type of system, although it can work also.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, that's unfortunate. I think Cal explained earlier, you know, that conflict and how it's addressed. Would you like to hear it again? I can have him come up and address it. The one he was saving for later, but I asked him to jump the gun. Did you get his answer okay?

MR. DOUVILLE: No. It doesn't matter.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It doesn't matter, okay. I think it's unfortunate that we have that kind of conflict though. After the fact, I think it's difficult to work with after the process has been completed. Any other comments.

Cal, go ahead.

MR. CASIPIT: Again, for the record, Cal Casipit, acting Inter-agency Staff Committee for the Forest Service. Mike's concerns on the winter steelhead fishery and the use of bait, for that one year that did happen, but we heard you and we put it back in in future years. We probably didn't follow the procedures quite the right way on that issue. There should have been a response to you with in-season's rationale for rejecting that particular part of your recommendation. We apologize. Hopefully that won't happen again.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Cal. Thank you for the explanation. Mr. Kitka, go ahead.

MR. KITKA: I still think the affected
communities should have a say in this some way, some
how. I believe that an emergency closure like in some
places that has an effect on the community at some
point the local community should have a voice in there
somewhere. Whether we need to put some trail on how
they get to that point might be important.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Adams. Under number
two, we only have meetings two times a year, so I felt
that first sentence should be deleted under number two
and then just go with the next sentence all the way
down. That way it kind of clears up this language
instead of throwing some grey cloud in there. We don't
need to know what the first sentence is because we
already know that we only have two meetings a year.
The reason why this one is being addressed in the
context is because we're not meeting.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What we can do to
address that, Mr. Kookesh, is a motion to take that out
of there. It would be like an amendment.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. I believe
we have a motion on the floor and we're under comments
that we're making these changes as we're talking, is
that correct? We don't need to have a motion every
time we want to make a change during a motion.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. See, go ahead.

MR. SEE: I believe a motion to amend
would be in order.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: A friendly amendment
would work. What you're doing is you're actually
amending the main motion, so I think an amendment would
be in order to take that out of there.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. I'd like
to make a motion to remove that one sentence.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Is there a second.

MR. SEE: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. See.
We're under discussion now. Mr. Douville, go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: I'd like to clarify what sentence are we deleting.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'm sorry. Item number two, the very first sentence where it says, "Whenever the Council meeting schedule permit, recommendation(s) will be sought from the Council prior to implementing either an emergency or temporary special action." That's what the amendment is trying to do, take that out of there.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kookesh, go ahead.

MR. KOOKESH: The logic for it is that this special action is being done because we're not meeting.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Again, if the motion maker had been clear on specifically what his motion would be there wouldn't be this confusion. I believe the motion is to delete "Whenever the Council meeting schedule permit, recommendation(s) will be sought from the Council prior to implementing either an emergency or temporary special action. If the Council is not meeting in a relevant time frame....."

MR. KOOKESH: I was just referring to the first sentence.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: What is the purpose of leaving if the Council is not meeting in a relevant time frame?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. That's if the Council is not meeting. Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: What would be the purpose of taking that sentence out? To me it seems to
be not a bad thing to have in there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think Mr. Kookesh explained his rationale. Would you like to go over it again for Mr. Douville?

MR. KOOKESH: The rational at the time is that we only meet twice a year, so it's understood that the reason why we're having a special action is because we're not meeting and that's what it's for. We're unable to meet on it, so it gives that authority, correct?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Robert.

MR. LARSON: I just want to note that with the even/odd year cycle with fish and wildlife regulations, we will be adopting proposals only every other year. So if there are in-season actions that need to be taken, that's one thing. If the action needs to be addressed by a proposal at the appropriate Council meeting, that's only going to happen every other year, every fourth meeting. So I think that's some of the reason for that first sentence.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Michael.

MR. DOUVILLE: I, at this time, believe it should be left in there. It just gives us an opportunity to address something on a cycle if you will because we have more than just game issues. We have fish issues and at some point they would connect, so there is no reason to take it out.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Especially if there's a two-year cycle that's taking place right now. The other Michael.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another point that has to do with that sentence, I think it would be appropriate to include the intent that possibly a teleconference could occur. We could have a meeting of any kind through the proper channels. I think leaving that sentence in is good.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kookesh, go ahead.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. My intent
was just to make the language a lot easier and if that's not going to be the case, if I'm going to sit here and make a mockery out of this, I'll withdraw the motion. Keep it that simple. Hopefully the second will withdraw the second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. See.

MR. SEE: Mr. Chairman. I'll withdraw the second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. The sentence will remain in there. Cal, did you have something you wanted to add or did we take care of it already? Thank you.

It's lunch time now, folks. Let's see if we can be back here, and you're on your own, quarter after 1:00 and then we'll continue on with this discussion.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We'll call the meeting back to order

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We're still working on the paper. Did we talk about Item No. 2 enough or is there something else we need to address there.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I have something on Item No. 2.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Over the lunch break I thought of a couple questions I wanted to ask here. They may have to be answered by OSM Staff, I'm not sure, but I think we have somebody here if necessary. In the action that we're proposing to do here, we're designating in-season managers. The first question is, is that something the Council has the authority to do? Do we vote on this and that's the way it is, or are these recommendations to the Board for them to do. I guess I need that clarified.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Could you help out on that, Robert.

MR. LARSON: Yes. These would be recommendations and there would be positions of the Council, but they would go to the Board for disposition, but there's no requirement for the Board to do anything that is in the recommendation. So they will do or what they will not do after some consideration. I don't know what process they would go to evaluate the appropriateness of especially those in-season manager designations. But they'll have some process that they go through once they receive our recommendations or your recommendations.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Second question. As far as the delegation of authority, I want one more clarification. Is it true that the in-season managers can only take an action that the Council has predetermined them to take? On Table 2 we have authority delegated and I know these are things that we have acted on as a Council. So my question is if a circumstance arises that we haven't directed an in-season manager to take an action on, do those type of actions have to come directly from the Board such as the ones that are listed in the first table where these actions occurred all taken by the Subsistence Board? Is that the way the system works?

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. The Board delegates authority very, very specifically to a position. And so the recommendation as specified in one would have an in-season manager for all species of wildlife that would be the same person as currently has in-season management authority for all fish and it would have similar kind of authorities. The in-season manager will react to a request for in-season actions without regard to who it comes from and it does not have to be somehow proposed by the Council or it doesn't have to come from OSM. It can come from any person. There is a process involved about making sure that those decisions, in fact, go through the right stages and have all the right analysis.

But, no, there doesn't have to be any action by the Council prior to an emergency and that's what we're talking about here, that there has been some situation that is deemed an emergency. That's the first criteria. It can't be dealt with during a regular session.
One thing I would like to remind the Council of is that the Council can have more than one meeting. We could have a teleconference type of meeting to address something if you wanted to. These don't come from the Council. The delegations are from the Board and the emergencies are identified by most anybody.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: When does the in-season action come from the District Ranger and when does it come directly from the Federal Subsistence Board?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Robert, why don't you go ahead and explain the process using an example of a special action situation.

MR. LARSON: The authority to act is from the Board. The Board in some circumstances will delegate that authority to in-season managers, otherwise they retain that authority within OSM.

Let's pick out an instance here. For martens in Kuiu Island. We had a request for action from the Department of Fish and Game and it's in response to actions taken by the Board of Game that there was Staff assigned to do an analysis once the Board determined it was an emergency and it could not wait until the next regular cycle. The analysis indicated that, in fact, there were low numbers of martens and then the Board determined that it was appropriate to close marten trapping for this year.

Under item one, that authority to make that decision would be delegated in that case to the Petersburg District Ranger, who has the same authority for that area for fish.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any other comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What's the wish of the Council on what we have before us now. We made a motion, seconded it, discussed it. Any more discussion on any of the items, one, two or three?
MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: On number three, the last sentence, the Council will schedule time to review Federal wildlife management plans during the winter meeting. This is a suggestion. And develop proposals during their winter meeting.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That is suggested. It's at this time that these kind of wildlife management issues will be taken care of.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I wanted to insert "and develop proposals." We have that in our packet already. Our regional coordinator has taken the initiative to put proposals into our packet that are related to special actions for in-season closures. I'm not stuck on it to add and develop proposals. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Bob is offering to speak to it, so go ahead.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. The reason the wildlife proposals are not included in that is that we're under an every other year cycle for wildlife proposals. The way I see the schedule working would be at this winter meeting we would develop proposals for wildlife. At a year from now at our scheduled winter meeting we would be developing proposals for fish. I think that's going to be the way that this whole process evolves.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'd kind of like to move on with this and get it behind us now. If there's any more discussion in any of the items.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called. Would you take roll, Harvey, please.

MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Mike Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Votes yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: He's absent.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. The motion passes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

I just got information that Mr. and Mrs. Stokes was late getting down to the restaurant to have food and you know their inability to get around very well is causing problems, so they're going to be kind of late coming back.

Thank you very much. That passes.

We're going to go ahead and move on to number 13, wildlife proposals and special action presentations by Susan Oehlers. Please come forward.

MS. OEHLERS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council. I just have a real
brief presentation for you today just reviewing the past two regulatory years special actions. As Robert just reiterated, we'll be focusing on the wildlife special actions. I do have some handouts, but I have included some of the fisheries special actions. That was my not following directions, so I will put my dollar in the kitty after we're done.

I think the purpose of this is just to review some of the special actions from the last couple years that refresh your memory and that may kind of have some bearing on some of the potential actions you'll be discussing here shortly.

For 2007-2008 we just had two wildlife special actions involving deer in Unit 4. The first one was specific to the NECCUA, which closed the NECCUA to the taking of female deer and that was starting November 27th, 2007 for 60 days authorized by the Board.

Following that we had another special action for all of Unit 4 as well as 1C deer, which closed the hunting of female deer for the remainder of the season starting in December 27th, 2007 extending to December 31st in Unit 1C and January 31st, 2008 for Unit 4. That was also authorized by the Board.

For 2008-2009 we had three wildlife special actions. Again, in Unit 4 deer in the NECCUA it was closed to the taking of female deer effective October 2nd, 2008. This was in line with a similar State closure and this was effective through the end of the season January 31st, 2009. This was authorized by the Hoonah District Ranger, who had authority delegated to him by the Federal Subsistence Board.

In Unit 5A, the Yakutat Forelands area, the moose quota was changed for Unit 5A outside of the Nunatak Bench when 50 bulls rather than 60 had been taken from the unit. That allowed the season to be closed west of the Dangerous River when 20 bulls had been taken as opposed to previously it had been 30 and that was authorized by the Federal Board.

Finally for Unit 3, Kuiu Island marten, this closed Federal public lands in the Kuiu Island portion of Unit 3 to trapping or taking of marten. This was effective December 12, 2008 through February 9th of this year and that was authorized by the Board.
That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Susan.

Questions of Susan. Maybe you could explain some of the reasons why these special actions were taken. Like, for instance, the moose being reduced from 60 to 50 in Yakutat.

