

00045

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

SOUTHEAST REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING

8

9

10

Saxman Community Hall

11

Saxman, Alaska

12

March 10, 1998 - 9:00 a.m.

13

14

VOLUME II

15

16 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

17

18 Mr. William C. Thomas, Sr. - Chairman

19 Ms. Dolly Garza - Vice Chairman

20 Ms. Patricia A. Phillips - Secretary

21 Mr. Herman Kitka, Sr.

22 Ms. Mary Rudolph

23 Ms. Mim McConnell

24 Mr. John Vale

25 Mr. Gabriel D. George

26 Mr. John Feller

27 Ms. Vicki LeCornu

28 Mr. Jeff G. Nickerson

29 Mr. Lonnie Anderson (Telephonically)

30

31 Mr. Fred Clark - Coordinator

00046

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

(On record - 9:00 a.m.)

MS. GARZA: Call the meeting to order. We will continue with the proposals that we started yesterday. We'd like to welcome John from Wrangell. Glad to see him here. We deferred one proposal, 13, which has to do with your area, John, so when we finish the Sitka and the Prince of Wales proposals we'll come back to that, okay.

MR. FELLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Brad Powell.

MR. THOMAS: Front and center.

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Oh, he's back in the kitchen. Fred.....

MR. CLARK: There are more coffee cups on the way.

CHAIRMAN GARZA: This is a bring your own coffee cup day.

MR. THOMAS: And a lot of good water back there if you don't drink coffee. He must be getting guidance from above. Mike -- Mike Brown, you could speak for Brad, couldn't you?

MR. BROWN: It depends on what you're asking.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And how bad do you like his job.

CHAIRMAN GARZA: So yesterday we did introduce the Council as well as everybody in the audience and there are several people who are here now that were not here yesterday. If you could introduce yourself.

MR. COLT: I'm Colt -- Wildlife leader for the Ketchikan area, Tongass National Forest.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, I'm Mike Brown. I'm a wildlife biologist here in Ketchikan.

CHAIRMAN GARZA: With.

MR. BROWN: The Forest Service.

MR. POWELL: Good morning, I'm Brad Powell and I'm the

50 Forest supervisor of the Ketchikan area of the Tongass.

00047

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Millie.

2
3 MS. STEVENS: Good morning everyone. I'm Millie
4 Stevens from Craig and I represent Craig Community Association.

5
6 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you for being here Millie. And
7 Brad it's my understanding that you would like to make a
8 welcome address. There you are -- if you could use a mic,
9 please.

10
11 MR. BROWN: Do I need to clip it on or can you hear me.

12
13 REPORTER: You can clip it on if you want, but we can
14 hear you.

15
16 MR. BROWN: It's my pleasure to welcome you this
17 morning. I am Brad Powell and I am the Forest supervisor here
18 in Ketchikan. I would welcome you, you're doing important work
19 and I think you all know that. It's important work to us in
20 the Forest Service, and we're really proud that you've come to
21 Ketchikan, come to Saxman. We're pleased to have the
22 opportunity to interact with you at this meeting.

23
24 You've got an important agenda, I'm not going to take
25 much of your time. I'm pleased to be here, pleased to see you,
26 look forward to working with you in the future and thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, very much. John.

29
30 MR. FELLER: Good morning, I'm John Feller. I'm from
31 the next town up, Wrangell. I've been on the Council since the
32 beginning and I also represent the Wrangell Cooperative
33 Association, the tribal government there. I'm currently the
34 chair and also chair of Camp 4, ANB, Alaska Native Brotherhood.
35 It's good to be here.

36
37 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And then Jeff and Herman, you guys
38 were a bit late yesterday, did you introduce yourselves?

39
40 MR. NICKERSON: My name is Jeff Nickerson. This is my
41 second -- well, this is finishing my first one year. I've been
42 to one meeting in Yakutat and I'm looking forward to the next
43 two years, hopefully. I enjoy being here, thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thanks, Jeff. And Herman, do you want
46 to introduce yourself.

47
48 MR. KITKA: Herman Kitka from Sitka.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. And Vicki, even though you're

00048

1 just sitting down, do you want to quickly introduce yourself.

2

3 MS. LeCORNU: I'm Vicki LeCornu from Hydaburg.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GARZA: It's good to see you here.

6

7 MS. LeCORNU: Thanks.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So getting on to business. We
10 were on Proposal 14. Proposal 14 proposes to do two things,
11 reduce the daily bag limit of deer from six to four and to
12 reduce the season from January 31st back to December 31st. We
13 received the team presentation, some agency information, we
14 have five written comments, we had some public comments and we
15 are to the point of Council deliberation.

16

17 The proposal is on the floor to adopt the proposal for
18 discussion purposes. So are there comments from Council
19 members or are we prepared to vote? Gabriel.

20

21 MR. GABRIEL: Thank you. I, of course, speak against
22 the motion. I appreciate Staff's recommendation. As I
23 understand the task in front of us and what -- how we need to
24 address proposals in terms of the subsistence priority, I don't
25 believe this fits any of the criteria that would make it such
26 that we would have to shorten the season or lower the bag
27 limit. So I agree with Staff's recommendation to oppose the
28 proposal.

29

30 I know that the initial proposal for extension of the
31 season came out of Angoon. Angoon is a subsistence community
32 and the people that were hunting in January were subsistence
33 hunters and the need for the deer was essential to them. And
34 at that time, the season was closed and they were arrested,
35 their guns were taken, their deer were taken and I believe
36 eventually were given back to them. But this is to the heart
37 of where we are coming from or how we are addressing proposals,
38 to meet the needs of subsistence hunters. And so I agree with
39 Staff's recommendation and strongly oppose this proposal.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Gabriel. Are there other
44 comments from Council? John.

45

46 MR. VALE: Thank you. Given the information we heard
47 earlier that there isn't really a conservation concern here, I
48 don't support the proposal either.

49

I did notice in the public comments that the Sitka

00049

1 Advisory Committee, while not commenting on changing the bag
2 limit, was in favor of, as I understand it.....

3
4 MS. McCONNELL: Season.

5
6 MR. VALE:yeah, supporting the season change.
7 And I know that those folks on the Sitka Advisory Committee are
8 a pretty committed group and it's been my experience that they
9 work hard to resolve issues in the community. And I guess I'm
10 -- I know I heard from you, Dolly, yesterday, that you felt
11 because there isn't a conservation concern we shouldn't reduce
12 the season. But I was just wondering if perhaps you or Herman
13 would want to comment on the Sitka Advisory Committee's
14 comments here and want to share any thoughts on that.

15
16 MR. KITKA: We had meetings with Sitka Tribe and Sitka
17 ANB, and subsistence hunters that were controlled by Sitka
18 Tribe, everyone of them spoke against cutting back to four
19 deer. They said that there was a lot of deer in the woods.
20 Every place where they hunted subsistence hunters, they said
21 that there was more deer in the woods, none showed on the beach
22 on account of no snow, so those sportsman that put in the
23 proposal that said there was no deer, they couldn't shoot any
24 off the boats, so they said that there was no deer. But the
25 actual subsistence hunters, they claimed that there was more
26 deer in the woods that there ever was on account of the mild
27 winters we've been having. And so we oppose -- we want to keep
28 that existing regulation. And we also discussed cutting back,
29 shortening the season but then there was other outlying
30 communities that depend on the subsistence hunt in January, so
31 we all voted to leave it the same way it was.

32
33 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bill.

34
35 MR. THOMAS: Madame Chairman, like I mentioned
36 yesterday this game management unit and their resources with
37 their wildlife has been studied, restudied, scrutinized,
38 excellent comments and input provided by very knowledgeable
39 people on this subject. The Staff, I see, has taken advantage
40 of the good information and I'm convinced that they made a very
41 conscientious choice with their recommendation. Given that, I
42 would support Staff recommendation.

43
44 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Bill. Other comments.
45 Vicki.

46 MS. LeCORNU: I missed that. Are we discussing the
47 motion to adopt 9?

48
49 CHAIRMAN GARZA: No, I'm sorry, I should have let you

50 and John know what we were doing. We sort of skipped around.

00050

1 Yesterday we started with Proposal 1, and then we moved on to
2 Proposal 13, and we postponed that proposal because we didn't
3 have anyone from Kake or Wrangell, we now have John. And now
4 we're going to do 14, 15 and 16, and then we'll move back to
5 the Prince of Wales proposals. And we're going in this order,
6 in part, because Mr. Robert Willis needs to leave today so we
7 wanted to get his report on those proposals before he left.

8
9 So on Proposal 1, we did pass that. And then on
10 Proposal 13, we wanted to get some comments on the perception
11 of the rack size from the Wrangell, Kake people and we'll get
12 back to that. So right now, we're on Proposal 14, which would
13 do two things, reduce the bag limit from six to four, and to
14 reduce the season by a month by moving it back from January
15 31st to December 31st. The Staff has recommended against the
16 proposal. It's my understanding that Fish and Game supports
17 the proposal. And the summary from the written public comments
18 have been split, two in favor, two against, one neutral.