MS. OEHLERS: Certainly. And I think we'll talk about this a little more. This was primarily due to concerns of a low bull/cow ratio in recent years particularly on the western side of the Forelands. I don't have the specific numbers in front of me, but I believe we were looking at bull to cow ratios as low as 10 or 11 to 100 in 2006 and 2007, which was quite a bit lower than the other side of the Dangerous River. The Dangerous River basically divides 5A into kind of two separate halves.

On the other side of the Dangerous we were looking at bull to cow ratios of closer to 20. So we were concerned about the bull to cow ratio closer to town and we did want to go ahead and reduce the quota at least for a season to try and get those numbers back up.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And a healthy bull/cow ratio is what?

MS. OEHLERS: Generally Fish and Game recommends at least 25 to 100.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Over the past couple three years I noticed that it was about half of that. I just wanted to have the Council understand the reasons behind that. Like you said, we will be talking about it.

MS. OEHLERS: Uh-huh, certainly.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Any other questions.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Who initiated the special action process on these?
MS. OEHLERS: I don't have that information specifically. For Unit 4 deer, that was kind of following some actions by the State. Does anyone have that handy? I'm thinking for most of it it was kind of initiated by the State. Does that seem right, Mr. Larson?

MR. LARSON: (Nods affirmatively)

MS. OEHLERS: So I think that was the case for most of the Unit 4 deer. 5A moose we actually -- the Forest Service put that in and that was to be able to align our quotas with that of the State. The hunt is a joint Federal/State hunt. Then Unit 3 marten, I believe that was requested by the State, who had put in a similar closure for the State regs.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Any other questions. Go ahead.

MR. KOOKESH: Under the Unit 4 NECCUA, what's the rule on 60 days for NECCUA?

MS. OEHLERS: After 60 days, then the season would go into effect again. It was just a temporary 60-day closure, so that actually allowed for a certain amount of time, like towards the end of the season in January where the season would be open again.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Isn't there a rule on 60 days?

MR. LARSON: There are special actions according to our regulations are restricted to 60 days. You can convert a special action into a temporary special action through an increased public process. The increased public process is public hearings that are held in the affected areas. A temporary special action is can and usually does extend to the end of the regular season. So if you need to do something for longer than 60 days, you have the ability to do that by converting a special action into a temporary special action after you hold public hearings.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: What I was looking for is there going to be a hearing on this or do you just start all over with a fresh season on August 1st?
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I don't have an answer to that. Do you?

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. As far as I know, there are no plans to have -- or no requests for a special action to amend or restrict any deer hunting anywhere in southeast Alaska.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Susan.

MS. OEHLERS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We're going to move on to item number 14 now. This is where a lot of the concerns that was brought up during the issues on the management portion of it, the principles and the guidelines. Did you want to take some time and address an issue here at the top -- I can't remember your name.

MS. RICE: Sunny Rice is my name.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, Sunny Rice. I know you came to me this morning and you wanted to know when we'd be getting to this portion of it.

MS. RICE: Whatever works for you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You don't mind waiting?

MS. RICE: I don't mind waiting.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. We're just going to go down the line then if you don't mind and we'll take them as they come. 14A customary and traditional use on Berners Bay moose. We've had it on the table before. I don't know what the Council wishes to do with this issue, but we can bring it up for discussion at this point.

MS. PHILLIPS: Are we on 14.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We are on 14 now, Council.
(Pause)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs, you got something.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This customary and traditional use was specifically for Gustavus residents, I believe, and I thought we addressed that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, I recall that too. Mr. Larson and then Donald.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. If you recall, the proposal initially was to have a C&T determination for Berners Bay for residents of Gustavus. The Staff analysis that was done for that proposal addressed all residents of Unit 1D, including Gustavus, but it did not include residents of places like Hoonah and Petersburg and Sitka, places that would have residents that applied for permits for 1C, but they weren't included in the analysis.

The Council two years ago during this time said that the analysis that was before them was incomplete and they recommended at that time that no action be taken on the proposal and the Council wished to resubmit this proposal during this cycle for all residents, including a C&T analysis for all residents of Southeast Alaska and that's what the Board did. The Board said, okay, we will defer this until we see the new proposal from the Southeast Regional Advisory Council. So this is a leftover proposal from two years ago.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to submit Federal subsistence wildlife proposal for customary and traditional use for Berners Bay moose, Unit 1C rural residents of Yakutat and southeastern Alaska areas.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, ma'am. Is there a second.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: All right. Let's
bring it up for discussion.

Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with what Mr. Larson reviewed for us there. I think this is a necessary proposal. I think the Staff needs to do an analysis that covers all rural residents in Southeast so that the Council can look at that and see who is eligible for this customary and traditional use. It was as a result of a proposal that came before us that was not adequate in scope. So I would recommend we vote in favor of this proposal.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Donald. Mr. Stokes, go ahead.

MR. STOKES: I was wondering if that was the proposal that was put in for subsistence moose hunt on the Stikine where the State has any bull season open. Wrangell would have liked to have seen it where they would be changed to a subsistence season. I think it kind of lost its identity. Do you follow me?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think. But what we're asking for is customary and traditional use for Berners Bay. That would address the subsistence issue. Mike, do you have something to add there.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think what Mr. Stokes is referring to is under Item J.

MR. STOKES: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. STOKES: I don't believe there would be a subsistence traditional use in Berners Bay because when I was going to high school and graduated in 1943 our coach moved to Juneau and he missed moose hunting, so he got some friends together and went up north and got a few of the calves and brought them back and introduced them to Berners Bay. There's no traditional use there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I know that when this was brought up at one of our last few meetings ago, two years ago, this was a part of that discussion. A lot of those moose were transplanted there. Whether it should be customary and traditional use is what we're
talking about right here. Do we want that for them or not?

Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. If I recollect from the material that was given to us before, it was my comment at the time in reviewing the harvesters of Berners Bay, what I saw was a large amount of the harvest was by the Juneau and Douglas residents, so my comment was why don't we give them C&T. But I do know that from talking at the local Fish and Game meetings in Juneau it was mentioned to me that the territorial sportsmen are the ones responsible for planting, so I don't know if we're breaking new ground on C&T.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: This is placing a proposal forward for it to be analyzed and these discussions that you're having about whether it should be designated with C&T or not will come through in the proposal process.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. All we need to do is either say yes or no to this proposal. If we pass it, then we'll go through the process of Staff analysis and then for the next cycle be brought to us for consideration. That's all we're doing right now is considering whether we want to move it forward or not.

MR. BANGS: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question to vote or no.

MR. BANGS: Question, yes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called for. Let's do roll call again, Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.
MS. HAWKINS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Mike See.
MR. SEE: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.
MR. KOOKESH: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.
Michael Douville.
MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.
MR. STOKES: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. We have enough.
It passes.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. That passed. We'll move on down to the next one.
Martin trapping.
Patty.
MS. PHILLIPS: Move to submit Federal subsistence wildlife proposal for Kuiu Island marten trapping harvest season, new regulation, Unit 3, Kuiu Island December 1 - February 15th, no limit, Unit 3, no open season.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Do I hear a second.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Seconded by Donald.

MR. KOOKESH: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called. Roll call, please. Do you want to discuss it?

MR. DOUVILLE: This one, marten trapping?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. Okay.

MR. LARSON: We should have discussion on motions.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We need to discuss it. Go ahead, Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This just says there's low numbers. Where is the study, the evidence, the causes or supposed causes. I would like to see some reasoning to go here.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Perhaps we could have someone address that, but from what I understand, Mr. Douville, the marten is kind of similar to what is happening in Yakutat with the moose. The male population isn't in healthy ratio as far as female population, so there was a conservation concern and that's the reason for this proposal.

Mr. Larson, do you have anything to add to that.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. This proposal was not generated by request of the Council. This proposal was generated because there was a special action to close the marten season this year. That's why it's before you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you for that clarification. It was a special action that took place. Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to hear from the State wildlife biologist as he could probably explain a lot of the reasons why the State took action and it shows good reasons for that
1 action.

2 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. State wildlife
3 biologist, would you come forward, please.

4 MR. LOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 Members of the Council. For the record, my name is
6 Rich Lowell. I'm the area biologist for Alaska
7 Department of Fish and Game Division of Wildlife
8 Conservation here in Petersburg. I have primary
9 responsibility for oversight of wildlife management in
10 GMU 1B and Unit 3, which includes Kuiu Island. I'm
11 quite familiar with the events leading up to the
12 State's proposal to the Board of Game to have the
13 marten season close. I'd be more than happy to address
14 any questions the Council or yourself might have for
15 me.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Can you elaborate a
18 little bit about the reasons why we took that action.
19
20 MR. LOWELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
21 Concerns about marten populations on Kuiu Island are
22 not new to the Department. Our concerns originated in
23 the early 2000's when some initial research efforts
24 were begun there. Capture rates in 2001 and 2002
25 revealed low marten numbers on the island. Followed in
26 2005 university efforts to collect hair samples from
27 marten as a result of DNA research effort looked at the
28 island island wide and found that populations appeared
29 to be low across the island. We had been prepared to
30 request that the Board of Game close the season in
31 2006. We decided at that time that we should intensify
32 research efforts in 2007 and 2008 to try to get a
33 better handle on if this was just an odd year when
34 numbers were down or if this was a chronic problem.
35
36 Safe to say that with regard to marten
37 research efforts our efforts on Kuiu Island are second
38 only to the efforts on northeast Chichagof. They are
39 ongoing now. We have animals radio-collared there.
40 We've continued our trapping efforts. These are live
41 trapping efforts. One of the units of measure that we
42 use to determine the abundance of marten is live
43 capture rates per 100 nights of trapping effort.
44
45 Just to give you an example of some
46 other populations which we might compare Kuiu marten
47 populations and densities to, on Chichagof Island,
48 northeast Chichagof, for 100 trap nights of effort we
typically caught almost six. We actually did these
efforts in a number of locations, including Chichagof,
Thomas Bay, Point Kuverdom (ph), Prince of Wales,
Kupreanof Island, Kuiu Island and Edlin Island. Kuiu
actually came out the lowest of the many places we
sampled. Only one area was lower and that was Edlin
Island, which our capture rates there were .4 marten
per 100 trap nights.

That was just a one-time effort there.
Just to bring the Council -- we have had some radio-
collaring efforts there. We have concerns about marten
survival on the island. 2007 we captured and radio-
collared 19 marten, 11 males and 8 females. This year
we have captured and radio-collared an additional 17.

Our concerns about marten survival
resulted to some extent last year when I believe it was
11 of the 18 marten we captured died over winter
presumably as a result of starvation. There was no
trapping effort on the island. When we looked at the
ages of the animals this year following what we
perceived to be a large mortality rate, indeed we found
that there was very little recruitment of young animals
into the population. The animals we sampled this year
were older animals and there was little recruitment.

I just want to stress to the Council
that obviously Fish and Game doesn't recommend, nor
would the Board adopt, a closure unless we felt it was
warranted and made a good case with regard to a request
for that action.

We initially, when we developed this
proposal, hoped to preserve some trapping opportunity
on Kuiu. Some of the things we initially considered
was we'll shorten the season to a two-week trapping
season. Most marten are harvested earlier in the
season and they can be trapped out pretty quickly and
trappers tend to move on. That was one of the things.