19
20 MS. LeCORNU: Thank you.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mary and then Gabriel.

23
24 MS. RUDOLPH: Yes, I'm going to have to agree with not
25 supporting the proposal, only because being from the village of
26 Hoonah, by January our people are having a hard time. There's
27 no income, no place to get a job, logging is closed for them
28 that are logging and fishing is closed for the ones that are
29 fishing. So the clams and the gumboots and the deer and the
30 seal are real crucial to our tribe in surviving during the
31 winter. So it's really -- I think it would be really harmful
32 for our tribe, I know I'd get a lot of repercussion back if I
33 went ahead and supported this proposal.

34
35 I can understand Sitka's concern just reading Prince of
36 Wales report and stuff, but I think we'd have to let them maybe
37 figure out a way to support just this one area if that's what
38 the Sitka Tribe wants. But I see the Sitka Tribe is opposing
39 it also.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mary. Gabriel.

44
45 MR. GABRIEL: Thank you. As you can see on Page 101,
46 the map of Unit 4 for this Proposal 14, is quite a large area
47 that encompasses that and on to Baranof and Chichagof, the ABC
48 Islands. And within that -- within those boundaries are Angoon
49 on Admiralty, Tenakee, Elfin Cove, Pelican, Sitka, PA on

50 Chichagof and Baranof. I believe that there are differences of

00051

1 opinion as to how best to manage the local stocks in the
2 surrounding communities. So that I think in the future we may
3 well be into trying to address the boundary lines per the
4 community if we're able to get some consensus on use areas
5 without effecting one -- you know, overwhelming one community
6 or taking away their major deer harvest areas.

7
8 So that I guess what I'm suggesting in the future, that
9 maybe we may wish to make Unit 4 a Unit 4(A), (B), (C), (D),
10 (E) and (F) in an attempt to address Hoonah's concerns,
11 Tenakee's concerns, Sitka's concerns. But it would have to be
12 a process that would satisfy, you know, the Sitka concerns and
13 the Angoon concerns and others, and Kake and other communities
14 that use Unit 4, so that we don't inadvertently hurt
15 subsistence users in other communities. But that would be
16 something that I think that we ought to sit down and address
17 sometime in the future.

18
19 Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Gabriel. So are we
22 prepared to vote.

23
24 MR. VALE: Call for the question.

25
26 MR. THOMAS: Question.

27
28 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. The question has been called
29 for the proposal. The motion was to accept Proposal 14. If
30 you vote in favor then you accept the proposal, if you vote
31 against, then you accept the Staff recommendations of opposing
32 the proposal.

33
34 MS. LeCORNU: Say that again, I didn't hear you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Proposal 14. The motion was to
37 adopt Proposal 14. So if you vote in favor of the motion, then
38 you're accepting these changes. If you vote against the
39 motion, then you are voting against Proposal 14. Gabriel.

40
41 MR. GABRIEL: And the changes are that in this proposal
42 is to lower the bag limit from six to four and it's also to
43 shorten the season from January 31st to December 31st, that's
44 the proposal.

45
46 CHAIRMAN GARZA: All in favor of the motion signify by
47 saying aye.

48
49 (No opposing responses)

00052

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Opposed.

2

3 IN UNISON: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, the motion fails.

6

7 MR. CLARK: Madame Chairman, we have Lonnie on the line
8 now.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

11

12 MR. CLARK: You might want to give it a try.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GARZA: I understand that we have Lonnie
15 Anderson from Kake on the little box over there; is that you
16 Lonnie?

17

18 MR. CLARK: Lonnie can you hear?

19

20 MR. ANDERSON: No, not very clear.

21

22 MR. CLARK: We'll try moving some mics around.

23

24 MR. VALE: It's nice to have another bald eagle with
25 us.

26

27 MR. CLARK: Okay, let's try that.

28

29 MR. ANDERSON: I hear you loud and clear there, Fred.

30

31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, Lonnie, can you hear me, this is
32 Dolly?

33

34 MR. ANDERSON: No. I can hear you in the background.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. We'll have to have Vicki
37 translate everything since she's closest to the machine.

38

39 MS. LeCORNU: We said we're glad to have another bald
40 eagle here.

41

42 MR. ANDERSON: I'll tell you what it's good to be in
43 the slow capital of the world.

44

45 MR. CLARK: Lonnie, we will move the speaker so you'll
46 be able to hear better.

47

48 MR. ANDERSON: Very good.

49

MR. GEORGE: Ask him what his vote is on Proposal 14.