Another item we considered was to close
the road system to trapping. A third item was to close
the season to non-residents. When we looked at those
things, we found that while very few of the marten were
being trapped on the road system, I believe since 1993,
just 199 marten had been taken off the island and only
something like 30 or 16 percent of those had been taken
from the road system. So we felt the road system
closure wasn't going to be enough to adequately address the problem.

We also looked at either the component for non-resident harvest. Well, it turned out there were no non-residents trapping marten. These were indeed Federally-qualified residents of Unit 2, Unit 4 and Unit 3. In terms of the number of trappers, we felt like we weren't impacting a large number of people. Since 1993, during seven of those years, it's a 15-year period, there were no trappers in any given year. No one trapped there. For six of those years there was one trapper. In one year there were two trappers and in another year there were three trappers. I think that low effort indicates to some extent a low return for the amount of trapping effort someone might put forward there.

So those factors combined, and I believe Council Member Douville asked what is the cause, and as with so many research efforts you end up with more questions or as many as you answer and there were a couple things going on with Kuiu that is of concern to the department and one is the extensive timber harvest that is occurring on the north end. Over 28,000 acres have been logged to date. Increasing road densities. Marten are relatively easy to trap and roads increase human access and increase vulnerability to marten.

That said, these research efforts also looked at small mammal abundance, small mammal trapping, to see what the prey base for marten looked like and it was indeed quite low as well. Other factors, other supplemental food sources. You know, in many areas where marten exist with healthy deer populations you often get winter kill deer, marten go to the beaches, scavenge on deer carcasses. Well, deer are in very low abundance on Kuiu. So it could be a combination of several factors that are conspiring to hold marten populations at low levels on Kuiu.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Anymore questions. Donald and then Patty and then Harvey.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Were marten introduced on Kuiu Island?

MR. LOWELL: No. If I might elaborate a little, there's another concern with marten on Kuiu
in that the genetic studies have indicated that there
is at least a different subspecies if not separate
species of marten on Kuiu. There's Martes americana,
which occupies most of Southeast Alaska. Then there's
Martes caurina, which is also known as the Pacific
marten.

Up until the early 1950s those were, in
fact, considered two separate species. They were
subsequently lumped. You know, taxonomists being
lumpers and splitters, they were lumped. Now the
genetic research tends to suggest that they were
appropriately identified as two separate species which
only exists on Kuiu and Admiralty in southeast Alaska.
So you have an endemic species there that adds just a
little more concern to this marten issue on Kuiu
Island.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What is the forest density?

MR. LOWELL: You mean with regard
to.....

MS. PHILLIPS: Trees, timber, density.

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair, Council
Member Phillips. The forest density differs across the
island. I'm not sure I'm following you. I mean it's a
mosaic of muskeg and low volume timber and high volume
timber.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Is there clear-cuts on
the island?

MR. LOWELL: Mr. Chair. Member
Phillips. Absolutely. Timber harvest is concentrated
primarily on the northern lobe or the northern half of
Kuiu Island. There is some wilderness on the southern
end and some of that has not been logged. But when we
looked at or university personnel looked at some of
those southern areas to see if perhaps they were on the
south end outside of the areas that were logged. It
appears that densities of marten are equally low across
the island.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Harvey, go ahead.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was curious whether there were any cycles and how they will reach a certain number and then eventually fall back because the food or disease or whatever.

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Mr. Kitka. Typically that is what we see with marten populations. They typically fluctuate based largely on the abundance of long-tailed voles. That appears to drive marten populations in areas where voles do occur. We typically see those types of fluctuations occurring reaching highs and peaks and valleys. Perhaps we just haven't looked at Kuiu Island long enough, but the years that we've been there we have not seen those peaks. We are currently now in the process of determining if we will continue and intensify these research efforts into the coming fiscal years.

I imagine this group might wonder how do you plan to reopen the marten trapping season if you don't periodically check that. So that's one of the things we're thinking that the same capture rate assessment that we've conducted over the last several years would be repeated at points in the future that would evaluate whether the population had increased to a point that trapping could be reinstated there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mike, go ahead.

MR. SEE: You stated there were two species. Do they inter-breed or, if they don't, is there one more prevalent than the other? Is either one getting to a point where they're going to be threatened?

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chairman. Member See. Very good question. Our genetic research shows that these two marten do inter-breed. There's a distinct possibility that Martes americana, the American marten, will eventually swamp the Pacific marten. So there is some concern that this population will wink out either from over-exploitation or just from genetic swamping by the other species or subspecies if you will. Depending on whether you're a lumper or a splitter, it hasn't been definitely determined that this is a separate species. It may just be a separate subspecies.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs, please.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had a couple questions. Marten, if I have this right, they're reliant on old growth forest?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Turn your mike on, please. When you're done here, you need to put maybe a couple dollars into that kitty there.

MR. LOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering what that was for over there. I thought you were supposed to help yourself.

(Laughter)

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Member Bangs. Yes, marten are identified as an old growth associated species.

MR. BANGS: Thank you. The other thing I wanted to point out at our meeting in Kake there was concern by the residents of Kake about the Forest Service projects they had over there and we submitted a letter to the Forest Service in regards to timber sales that were going to happen on north Kuiu and I believe Ms. Phillips was part of a group that we worked on a letter.

The way it's appearing to me now that this marten thing has come up, they're like a spotted owl of Kuiu. I don't know what steps the Council could do to reiterate our concern over that timber harvest on north Kuiu, but it might be something we could address.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bangs. Any other questions. Mike, go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: There's been between one and three trappers on there for the past six years or since you've been looking at it. On average, how many marten do those people take a year?

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Going back to 1984, which was obviously getting into the pre-computer records and having gone over some of the hard copies, trapping, if I recall right, it's about 17 marten per year. The highest that I've looked at was
51 in one year and that was in 1996.

MR. DOUVILLE: Follow up. I know there was a big logging operation and probably people trapped from there. That's not going on now, so I'm only referring to residents of Kake because virtually no one else goes there and those numbers are not reflecting their effort for say the past five or six years.

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Member Douville. I don't recall seeing any trapping effort on Kuiu for marten, at least successful trappers, I don't recall seeing Kake residents on that list. Petersburg, Little Port Walter, Northern Prince of Wales, are people I recall seeing in the records. I don't envision our efforts having been greatly disruptive to the organized village of Kake.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Another one, Mike. Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do a lot of trapping myself, but I do know there is something about marten you've got to understand. They walk across the ice from Kupreanof onto Kuiu. I mean it's just like a highway. In some cases they've even moved across to Dall Island. It appears they can move if it's a close swim. I've always been under the impression that they're like cats and won't go in the water, but they will. They have been observed going after water oozles (ph) in the creek and going right in after them just like a mink would. It changed my impression of marten. As far as them being a separate subspecies, I'm certain that they'd be contaminated because they can flow back and from Kuiu to Kupreanof just simply walking on the ice in the wintertime.

In any case, this proposal I would support if it did not close off the residents of Kake whether they trap there or not. I have no problem with it being closed to all other residents in southeast.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: What are the populations on Kupreanof of marten?

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Member
Phillips. Concerning Kupreanof Island, most of our work was done at Portage Bay, the northeast corner, where we had a road system. Comparatively, in 2002, we captured two marten per 100 trap nights. 2003, 2.5 marten per 100 trap nights.

Mr. Chairman, if I might, I realized that I neglected to address one of Mr. Douville's questions with regard to the presence of logging camp there. There didn't appear to be much trapping effort, at least successful. Again, we don't have records showing that there was a lot of trapping activity going on out of the Rowen Camp when it was active there, but that was a concern with regard to upcoming timber sales that are planned for northern Kuiu that perhaps we might see some activity, particularly with marten prices having kind of spiked in recent years. It doesn't look quite so favorable this particular year, but having gone from 30 up to 80 and 90 in the past couple of years we were concerned that that would encourage trappers despite the low numbers to try to get martens to secure those higher prices.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Any more comments, questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Appreciate it. I don't think you're familiar with what happened a couple years ago in Sitka. We had Girl Scouts that came there and they were raising money to go on a camping trip. They supplied us with the food over there. You see they had a little money box there. So I took an opportunity of helping them to replenish that fund by fining anyone that forgot to turn on their light when they spoke and I was one of the biggest contributors, you know, chairing this thing all the time. I think the one that really outbid me though was George Pappas. We fined him for coming into the meeting late, we fined him for leaving early and a whole bunch in between. That Scout Troop really walked out of there real happy that they can go on a trip because they raised over $400.

So that's what that's for over there, sir.

MR. LOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for clarifying that. I'll be sure and make all my due
contributions accordingly. Sir, I would also be representing the Department on the next issue. If you don't mind me stepping back, I'd gladly come back at your beckon.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure. We'll look forward to that. Thank you. It looks like this issue is serious enough where they had a special action done. Now they want to make it permanent.

Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm in support of this proposal because I believe there is a conservation concern there from all we've heard. I spoke with trappers that have trapped over there and they expressed they weren't going to trap over there any more because the numbers were so low. We could say that it's self-regulating, but at the same turn I think it would show we are concerned about the conservation of those stocks.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I'd be in support of this if we do what Mike Douville proposed.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: If that's the case, then I think we need to offer an amendment to it to include not including Kake.

MS. PHILLIPS: I would do that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We just amended to exclude Kake from the closure. Robert.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. I caution you regarding going down that road that the C&T determinations have already been made and it's a broader scope. It's all rural residents. I don't know that that's anything we've ever done as to have a proposal that is essentially an analysis of .804 and that's where you would be going, would be to have a separate analysis regarding who is the most deserving to keep access to those martens. If that's your desire to initiate an .804 process, then that's your prerogative. If that's not it, then I caution you that maybe that's not the right way to go.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Caution is well taken, Mr. Larson. I'm going to leave it up to the Council to determine where they want to go with this issue. Mr. Hernandez, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I would agree, Mr. Chairman. It would be premature to amend this proposal prior to the analysis. We need to see the full analysis first before we start amending the proposal.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That point is well taken too, Donald. Let's take that into consideration. Anyone want to make a comment. Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: I said I wouldn't support it, but that doesn't stop it from going through at this point. When it comes before us for consideration down the road after analysis has been done and so on, we can modify it. We can do whatever we see fit at that point and this will give it a little more time for further analysis and looking at how it affects Kake residents.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Douville. That's the road we're going to take then. We'll either accept it or not and go from there.

MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question has been called for. Roll call, please.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.
MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes no.

Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. Let's move on. Unit 1B and three moose antler restrictions. Do you want to come forward, sir, and address this issue for us. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Do we need a motion?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, we need a motion to accept this proposal and a second. Trying to move too fast.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to submit Federal subsistence wildlife proposal Unit 1B and three moose antler restriction, methods and means of harvest, substitute language for .26(N)(1)(7) and .26(N)(3)(3), one bull with spike fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with three or more brow tines on one side or antlers with two brow tines on both sides.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Phillips. Is there a second?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's been moved and seconded by Donald. Sir, go ahead.

MR. LOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hopefully I can be a little more brief on this one than the preceding one.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: For the record, please introduce yourself again.

MR. LOWELL: For the record, my name is Richard Lowell. I'm the area wildlife biologist for Fish and Game's Division of Wildlife Conservation here in Petersburg.

Moose antler restriction, as certainly the locals know, has been a hot topic here in Petersburg for quite some time, basically since they were implemented. We went to the Board of Game with the proposal requesting that we modify the antler restrictions for moose in a sense to liberalize them.

A secondary component of that request was that we suspend or eliminate the any bull drawing permits that had been used to gather the age and antler information that we then used to modify the antler restrictions. We felt that they were somewhat over-restrictive for our smaller andersoni subspecies. There were some additional harvest opportunity there. We felt we could safely afford to the public. It was not without some reservations that I, as the manager, moved forward with this coming on the heels of two hard winters that did impact our moose herd to some extent.

I don't know how far you want me to go with regard to the history of antler restrictions here. Basically since 1995 all of our local moose hunt has been under antler restrictions. It was phased in in Thomas Bay initially. Then, when moose hunting opened in the Unit 3 islands in 1990, they also came under antler restrictions. The Stikine River drainage actually was the last to come under management with spike fork 50 three brow tine regulations. That essentially was implemented as a result of a precipitous drop in the moose population on the river. Those antler restrictions have been successful in rebuilding that population.

The nice thing about antler restrictions are that with appropriate compliance
there's no need for harvest guidelines. It's a self-
regulating hunt. It allows unlimited hunter
participation. I'd just like to point out that our
local moose hunt is an amazingly popular hunt. We
issue over approximately 1,000 registration permits for
from 50 to 90 moose a year. The overwhelming majority
of those are Federally-qualified locals and Alaska
residents.

You can leave the hunt open for an
entire month. We have one of the longest moose hunts
in the state and not only that it also encompasses
almost the entirety of the rut. A lot of moose hunts
in the state is closed during the rutting period to
protect bulls.

The antler restriction partition the
harvest into certain age classes to ensure that enough
bulls are retained in the population to provide for
timely and complete breeding of cows. It allows you to
harvest the younger age classes and the older age
classes and protect the middle-age bulls for breeding
purposes.

Because the antler restrictions were
originally developed in British Columbia, they were
later modified for moose on the Kenai Peninsula. They
were developed to fit a much larger subspecies of moose
than we have here. I guess moose routinely reach in
excess of 50 inches. Here in southeast in the central
panhandle region we see very few bulls that exceed 50
inch in antler spread.

So what we saw happening was we appear
to be killing -- you know, our harvest was dominated by
70 to 80 percent one and two year old animals, but we
were not taking many off the top. The public had come
to us with various recommendations about how we might
fix this and one of them was to adopt this 2x2 brow
tine antler restrictions.

I was a little uncomfortable with that
initially. As an alternative, I went to the Board of
Game and requested that we implement some limited any
bull permits so that I could get age data from what
would otherwise be protected population. We didn't
know what the age of 2x2 brow tine bulls were because
we weren't allowed to harvest them. So these any bull
permits were actually implemented as a tool to gain
information. After evaluating the age data from those
animals we ended up getting a reasonable sample size
that we could make inferences about.

We found out that a bull with two brow
tines on both antlers was on average the same age as a
three brow tine bull. That was five and a half years
old. At that age they should be available for harvest.
It's not without some reservations that we move forward
with this. One of the reasons this likely will come up
later is one of the reasons we chose to discontinue the
any bull permits we were offering at that time was so
that we could evaluate the impacts of liberalizing the
antler restrictions on the herd. The any bull permits
typically come out of the age class that you want to
protect. They're the most abundant.

What we're going to do is provide some
more opportunity by allowing the two brow tine bulls
but we're going to cautiously watch and see what impact
that has on bull/cow ratios on the Stikine and
productivity and stuff. That's why we decided to step
back from one until we saw the impact of the other.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, some members
of the public they really like an any bull permit if
you're the one who draws it. If you're not the one
that gets it and you have to pass up a bull that walks
over to a guy next to you and he gets to shoot it,
there was some dissatisfaction with that scenario. The
people, at least that I've talked to in Wrangell, said
we just want everybody on the same footing with the
same opportunity to harvest, so we proceeded with that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Lowell.
Is there any questions by the Council. Mr. Bangs, go
ahead.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Rich, do you anticipate a large increase in harvest?
Are you thinking maybe it will double or triple or how
do you feel about that?

MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Member
Bangs. Good question. I guess it depends to some
extent who you talk to. Some say it won't have much
effect. Others say it could have a great effect. My
personal opinion is that I don't envision it being a
huge impact. I think what we'll see is an initial
spike in harvest to begin with and then, as those 2x2
brow tines are reduced, they will be less in subsequent
1 years. How it compares to the number of any bull
2 permits we had previously been issuing 22. We
3 typically saw 20 animals harvested. Do I think we're
4 going to get 20 more two brow tines to replace the any
5 bull permits, I'm not sure. I just feel the need to
6 approach this carefully. We've rebuilt this moose herd
7 to pretty nice levels and they've spread out to the
8 Unit 3 islands. We're in pretty good shape now despite
9 the recent tough winters we've had.
10
11 MR. BANGS: Thank you.
12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Carrie, have a safe
14 trip back home.
15
16 MS. SYKES: See you next time.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any other questions.
19 Patty, go ahead.
20
21 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 I'm curious how did you determine that the 2x2 brow
23 tine is the same age as the three brow tine?
24
25 MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair. Member
26 Phillips. In this particular hunt we have a mandatory
27 requirement to bring the antlers in so that they can be
28 measured and photographs. At that time we also pull a
29 tooth for aging. It's a requirement that hunters
30 submit the lower jaw. So we're able to look at various
31 antler configurations and then make inferences about
32 the age based on the samples we've collected over time.
33
34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Anyone
35 else.
36
37 (No comments)
38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir.
40 Appreciate it. What's the wish of the Council.
41
42 MS. PHILLIPS: Question.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been
45 called. Mr. Kitka, roll call.
46
47 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
48
49 MR. BANGS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

We're on to item number D now. Unit 1A, Cleveland Peninsula, deer harvest limits. What's the wish of the Council. Do I hear a motion to accept.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to accept Federal subsistence wildlife proposal Unit 1A Cleveland Peninsula deer harvest limits. Substitute language for .26(N)(1)(7) deer, two bucks.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You've got to contribute over there too, Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Before we second that proposal it looks like there was also a special action request dealing with the brow tine restriction that we need to.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think we can talk about that. Let's go ahead and second it right now.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Now it is up for discussion. Do you want to come forward and introduce yourself, please, and help us understand this a little bit better.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Boyd Porter. I'm the wildlife management biologist for the State out of Ketchikan for Units 1A and Unit 2.

The State has been looking at Unit 1A along the Cleveland Peninsula for several years now. To give you a little history, back in the mid '80s to end of the early '90s our hunters were harvesting around two to three hundred deer from the Cleveland Peninsula. The harvest has since gone down to just around a dozen animals now. It's not clear what happened to that population and we're looking at several potential scenarios but it's hard to piece that together. It just slowly declined. Of course, once it's down at low levels the predators that are there can keep that at low numbers.

We've since liberalized trapping seasons, maximized those for wolves as much as we can. There's been a pretty consistent harvest of black bears, another predator on deer, in that area. As far as we can tell, those low numbers may be at a different equilibrium. Maybe they've shifted and they're not only having a hard time pulling out, but they don't have the habitat as far as we can assess up to this point to allow that population to ever get back to where it was in the mid '80s to early '90s. It's hard
to imagine looking at the current conditions out there
that there were ever hundreds of deer over there.

Anyway, we've looked at it pretty
extensively. Deer persist right now in small pockets
and we were trying to figure out what we could do with
seasons and bag limits to try to relieve that deer
population and give it a chance to bounce back. This
was one of the ideas that we came up with that we'd
reduce the number of bucks being taken off of that area
because those deer are in such small groups that
potentially if someone went in there under a four deer
bag limit they could take every buck out of a small
drainage.

Going to a two buck bag limit also
makes it consistent with 1B, which is on the west side
of the Cleveland and that's been a two deer back limit
for some time now already. What this proposal did, in
a sense, is it went from a four buck bag limit to a two
buck bag limit. Realizing too that there's very little
hunting effort in that area. The intent of this
regulation was to try to give that population a chance
to rebound.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Boyd. Any
questions from the Council.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You said that area does not have the habitat to
replenish the deer. Could you elaborate.

MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Member
Phillips. Through all of our assessment of being on
the ground and looking at winter habitat, which is the
bottleneck for deer as you all know, it really makes
you wonder what that population could ever bounce back
to. We may be looking at a population level that will
never reach what it was 20 years ago. All assessment
and comparing it to other places like Prince of Wales
and even the mainland over on the east side of Unit 1A,
this would just be one potential fix for that
population to see if it rebounds. If it doesn't, we're
not out anything. Most people don't spend a whole lot
of time hunting over there anyway.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Michael, go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you. I assume it's safe to say you have predators on that peninsula.

MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Member Douville. We do and it doesn't seem like those numbers have changed a whole lot. I guess that's sort of problematic in that we have less trappers going to those places. Most wolf trappers have slacked off just due to the cost of operating no matter where you're talking about. So we have less trapping effort, less hunters that are over there that are likely to encounter those wolves and shoot them during an open hunting season. There's not a whole lot of other tools that you could use to kill more predators over there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: If no one is harvesting them, then it's safe to say that those deer are not going to bounce back. That I can almost guarantee. The only way I could support something like this proposal, as it puts a restriction on rural users, is other users would have to be eliminated. I just want to point out that we have rules in Title VIII that apply to this type of situation.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Michael. Are there any other questions, comments. Boyd, go ahead.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair. I might mention to Mr. Douville that the hunters that hunt that area, the only Federally-qualified hunters that I can think of that spend much time there are Meyers Chuck and they're on the west side, as you know, and wouldn't spend much time on the 1A side of the Cleveland. It splits down the middle by the way through the mountain range there. I'm not sure how much affect that would have if you made it just Federally-qualified hunters.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any more comments, questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You brought up a good point there, Michael, but I think I'm going to vote in favor of this because it's going to go through Staff
analysis and come back to us at the next go around. Then we can pick out those points of interest that you brought up. Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I wasn't trying to derail submitting it, but what I'm saying is it falls into restricting a rural user and when it does come back to us that will have to be considered.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I agree with you on that. Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to add I spent time down there hunting and quite a few hours and the only deer I saw was being carried off by a big wolf, so I know there's predators there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thanks. Go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: I'd like to make a statement to Mr. Porter. You can put eight or ten wolves on an island and it supports them for eight or ten years and then pretty soon it doesn't. While the wolf number doesn't seem to increase, the deer population goes away. So unless there's some harvest of those predators you won't have any success rebuilding that herd.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair. Member Douville. We spent some time talking to trappers about where they're putting their efforts and I spent some time with people over in Meyers Chuck and in fact two of the residents over there came into my office. We talked about trapping methods for wolves and lo and behold the next couple of years they were able to collectively, between the people out of Meyers Chuck and the people coming from Ketchikan side on the east side, they were able to take the most wolves that we ever took off of there. About 19 wolves came off those next two years. But they weren't able to keep at it, so we've since lost those two people over on the west side that were trapping. As you know, you've got to hammer them and continue to take 30 to 50 percent of the estimated population before you really drive that wolf population down.