00053

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So we're on to Proposal 15,
2 which is also for Unit 4.

3
4 MR. GEORGE: Could you tell Lonnie what we just did on
5 Proposal 14?

6
7 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Sure.

8
9 MS. McCONNELL: She said Vicki could tell him.

10
11 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Lonnie, can you hear me?

12
13 MR. ANDERSON: I can hear you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Lonnie, we're taking the
16 proposals out of order. Yesterday we looked at Proposal 1
17 which expanded the moose area in Unit 1(B), and we voted in
18 favor of that proposal. The next proposal we looked at was 13
19 which increases the area for moose and establishes a rack size.
20 We postponed that proposal, voting on the proposal because we
21 were hoping to hear from you and John Feller and John is here
22 with us this morning. We're now working on the Unit 4
23 proposals, Proposal 14, which reduces the bag limit and
24 decreases the season. We just defeated that proposal and we
25 are moving on to Proposal 15. When we finish the Unit 4
26 proposals then we will move on to the Prince of Wales proposals
27 which are 9, 10, 11 and 12.

28
29 MR. THOMAS: There's a lot of people signing in back
30 there.

31
32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: You got that?

33
34 MR. ANDERSON: I have it.

35
36 MR. CLARK: Madame Chairman.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Fred.

39
40 MR. CLARK: Salena's going to unplug the speaker for
41 just a moment, so Lonnie won't be able to hear what you're
42 saying.

43
44 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, we'll be at ease for a minute.

45
46 MR. THOMAS: At ease, at ease.

47
48 (Off record)

49

00054

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So the meeting is called back
2 to order. We are now ready to address Proposal 15. Proposal
3 15 is for Unit 4. It adds a special provision that all edible
4 meat harvested from ungulates in Unit 4 must remain on the
5 bones until the meat is removed from the area or is processed
6 for human consumption. We'll start with the team presentation,
7 Mr. Willis.

8
9 MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Madame Chairman. This proposal
10 was submitted by our own Patti Phillips of Pelican out of a
11 concern about wanton waste of meat of deer in Unit 4.

12
13 This is an issue that was discussed quite heavily in
14 last years Council meeting in Sitka and was discussed to some
15 degree yesterday when we were talking about the proposal to
16 reduce the season harvest limit in Unit 4. Since we've pretty
17 thoroughly discussed the deer situation in Unit 4 and agree
18 that we have a healthy population there and we're not dealing
19 with a conservation issue, I'll kind of skip over that part and
20 talk about the wanton waste issues specifically.

21
22 The single issue that was brought to our attention as a
23 contributing factor to wanton waste was the big buck derby
24 contest held in Sitka. There have been some other issues
25 raised in testimony prior to this meeting that were considered
26 to be contributing factors to the wanton waste issue. And
27 those were, legalized shooting from boats by inexperienced
28 people. The presence of a designated hunter provision which
29 allowed a hunter to harvest twice the daily harvest limit. The
30 proposal as submitted by Patti would change the regulations
31 found in the front part of our blue regulations booklet under
32 utilization of wildlife which states that all edible meat
33 harvested from ungulates in Unit 4 must remain on the bones
34 until the meat is removed from the area or is processed for
35 human consumption.

36
37 This proposal is very similar to a couple of proposals
38 that the State currently has in place in the northern and
39 northwestern part of the state, requirements to leave meat on
40 the bone of large animals are currently found in State
41 regulations for moose in the Koyukuk River Controlled Use Area
42 up in Unit 24 and in Unit 9(B). And for moose and caribou both
43 in Unit 17, Unit 19(A) and Unit 19(B). These regulations are
44 fairly new, and I think the first one was instituted in 1995/96
45 in Unit 24. And the reason those proposals were put in place
46 up there is that hunters were taking long float trips, shooting
47 animals early in the trip and then losing most or all of the
48 meat before they finished the trip. Also there was a large
49 number of fly-in hunters that are roped off to hunt caribou and

50 moose. Many of these hunters are non-local hunters and are

00055

1 really not familiar with what's required to take care of large
2 amounts of meat in the field, especially during warm and
3 unusually rainy weather. So the State instituted this
4 regulation with the idea that hunters would be forced to,
5 number one, recognize that they had a significant problem in
6 dealing with the large quantities of meat, secondly, that
7 keeping the meat in larger pieces makes it easier to keep it
8 clean and dry and there's less surface area exposed to the air.
9 It also discourages hunters from shooting animals which is too
10 far from their camp to transport it efficiently back to camp.
11 And finally it aide the law enforcement officials in
12 determining how many animals have been taken when they come to
13 camp and the meat is hanging on the pole. If it's still
14 attached to the bone then they're able to count hindquarters,
15 forequarters and so forth and make sure that there haven't been
16 an excessive number of animals taken.