MR. DOUVILLE: You are absolutely
correct.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you much.

MR. BANGS: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called. Mr. Kitka, roll call.

MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.


MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

Next item, Unit 2 and three black bear harvest
restrictions. Motion to adopt is in order.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. This topic
was included because of some actions taken by the Board
of Game at their last meeting. I did not include any
proposed wording. Subsequent discussions we've had
with OSM and ADF&G made it clear that those
restrictions adopted by the Board were not intended to
apply to subsistence hunters and we agree that the way
the regulatory language is in place right now is that
they don't apply to subsistence hunters.

The topic was included on here as an
opportunity to raise this issue and to have some
discussion if the Council so desires, but there's
nothing before the Council right now as a form of a
recommendation or a proposal.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. What's the wish
of the Council on this issue. Do you want to talk
about it and move on or ignore it? Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I'd like
to hear what the issue is myself.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We'll bring Mr.
Dickerson up as well so the two of you can work
together on that.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
the Council. My name is Boyd Porter. I'm the wildlife
management biologist for Unit 2.

MR. DICKERSON: I want to make sure,
Mr. Chairman, I turn my microphone on. I'm Larry
Dickerson, wildlife biologist for the Forest Service in
the Craig and Thorne Bay Ranger Districts.

MR. PORTER: So, Mr. Chairman, you
would just like the justification for this regulation.
This is one of those balancing acts with bears and deer
certainly. We've been watching this black bear
population slowly increase for the last 10 or 15 years
and it's just creeping up, but it started getting into
a cautionary area the last few years and realized too
that this is about 80 and 85 percent non-residents
harvesting most of these black bears. It's an economic
stimulus for places like Prince of Wales and other
areas that supply services and provide things to these
hunters. It's a fairly easy access area with all the
roads on Prince of Wales. It certainly ties in with
the Unit 2 deer planning efforts when we talked about
the predators that were having an impact on deer
populations particularly along the road corridor where
people were spending a lot of time deer hunting. That
happens to be where a lot of the bear hunters spend a
lot of their time because they're able to cover a lot
of ground and locate bears fairly easily. Some of the
hunting is from the beaches as well, but the road
system provides a real conduit to get people into a
majority of places in Unit 2. As we were seeing that
black bear harvest increasing, we were sort of juggling
those two things. Realizing that by limiting those
black bears along the road corridors it was providing
more deer by protecting some of those deer fawns from
black bear predation.

We've reached a point now where along
those road corridors we're concerned for some of the
bear populations, especially along the streams that are
intersected multiple times by the roads. It's
different than most places in the state where you may
only have one access point to a stream. What you find
is that these hunters will go to the streams in the
fall particularly and intersect these bears at many
points along the salmon streams and those hunters that
are harvesting bears along the streams are less
selective in terms of the size of the bear they take
and whether it's a male or female. Consequently, the
female harvest was getting to a point that we felt it
was unsustainable in some of those places.

So at the same time we were trying to
balance that out with the deer survival, we feel like
we've got to put some restrictions on some of this bear
harvest and realize, as you mention, there was an
intent to not affect Federally-qualified hunters.
There was discussion at the Board meeting and Larry
spent some time going over the minutes of those Board
of Game meeting just to sort out the discussion points
that we made and the intent was not to affect
Federally-qualified hunters that did want to go out and
harvest bears in Unit 2 and 3.

I'll see if Larry has a comment or two
as far as the Forest Service perspective.

MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Chairman and
members. As far as how we've looked at this as it
affects rural subsistence hunters, deer regulations in
GMU 2 are different than deer regulations as all rural residents are bear hunters under the subsistence regulations in GMU 2. To verify Mr. Larson's statement and what Boyd has mentioned too, there was 522 pages of transcripts and presentations at the Board of Game meetings and we didn't see where that was discussed there, but Boyd and Steve Bethune got the voice transcripts to us and it's mentioned very clearly in two areas in here that the intent of what the Board of Game changing this was not to affect bear hunting of rural residents. So that is true.

One of the things, Robert, I did want to speak on is the one thing we feel will be affected is that we may have to change the Federal subsistence regulations to show that bear hunters have to have a harvest ticket now for bears. I'll quickly read just two lines and this is under the 2008 to 2010 regulations. Page 16 says subsistence hunters are also required to possess and comply with provisions of any permits, tags or harvest tickets required by the State unless superseded by Federal regulations. Therefore, just as we go any subsistence hunter in Unit 2 or 1A and pick up your harvest permits for deer, we feel without a doubt by the fall of 2009 we'll also have to have a bear harvest permit too.

So this is going to be just a little bit different for someone that could be a subsistence hunter, though I think we have few subsistence bears killed there. I've heard 15 to 20. But, nevertheless, that opportunity is there and I don't think we have a real handle on how many bears were taken opportunistically or for subsistence purposes because that hasn't been captured in the harvest records.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Larry. Go ahead, Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Boyd, I guess my question is I fully agree that from what I hear that the wording of this proposal is not going to affect the subsistence hunter's taking of bears. I can see that. My question is, is this regulation the State has adopted going to be adequate to address the problem? I would raise the question of whether or not the Subsistence Board will want to consider a more restrictive proposal than what the
State does. I have my doubts as to whether your proposal will actually decrease the harvest to the extent that you're hoping it will. What exactly is the wording regarding this restriction on -- is it motorized vehicles or something to do with using the vicinity to a road or how is it worded?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair. Member Hernandez. This thing has several layers and I realize I didn't cover that part when I went through the population concerns. This wasn't the proposal that we went to the Board with. We went to the Board with one that I thought was going to fit and it closed the first 15 days of September, which was when the majority of those female bears along the road corridor were being harvested. The proposal changed as we were having discussion at the Board. Unfortunately, people that had commented on the original proposal felt a little bit slighted if they weren't at the Board of Game because they didn't get a chance to comment on it. But this one fits better than the September 1st through 15th closure. It's still not a perfect fix and we realize that.

The Board really gave us some marching orders when we left there last November. That was in two years when the Board sits in Ketchikan in 2010 they want us to come back with a whole lot more information. We'll have a harvest information from the harvest permit and when I say that, we get good information on bears that are harvested. We know nothing or very little about bear hunters that spend time hunting and don't harvest a bear. So that's what the harvest ticket is going to give us.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, you still didn't answer the question. What exactly is the wording of this new regulation? Does it say a person cannot use a motorized vehicle to take a bear?

MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Member Hernandez. It is no use of motorized vehicles for bear hunting during the month of September 1st through 30th. So that means the transport of bears, bear hunters, bear hunting equipment. It doesn't prevent someone from hooking onto a boat at the ferry or at a lodge and going somewhere by boat. So, in other words, there's still a lot of opportunity. We're trying to maximize
opportunity while ensuring that we were managing under
a sustainable harvest. It has some restrictions along
the road corridors. Realizing it has some implications
for -- you've got deer hunters out there that can still
deer hunt. Moving from Point A to Point B. The
protection people don't like this a whole lot. They
still feel like it's enforceable nonetheless.

I wanted to add just one more thing,
Don. That is the Board wants us to come back with a
lot better information. We've engaged in a research
project over there that's got some promise to come back
with better density estimates or an estimate of how
many bears are there. Also, they really felt strongly
that we would go some place like a drawing permit for
non-residents. That's the most likely proposal that
the Board is going to take up and strongly consider
during this next Board cycle. At least with the
research that we're doing on the ground that's going to
give us a lot better handle on if we had a drawing
permit, what would those limits look like. What would
the harvest objectives look like across the unit. We
may split that up across roaded and unroaded areas.
Remember, that's only for non-residents. Residents
would not be restricted under that drawing permit.

MR. HERNANDEZ: One more question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Make it quick.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Have you considered a
cap on the harvest such as is in place like for Kuiu
Island?

MR. PORTER: Through the Chair. Member
Hernandez. We did and if you followed that much with
the Kuiu situation, that's not a very good fix either.
It has some serious problems. That wasn't one of our
high priorities.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Other
questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, gentlemen.
So that was just a matter of information. It doesn't
need any type of action from us.

Mr. Bangs, you have something.
MR. BANGS: Yeah, real quick. I just hope that this new regulation doesn't confuse the subsistence hunters and they get in trouble because they answer the question wrong or some sort of an enforcement issue.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, that's always a big concern, Mr. Bangs, and I share your concern. Let's take a break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Shall we get to our seats so we can get started here. Thank you.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. We are ready to start here again. What I'd like to do if we can try to move through this here. I don't want to deprive anyone by pushing too fast through this, but I'd like to get done by 5:00 o'clock today. It looks like the rest of these items here will probably take up the rest of that time.

I just want to bring this out as a matter of information for those of you who are doing kind of an analysis for us. If you could just give us a brief outline of what these issues are about and then I think more details will come out as the Council questions you on those issues.

We'll go ahead and look at Item F, wolverine trapping season. Mr. Larson, is there someone who can address this for us?

MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Rich Lowell, the area biologist for Department of Fish and Game is here. I would like to mention that this is on your agenda because this was an action item adopted by the Board of Game at their November meeting.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Lowell, go ahead.

MR. LOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This proposal was born of concern about the season length basically throughout southeast Alaska. The fact that it had extended clear into April 30th for
wolverines. Well, wolverines have their young in March and April. Having that lengthy season, which my understanding was it was implemented initially because wolf trappers sometimes catch wolverine incidentally and they would be able to keep them.

Basically, the gist of this proposal is to shorten the season in order to protect denning females, which will improve recruitment of young into the population and then thereby provide more wolverines that will be available for harvest. With the long season right now we're killing our chickens right after they hatch rather than waiting for them to mature.

So that's the gist of it.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Lowell. Any questions from Council?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you. We should call for a motion.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, please.

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to submit Federal subsistence wildlife proposal wolverine trapping season harvest limit, wolverine Unit 1 through 5, November 10 through February 15, no limit.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Do I hear a second.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Seconded by Donald.

Now we are under discussion.

(No comments)

MR. BANGS: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called for. Roll call. Thank you, Mr. Lowell. Are you going to address the next one too?

MR. LOWELL: No. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I'm going to step back.

MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passed unanimously.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

Let's move on to item number G, Unit 4 deer management. This one here, you know, there has been a lot of concerns about deer management in Unit 4 and I'd like to be able to fully satisfy the subsistence users in this area and I think Floyd will be able to help us to address that a little bit better. I guess he suggested there be a system whereby it be divided into units.
Mr. Barten, I don't know if you'd have any suggestions. I'd like to be able to particularly come forth with a good proposal for this particular area.

Did we do a motion yet? We need a motion to accept. Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I guess I need to hear a proposal suggested by somebody. I don't have one.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson, go ahead.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. This agenda item was included on your agenda not because there is a proposal or special action request, but it was included because there was a special action request last year. I did not draft a suggested language for either special actions or proposals because it wasn't clear to me that we needed one. The agenda item is here because there was a special action last year and the year before.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Doggone it! I must owe that thing a lot of money now. With the principles and guidelines for recommendations for subsistence management and wildlife, I think we can use this as a guide. I know Floyd has some really deep concerns about management of Unit 4, so I want to be able to come out of this with something that will satisfy the subsistence users. I'd like to have Mr. Barten talk a little more about this and then we can go from there.

MR. BARTEN: Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. I guess I'm not exactly sure where this is going other than I assume we're going to focus on the special actions that took place the last couple years with the doe closures and the scale of that. Last year it was limited to northeast Chichagof. The year before it was a little wider spread.

Kind of in a nutshell, the reason we pursued that action and worked with the Forest Service and ended up with a Federal closure in some cases as well was because of the severe winters of '06-'07 and then followed up last year by not as severe a winter but another winter that really had us concerned about the long-term effects of harvesting productive does and some of those watersheds or some of those areas when we felt to err on the side of caution and try to preserve some of those productive females for the long-term good
rather than a short-term gain. That's kind of where we
approached that from.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Barten.
I think Mr. Kookesh's concern when we were going
through that process is that in Unit 4 those situations
might not apply in other sections of that unit. I
think what he's really looking for is a process on how
we can address those issues without affecting the whole
area.

Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. I've had
all morning to practice. Mr. Chairman, under G, I
believe G should be Unit 4 deer management for 2009. I
really believe that we need to talk about a cooperative
effort here where we get everybody in a coordinated,
integrated -- there's all kinds of terminology. But
the one thing that I really want us to do, because of
what's in front of us, I see this season because of the
record snowfalls we've been having that we do have a
conservation problem. It was evident when the State
first requested the closure.

So what I'd like to see us do is start
focusing, and I'm hoping Mr. See and Mr. Kitka and Ms.
Phillips will help in getting this right, but the one
thing that I noted, as I mentioned earlier, that we
need to talk about breaking ourselves into smaller
units so we can have a better control over maybe the
local management of our systems. What's good for one
may not be good for the other. We need to fix that so
it doesn't happen.

Then one of the things I was talking
about, if we do have a conservation concern, to start
asking for limits. Also some season adjustments if
there is a concern. I don't want us to go the way I
view the fishery in Sitka is going. I fear for that
one.

The other question, I guess, was the
local in-season management authority. Our MOU says we
should cooperate between both of us on all public
lands, is probably the terminology. Maybe I'll stop
for one second.

(Pause)
MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. When I reviewed the memorandum of understanding we have between the State and Federal government and I found out what the purpose of it is, it's for coordinated inter-agency management for subsistence on Federal lands. I thought this should have been the foundation for which we should have been building upon this morning along with that document we had. I'm just trying to build this relationship so we can work together. I don't want us fighting over a dead deer that has no meat on it in the end.

You can read on Page 25 of the MOU it talks about in-season fisheries and to recognize in-season fisheries and wildlife management. This MOU certainly speaks to what needs to be done and we really need to take it to that level. That's where's I'd like to see us take this. I don't know what kind of proposal we'd ask for. I'm not the paid Staff that knows this stuff inside and out. You have to tell me if we're asking for some in-season changes and breaking out the units so that we can have better control over what's around us.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Neil, can you respond to that.

MR. BARTEN: Yeah. Members of the Council. I think we're getting kind of to where you hope we get to, Member Kookesh. I think a large part is in-season management and, as we talked, having designated people who can make in-season management decisions. For instance, you know, two years ago the doe season was closed in a broad area and I know especially from Angoon some people were like we didn't need this doe closure, the rug got pulled out from under us and here we sit, and you guys were trying to address a problem in northeast Chichagof and you included other parts of Unit 4 that didn't make a lot of sense.

Last year we narrowed the scope and again working with the Forest Service to do that. Only northeast Chichagof was closed because that's the area that we see with the road system as well as the opportunity on the road system to spend a lot of time driving around. Phil Mooney spent a ton of time there, several weeks of time, doing transects and hiking around, trying to confirm or not confirm whether or not the deer numbers were as low as we thought they were.
He certainly found that.

Again, he had a meeting with the community there. So they did close northeast Chichagof kind of in and of itself because that's where we considered the area of biggest concern. It didn't go more widespread because some of the same concerns on northeast Chichagof aren't realized in other places, the access and the habitat fragmentation, which has led to a large drop in deer numbers, much more so than other areas.

I think we can address smaller areas with the setup we have right now and with the designated authority on the Federal side to kind of work together to close areas like that if we see fit. I think in the short term we can address those issues. Now whether or not we want to in a longer term go to our respective boards and ask for changes in seasons and bag limits, that's something to consider too. I think those are issues we can discuss. I think we do have the latitude right now to be kind of reactive and focus on areas of concern between both agencies and we can get it done to some degree pretty well right now. I think so.

Again, we may decide on northeast Chichagof in a year that, boy, this population is just not coming back. In a case like that, I think we get together and discuss whether or not we want to approach it with a long-term solution, which might be reductions in seasons and bag limits.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Floyd.

Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I would agree with what Mr. Barten said. It's a question we spent quite a bit of time discussing in the Unit 2 subcommittee. In the end, we decided not to break the area up into sub-units. Instead we did what Mr. Barten has said. If there is an area that can be addressed specifically within that unit, we can do that without actually taking a formal step of dividing it into sub-units and dealing with that as situations change from year to year. I think it's worked fairly well and I think it can work in Unit 4 also. That would be my recommendation.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Floyd, go ahead.
MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. The one thing that probably needs to be addressed that Mr. Douville had asked for earlier was the impact to the non-Federally-qualified. In talking about this issue -- for example, in Sitka, I talked about Angoon being on a voluntary closure for sockeyes, with the State not coming in and helping us, with no one. I don't want to get to the point where we, in Angoon, voluntarily reduce our own bag limits but yet we can still have non-Federally-qualifieds coming in and totally taking away from that. We need to get to the point where we address the non-Federally-qualified so that we don't lose. We do need to do something. I do know from living in Angoon and hunting in Angoon that we do have a problem out there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. If you look at Unit 4, could there be a way to identify where the real problems are and address them in a manner I think Floyd is kind of looking for. If you're going to have to address a situation where you have to close it, you can say, you know, Baranof Island, Unit 4, but keep the rest of the areas open. Just as an example.

MR. BARTEN: Members of the Council. Again, I think we showed this year that we can do that by focusing just on northeast Chichagof. I think the key is to work with both the Federal agencies and our agency to try to make sure we're on the same page. Number one, we look at the health of the stock first and foremost. I think on Chichagof we did that. It's a conservation concern that we're all in this together and it doesn't matter who takes does, it's still not a good idea. I think it worked well where we all agreed close a doe season and build for the future, not take out of the basket right now, which potentially might keep us at low levels for a long period of time. I think we kind of have that structure in place right now.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The guidelines we adopted this morning is a real good step in that direction, towards trying to address those issues. All we need to do now is implement this into, for instance, Unit 4 and work with the land managers, the State and, of course, it goes through the Council as well, in that manner.

MR. BARTEN: Yeah, Members of the Council. If I may add one more thing. You know, this
fall and through July, August, September, even on into early January, Phil Mooney, out of the Sitka area office who is responsible for managing wildlife in Unit 4, he was keeping in touch with the District Rangers through emails because I was part of that traffic. I think there was a pretty good network of interchange of information between the State as well as the decision-makers or the people who could work from the Federal side. I think that was a good kind of structure to follow.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What percentage of the deer harvest is by non-Federally-qualified from the NECCUA?

MR. BARTEN: Members of the Council. I don't know that off the top of my head. I really don't know. We certainly could get that data, but I don't have it with me at the moment.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I would like to know the percentage of harvest by non-Federally-qualified hunters by month preferably. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Barten is taking some notes. Anyone else.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So it looks like we have mechanisms in place to answer all of the concerns. Mr. Kookesh, do you think we covered that.

MR. KOOKESH: (Nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Great. Donald, go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I was going to ask a question. I think Patty was kind of going there herself. My question was, do the Council members feel that we've adequately addressed the question of whether or not the subsistence priority is being met for Unit 4 hunters.
MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you for asking that question and it is a very good question. It's one that I would like to reiterate. Are subsistence needs being met in the community of Hoonah. Should there perhaps be a reduction in season and bag limits for non-Federally-qualified hunters. I heard the biologist himself say that there is a conservation concern in that area. Are we just going to allow in-season management to be the management model or are we going to set a plan in place like we did in Unit 2?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That point is well taken, Patty. How would we go about duplicating something similar to Unit 2? Donald, you've been through that process. Go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I mean that's what we did in Unit 2, obviously. The situation there I think was a situation that was essentially a permanent situation. We've been dealing with that for a long period of time, that conflict between subsistence and non-subsistence users. I guess everyone's hope here in Unit 4 that situation is not really existed in the past. It's been brought out by these hard winters.

If our hope is that everything is going to get better in the next few years, then it's probably not necessary to do like we did in Unit 4 where we instituted new regulations that clearly gave a priority to the subsistence users and it's in place until we make another proposal to change it, which probably won't be for a very long time.

If that's the situation we think we're looking at, that this is temporary and in-season actions can address that adequately, the people with the in-season management authority I guess I heard this morning they do have the authority to institute more restrictive closures on non-subsistence users. I guess if we're satisfied with that and feel that this is temporary, I'd be comfortable with it. So I guess that's the big question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Does that answer your question a little bit Patty in regard to non-
subsistence users?

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. It didn't answer my question. It raised more questions. If we have more restrictive closures, those are blanket restrictive closures and are reducing the subsistence opportunity for those of Hoonah and that's where I have a problem. Specifically to the NECCUA. The reason I'd like to know what percentage of non-Federally-qualified. But that harvest is by month. Then perhaps we could submit a proposal that closes the NECCUA to non-Federally-qualified hunters at a specific month, like December 1 to December 30 or something like that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. See.

MR. SEE: Mr. Chairman. Patty's last statement there is what was being kicked around in Hoonah when I left because we more or less wanted to stay fluid with the emergency closure type thing because once you get it cast in stone it's in stone. We were going to submit that as a proposal for this next year.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Then we'll look forward to that proposal, Mr. See. Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Neil, a question for you. I heard a comment earlier today in some places where people who are rural in nature will go get permits from other people to hunt their deer for them.

MR. LARSON: Proxy.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Proxy.

MR. KITKA: Proxy hunting. How many does the State allow each person to carry as proxies?

MR. BARTEN: Members of the Council. Yeah, under the State system it's called a proxy. Under the Federal it's a designated hunter. If you're hunting under a proxy for the State, you can only hunt for one person at a time. So I could go out and hunt for another person and get whatever the bag limit is, say four deer, and then come back and I could go out for another person, but I need another permit. Under the Federal designated hunter system, I think you can hunt for -- it might be any number of Federally-qualified people at a time.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Follow up, Harvey.

MR. KITKA: Does that mean that one person can go out and if he had the means available to get proxy permits from 15 people he can get 15 deer in a day?

MR. BARTEN: Yeah, Members of the Council. Again, under the proxy, you can only hunt for one person at a time. One thing I neglected to tell you that Rich just whispered in my ear, under the State proxy you can only hunt for someone who is over a certain age. I think it's 60 years old they have to be or legally blind or 70 percent physically disabled. Obviously we want people hunting for people who might need help getting animals. You have to deliver it to the person within 30 days and then you could go out and get another proxy for someone else who needed the meet.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Anyone else. Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I move to submit a Federal subsistence wildlife proposal harvest limit Unit 4, Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area, Federal public lands on the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area are closed to the taking of female deer from December 1st to January 31st.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Do I hear a second.

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

MR. BANGS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'll go with Mr. Bangs over there. Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, this is getting back to what I'm speaking of in Unit 4. If we're going to do something like this and that's what I'm asking for and this kind of addresses it, but what I'm asking for is can we just do like in the big picture for all of Unit 4 instead of just focusing on NECCUA. It should be all of Unit 4 to non-Federally-qualified. That's what I'm looking for. I'm looking for lower limits, seasons. If we could just keep this to the season instead of just focusing on NECCUA. That's what I want to see come out of this. I don't want to just
walk in and say we've got a proposal for NECCUA. I want it for all Admiralty, all of Baranof, all of Chichagof. I want it to address those areas.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Neil, do you have a response to that and then Patty.

MR. BARTEN: Members of the Council. Yeah, one thing I do want to bring up. I have some data that Susan Oehlers handed to me a little bit ago just to give you some concept of what's going on in northeast Chichagof. This is for the 2003-2004 season, 52 percent of the successful hunters on northeast Chichagof were Federally qualified. Again, that's just one year and it's not broken down by month.

To that I'd like to add, you know, I've been in southeast Alaska just 11 years, but up until these last two really hard winters a lot of hunters from the Juneau area, Haines, Gustavus, all over the place actually, were able to go out and hunt successfully throughout Unit 4 and it's only because of the hard winters I think that the deer numbers really took a nose dive in some places and I think with especially in Unit 4 where we don't have wolves the deer recruitment can be -- their reproductive potential is really high and they can really come back from low numbers fairly quickly because of that.

I think it's important to remember that even -- you know, barring these hard winters, I think a lot of places in Seymour Canal and other parts of Unit 4 aren't really adversely impacted by people hunting does all the way from August through December because in a lot of cases we thought we were pretty close to the carrying capacity of the habitat up until these hard winters to where we were carrying a lot of deer and we were worried about what those deer might do to the habitat if we got a hard winter and we did and we lost a lot of deer.

So I think you might want to consider that too where if you did close all these areas to doe hunting after a certain period of time, you know, we really didn't have a problem in most areas until this hard winter hit.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I've got Patty and then Mike.
MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Barten. I want to reiterate what Mr. Barten said. The conservation concern is isolated to this NECCUA area. There is hard winters and it is stressing deer population, but in my area we don't have the heavy timber harvest, so we still have strong populations of deer. I don't want to expand closing the NECCUA to other areas of Unit 4. I want it just strictly to NECCUA because of what I'm hearing from the biologists. There is a conservation concern. Hoonah's subsistence needs are not being met.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Mr. Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I totally agree with Patty. I think if subsistence needs are being met in the other communities, there's no reason to restrict non-Federally-qualified. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mike.

Mike, the other Mike.

MR. SEE: I totally agree with Patty, too. If it gets to a point where the deer rebound enough where they become a problem again, we can go through the same process and change it. Right now this is a fix. If it gets to be not a problem, we can unfix it.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. See.

Floyd.

MR. KOOKESH: That's actually why I'm sitting here is because the community of Angoon feels they have a conservation concern and I'm trying to address it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any more comments, questions. What's the wish of the Council on this motion. Thank you, Mr. Barten. Appreciate it.

Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: While we're caucusing over there in the corner, we do have a motion on the floor by Patty to submit this proposal for Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area and I would be inclined to vote, yes, the proposal should be submitted, go
through the analysis and let's take a close look at this and consider it. That would be my recommendation.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's exactly what I heard the caucus was discussing over here. What's the wish of the Council.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called for. Roll call, Mr. Kitka, please. Before we do the voting, do you have something, Mr. Larson.

MR. LARSON: I do. I was looking at the regulatory language and what I believe would implement Patty's intent but would be correct language. If I may restate your proposal. It would say six deer; however, female deer may be taken only from September 15th and we scratch January 31st and we include November 30th and that is for the NECCUA area only.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Let's go ahead and take an at east here while they figure this out.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. It looks like we've got some language developed here for this particular issue. How is it going to affect the motion that's already on the floor? Is it going to be a new one?

MR. LARSON: Yeah. A clarification.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. May I remove my previous motion and make another motion?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: At the concurrence of the second. Is that okay?

MR. BANGS: I'll withdraw my second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. So done. So a new motion is in order.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.
MS. PHILLIPS: I move to submit a Federal subsistence wildlife proposal harvest limit, Federal public lands on the NECCUA, Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area, are closed to the taking of female deer from December 1 to January 30 except by Federally-qualified subsistence users.

MR. BANGS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Seconded. Any further discussion.

MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called for. Mr. Kitka, roll call, please.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.


MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
Mr. Kitka: Richard Stokes.

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Mr. Kitka: Mr. Chair, the motion passes unanimously.

Chairman Adams: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

Mr. Kookesh: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Adams: Floyd, go ahead.

Mr. Kookesh: Mr. Chairman. We're working on another proposal for Unit 4 and we'd like to bring it up later on under M, other items as necessary.

Chairman Adams: Thank you, Mr. Kookesh. We will do that. Number H then, moose harvest limit reduction in Yakutat. Susan, are you going to handle that one?

Ms. Oehlers: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Council members. Did you want me to do an overview?

Chairman Adams: Let's see. This was that special action that was taken. Go ahead.

Ms. Oehlers: Okay. I believe what we wanted to discuss was to put in a proposal to delegate authority. This would be a special action request for this year to delegate authority to the District Ranger out of Yakutat to basically set the harvest limits for moose harvest in Unit 5A. He currently has the authority to close the season when the quota has been reached, but he does not have the authority to set the quota. So in the regs there's specific numbers, which is 60 for the entire unit, and that the season would close when 30 moose have been taken west of the Dangerous.

In consultation and in line with the State, we did want to reduce the quota last year to 20, so we went through the Federal Subsistence Board to do that. It may be such that we would want to go with similar numbers this year, maybe 20 or 25, so what we would like to do is be able to give authority to the District Ranger to change that quota if need be.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So you're asking for a special action to authorize the District Ranger to change quota when he feels it's necessary. Kind of give us a background if you would on what happened last year with reduction of the bull moose and the cow ratio.

MS. OEHLERS: Certainly, Mr. Chair. As we talked about a little bit briefly before, we've been concerned for a couple years about bull/cow ratio in the 5A area. We have sort of a geographical dividing line through the Yakutat Forelands, which is the Dangerous River, so there's a total of 60 moose that can be taken, but we close the season when 30 have been taken west of the Dangerous River. So between the Dangerous River and the town of Yakutat is where most of the harvest takes place and where most of the subsistence harvest takes place primarily because of easier access. The other side of the Dangerous is a little harder to get to, mostly fly in, and that's where we get a little more of the non-Federal harvest.

One of the reasons for a lower bull/cow ratio on the western Forelands may be because we actually do get a higher harvest there. We generally do reach 30 or close to on that side, whereas on the other side of the Dangerous is usually quite a bit lower in the 10 to 20 range.

Just to give you a couple numbers for the bull/cow ratio November 2005 we estimated 20/100 and that was on the eastern Forelands, the east side of the Dangerous. The following year November of 2006 on the western Forelands we had 10/100. In 2007, where we did both areas at the same time, there was 11/100 on the western side and 18/100 on the eastern.

Some of these numbers may be a little low estimates. We do have problems in Yakutat with low visibility before we get the snow and so it's difficult to get out before the bulls start dropping their antlers, but if you go up without snow it's really difficult to get any kind of count. Nevertheless, we're still seeing much lower numbers on the western side of the Dangerous.

So, in consultation with the State again, the hunt is managed under a State/Federal joint permit. We did decide this year to reduce the quota to 20 bulls west of the Dangerous. So the whole limit was
changed from 60 to 50 with a closure when we reach 20
on the western side of the Dangerous.

The proposal that we're asking for is
to give authority to the in-season manager to be able
to set the harvest quota and that would be in
consultation with the State and with the Chair of the
RAC.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any comments or
questions from the Council. We did have a special
action last season. Essentially what you're doing is
asking the same thing or is it different?

MS. OEHLERS: Let me try and clarify.
Last year, in order to change that quota, we, as the
Forest Service, put in a special action request and
that went through the Board and they authorized that
quota reduction. What we're asking now for this season
would just be to give authority to the District Ranger
to set that quota. We did some surveys this fall.
We'll continue to monitor the bull/cow ratio, but we'd
like to have some flexibility to provide that in-season
management authority to the District Ranger.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Right after the moose
season last year I approached you and some other people
in the community talked extensively to Mr. Barten on
the telephone of a possibility of opening up a cow
season there for a short time. The information that I
got from Neil was all of Yakutat, Unit 5A, has a lot of
moose there and the bull/cow ratio was a real big
concern, so that's the reason that special action came
through. If there is a lot of moose in the area and if
the community's subsistence needs are not being met, I
thought it would be a good idea if we could do a
special action to open up at least for five cow moose
for a short time, particularly for subsistence hunters.
We talked about maybe doing that last year, but after
discussion with you and Neil and some other people we
decided to not pursue it. I think it would be a real
good idea to put that back on the table for this year
if need be.

I'd like to get particularly Neil's
feedback on that because they were supposed to do some
more surveys this winter and I'm kind of curious if
that took place and if there's any difference in the
bull/cow ratio.
Go ahead, Neil.

MR. BARTEN: Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. So last fall Susan was kind enough to be available. We had Board of Game meetings in Juneau and we ended up getting snow in Yakutat and I couldn't make it up there, so Susan actually did several flights on the west sign to do comp surveys. The first survey she did she counted 94 animals and actually saw a good number of bulls. She saw 23 bulls. So the ratio for that survey was close to 30-some bulls per 100 cows. About three weeks later she did a second survey where her sample size was a lot higher and ended up with, I think, 14 bulls per 100 cows. So I think we saw some immediate effects of limiting the harvest last year.

My sense, going into this year, if you go back the last five or six years, I think the average take on the west side of the Dangerous has been about 26 bulls or so in that area. Last year we limited the harvest to 20 and I think we could probably go up to 25 bulls and allow more opportunity and still accomplish our objective with another year or two of a somewhat limited harvest.

I think that would be a much better route to take than to consider an antlerless or a cow hunt. You and I talked about that because I think the Yakutat area is a pretty much predator limited system. Those cows out there, even if you take five, that might be six or eight calves that those five would have had, even if all of them get eaten by bears, they're going to have calves the next year, so there's a lot of reproductive potential with every cow out there over the course of its lifetime.

I don't see this as a long-term deal where we're going to be limiting bull harvest for many, many years to come, but I think we've already accomplished something by one year of limited harvest and I think next year we would be okay with going up to 25 and just keeping it right at that and then reassess the year after that and just see where we are.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Susan, go ahead.

MS. OEHLERS: Thank you. I'm in agreement with Neil. That would be a good conservative approach. We could allow some additional subsistence harvest opportunities and still work on rebuilding that
bull/cow ratio.

I just wanted to add the clarification.
What we would be asking for would be a special action
so that this would be in effect this year for 2009, but
then we would also want a proposal through the next
cycle to make it a permanent change, but we would want
this to be in effect this year as well.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I don't believe we have a motion on this yet.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You're right, we
don't. I'd like to entertain a motion at this point.
Go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm prepared to make a
motion that the Council designate the district ranger
in Yakutat to set the quota for west of the Dangerous
River for bull moose.

MR. KITKA: I'll second it.

MR. STOKES: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'll take Mr. Stokes,
Harvey. Does that cover your concern? Does that
motion have all the ingredients you need in it?

MS. OEHLERS: Yes. I think we would
want to include the whole area 5A, which would include
that portion west of the Dangerous River.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Further discussion
from the Council.

MR. BANGS: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been
called. Mr. Kitka, roll call.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.
MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passed unanimously.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. Are you going to address the goat management issue, too? Just give us an idea what this is all about and then if there's a motion that needs to be made we can entertain that and then discuss it, okay.

MS. OEHLERS: Okay. As we discussed earlier, did you want to talk about the possibility of looking at restricting the moose harvest in Yakutat to a number per family.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: While we're on the subject of moose, why don't we do that, Susan. It's kind of a new idea and Mayor Stone from Yakutat requested this through her and so she's going to bring it before us at this point.
Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

MR. BANGS: Mr. Chair. Would it be the time to draft a proposal for the next cycle or do we have time later? She requested that we put in a proposal for the next cycle and I just wondered if now is the time we could just get that out of the way.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, I guess that's possible. Mr. Larson.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. If it is the Council's intent to submit a proposal that is similarly worded and has the same effect as the special action that you just adopted, I could move that forward as Council intent and produce a similarly worded proposal, but I would need something in the affirmative from the Council to do that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I think that would require a motion for us to allow him to move forward with that. Mr. Bangs.

MR. BANGS: I make a motion to draft a proposal to address the management of the moose in 5A.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Do I hear a second.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald. Is there discussion.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. The intent is to delegate authority to the Yakutat District Ranger to establish quota in consultation with ADF&G and the RAC to close the season when the quota is filled in that portion west of the Dangerous River and Unit 5A.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, Susan. So that's covered then?

MR. BANGS: (Nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Then go ahead and
address.....

MR. LARSON: We need to vote.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, yeah, we do need
to vote. I'm trying to push it real fast. Are we
ready for the question.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Mr. Kitka.
MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
MR. BANGS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.
MS. HAWKINS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Mike See.
MR. SEE: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.
MR. KOOKESH: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.
Michael Douville.
MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.
MR. STOKES: Yes.
MR. KITKA: The motion passed unanimously.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Council and Mr. Kitka. Let's move on to the issue that Mayor Stone talked with you about.

MS. OEHLERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to kind of introduce this topic. We had the National Park Service Subsistence Commission met in Yakutat this last fall and I attended -- Mr. Adams here is also on that committee. We did have the Yakutat mayor in the audience participating. He had expressed some concern about moose harvest in Yakutat where there's a couple individuals or families that tend to take a large proportion of the harvest, so we're looking at generally 20 to 30 moose taken by Yakutat residents and one family may take several of those moose every year. So he was interested in possibly putting something through that would limit number of moose per household. I know he's not the only person in the community that has those concerns. I thought that was something I should bring forward to the Council for discussion.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Susan. To clarify that somewhat, I'm personally familiar with the situation where an individual who has a large family gets a permit for all of his children, goes out and shoots moose for all of them. I think the proposal that Major Stone is bringing our attention to is a real good one. Not only that, but this individual does a lot of designated hunting. There's been situations where he has hung moose in his shed and it's gone bad on him, so we have that situation. When those kinds of things happen, we need to stand up and take notice and I think this is a real good proposal. I would entertain a motion to address that issue. It would be one moose per family.

MR. SEE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. See.

MR. SEE: I am very unfamiliar with moose. How much meat do you get off one moose?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You get enough. I have a large family, five families in Yakutat, and we survive off of two or three. One moose is enough to
take care of one family. They're pretty big animals.

Donald.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll make a motion that we submit a proposal to limit the moose harvest to one per family in Unit 5A.

MR. BANGS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Any further discussion on this issue. Harvey.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chairman. I know you said one per family on this motion, but I believe they were talking about one per household, which is different.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And that is the real intent, one per household.

MS. OEHLERS: I believe that would probably be.....

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That would be more accurate.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I'll amend my proposal to replace the word family with household.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's a friendly amendment so we'll go ahead and accept it as that. Thank you.

Discussion. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: You mentioned something about the designated hunter. I don't know how designated hunter works in Yakutat. Maybe you could explain that to me.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Same as the proxy hunter with the State. They get a permit to hunt on behalf of an elder or someone incapable of hunting.

MR. HERNANDEZ: So unlike the deer hunting here, the designated hunter for moose there is only for an elderly person or disabled?
CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No, not necessarily.

They can go hunt for another person as well. It's been abused. I guess the better word for it would be proxy hunt. No? I see Patty looking at the regs.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I guess I would want to see a clarification on that. It sounds like essentially we'd be either doing away with the designated hunter or altering it. Maybe we'd still want to leave it open so somebody could designate hunt for an elderly or disabled person.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No, this particular motion or proposal is not to include designated. We're not addressing designated hunters, okay. Just one per household.

Patty, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The definition of household means that group of people residing in the same residence. The definition of designated hunter means a Federally qualified subsistence hunter who may take all or a portion of another Federally-qualified hunter's harvest limits only under situations approved by the Board.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you for that.

Did that help you out?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I guess my question was can somebody be a designated hunter for somebody within their own household presently and would that change that.

Go ahead.

MS. OEHLERS: Maureen just brought up the regs, too. Just to clarify, if you're a Federally-qualified subsistence user, you may designate another Federally-qualified subsistence user designated hunter to take deer, moose and caribou on your behalf.

Designated hunters may hunt for any number of recipients but have no more than two harvest limits in possession at any one time.

My understanding is you can be a designated hunter for someone else in your household. I don't think this would necessarily change that, but once you did get a moose, you would not be able to hunt
any more for those members in your household. Does that clarify?

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It does.

MR. HERNANDEZ: You could still be a designated hunter for somebody outside of your household.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I don't see any problem with that. Any more discussion.

MS. PHILLIPS: Question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been called. Mr. Kitka, roll call.

MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: (No response)

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Mike Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passes. One absent.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. We'll move on. Goat management in Yakutat. Do you want to just give us a little bit of highlight of what this is all about and then we can get the Council to address it.

MS. OEHLERS: Certainly. So regarding goat management in Yakutat. This is the Nunatak Bench portion of Unit 5A. This population we started seeing a decline in 2000. As Mr. Chair mentioned earlier, there had been some illegal hunting/guiding in that area, which we think kind of precipitated the decline. Numbers, we're talking 82 goats counted in 2000, 48 in 2001. In recent years we've counted anywhere between 20 and 40. So maybe only 25 percent of the population we were seeing in 2000. We did go ahead and close the season, both the State and Federal, starting in 2001. The State has removed that area from their registration hunt. As the Forest Service, we do have the authority to set that harvest quota and basically what we've been doing is closing this every year.

So this proposal is to basically close this season in the regs so that we're not reassessing every year and closing it. We're just not seeing any rebounding of the population. It's likely it's going to take several years, maybe even decades for that population to come back. So we're proposing to just close that area for now.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Susan, I don't see a proposal here in front of us, so is this something you're bringing before us right now?

MS. OEHLERS: I did write up a proposal. Does Mr. Larson have that?

MR. LARSON: Just special action.

MS. OEHLERS: So I guess this would probably be similar to what we're looking at for moose. We may want to do a special action this year and a proposal as well. I mean we're looking at this as a
long-term closure before we would see any harvestable
population in that area.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Patty, go

ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to submit a special
action request to close the Federal subsistence goat
hunting season in Unit 5A, that area between the
Hubbard Glacier and the west Nunatak Glacier on the
north and east sides of the Nunatak Fiord with the
intention of submitting this as a Federal wildlife
proposal.

MR. BANGS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.

It's up for discussion.

(No comments)

MR. SEE: Call for the question.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question has been
called for. Mr. Kitka, roll call.

MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.

MR. BANGS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Merle Hawkins.

MS. HAWKINS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mike See.

MR. SEE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.
MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

Mike Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Richard Stokes.

MR. STOKES: Yes.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

Susan.

MS. OEHLERS: Mr. Chair, if I may, I just had a few more notes on goats in the Yakutat area, if I could just finish up with that topic.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure. Go ahead.

MS. OEHLERS: Mr. Barten and I had talked. We just wanted to give the Council some information. I did do some work on the Nunatak goat area just kind of compiling historic information and population data. So if you're interested in some late night reading, you might want to take a copy of that home.

Also in there I talk about we are noticing some population decline in the area adjacent to Nunatak Bench. So we're not sure what's going on, why that population isn't rebounding, but we're starting to see some decline in the area from Harlequin Lake up to Nunatak. We were formerly seeing as far back as 2001, maybe 125 goats, 125 to 150 through 2006. In the last couple years we've been seeing between 50 and 60. So we're not sure what's going on, but it seems like there's a decline going on in the areas adjacent to that Nunatak Fiord now. The State did actually close that season last year. Subsistence harvest in that area is very low. We didn't feel at the time we needed to pursue a closure, but it is something that may become more of an issue.

I know the State is interested in doing
some surveys probably before the season opens this
year, so there may be some issues coming up for this
season, so I just wanted to give everyone a heads up on
that.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So something that
might come down the pike in the future. Thank you,
Susan, for that. I think it was you that I was talking
about why there wasn't any goat on the other side of
Russell Fiord. Was that you?

MS. OEHLERS: I think we've discussed
that, yes.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We talked about it and
we were wondering why. We thought maybe habitat wasn't
appropriate or something like that and looking at the
possibility of transplanting some of those over there.
There's nothing on that side. All the goats are over
on the Nunatak Bench. So it might be food for thought.

MS. OEHLERS: If I may, Mr. Chair. In
doing some research for the Nunatak area and some of my
local knowledge interviews, there were a couple
individuals that said they had seen a handful of goats
there over the years. So we're not really sure why
they're not there.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: All right. Thank you.

MS. OEHLERS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Before I forget, I think we skipped over a special
action on the 1B and Unit 3 moose antler change. We
put in a proposal, but in order for it to be enacted
this year we need to adopt this special action
proposal.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think that's next.
You know what, I think we can finish this up tomorrow
morning and finish up the agenda as well tomorrow. So
why don't we adjourn for the night. I promised some of
the Council members we would try to do that so they can
look around town and do some shopping. So why don't we
start at 8:00 o'clock tomorrow.

Let's make that 9:00. I think we can
do it.

(Off record)
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