17
18 The State biologists tell me that the compliance up in
19 the Koyukuk River country has been excellent, primarily due to
20 the fact that almost all the hunters who have to exit that area
21 have to go through a check station. Down in the more
22 southwesterly portion of the state, the State puts a lot of
23 effort into enforcement by flying around and landing at these
24 fly-in camps and checking hunters in the field. Lacking a
25 central check station in that area enforcement requires a
26 pretty large commitment of personnel and aircraft to do that.
27 Unfortunately neither of the situations found there occur in
28 Unit 4. When you're dealing with deer, people are scattered,
29 there's no central check stations. There's a lack of law
30 enforcement personnel. And you also have a situation where
31 people normally do a lot of packing of meat, boning out and
32 packing of meat.

33
34 This proposal was aimed primarily at the wanton waste
35 of deer, but since it specifies ungulates it would also include
36 goats. And almost everyone who hunts goats shoots them at high
37 elevations and bones out the meat before packing it out.
38 Likewise, most people who hunt deer in the early season do so
39 by walking in to the higher country, shooting their deer and
40 then boning it out before packing it out.

41
42 Our preliminary conclusion was to reject this proposal.
43 We feel it's certainly well intentioned and it tries to get at
44 a very real problem. But first of all, we don't believe that
45 adding a regulation to the book would stop people who are going
46 to shoot an animal and take only a portion of it or take only
47 the antlers and bring it in. If they're violating wanton waste
48 laws that are in place already to do that, and it's unlikely
49 that an addition to those regulations would have an effect on

50 those people. And we also feel that it would put a significant

00056

1 hardship on those subsistence hunters who hike away from the
2 beach to shoot their deer and have to pack it out. And also
3 those who hunt goats at higher elevations and have to pack them
4 out.

5
6 Again, we've thrashed this issue severely. As Bill has
7 pointed out in the past, without coming to a good solution, we
8 feel that it's a local problem that needs to be dealt with
9 through education and I think things are moving in that
10 direction. Apparently there's been some effort to alter the
11 way the big buck contest is held. And I think that's probably
12 the proper course to pursue rather than to try to add one more
13 regulation which would certainly negatively impact some
14 subsistence users and probably would not have a significant
15 effect towards doing what it was intended to do.

16
17 That concludes the Staff analysis.

18
19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Willis. So just to let
20 everyone know the process we're using for each proposal, is we
21 will start with the team presentation or the Staff analysis.
22 There may be agency information on the proposal. We will then
23 look at the written comments that have been submitted. We will
24 open it up for public comments. If there's someone in the
25 audience who chooses to speak specifically to the proposal.
26 And then we will move on to Council deliberation. So we will
27 do that for each proposal.

28
29 Bill.

30
31 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Madame Chairman. Robert, on
32 Page 115. I always appreciate this kind of a display where it
33 shows a pattern of use broken up into different years. And
34 right underneath it it says, as can be seen from the above
35 table, harvest is very significantly from year-to-year with no
36 discernible pattern of decline or increase. Just out of
37 curiosity, I was wondering, in this kind of management, what
38 would constitute discernible? I'm thinking, I guess, in case
39 of numbers. Is there a ball park figure, like within a certain
40 range of a number that would make it more discernible than it
41 is now?

42
43 MR. WILLIS: What we would need to do would be to run a
44 statistical analysis to compare standard error or the -- Well, I
45 won't get into the statistical analysis part of it too much,
46 but you would need to run it for a significant number of years
47 and then you would use a mathematical formula to determine
48 whether or not a change is truly in one direction, you know, or
49 whether or not it's just random in its occurrence.

00057

1 The problem we have in Unit 4 is that you have a large
2 number of hunters who hunt only when conditions are very
3 favorable. And so your harvest goes up and down with the
4 weather, both with severe winters which reduce the number of
5 deer, then with mild winters, which make it difficult to hunt
6 deer. All these things make it very difficult to establish a
7 pattern. This particular table begins in 1987 which was about
8 the peak of deer populations in Unit 4. The harvest shows up
9 around 4,000 animals at that time and it has not been back to
10 that level although it did come close in 1994. So that's kind
11 of an information chart, and the primary reason I put it in
12 there is to show that harvest varies because the number of
13 hunters varies and because the weather changes so tremendously
14 in that area.

15
16 MR. THOMAS: Appreciate it, thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Herman did you have a comment on the
19 variation there, I saw you writing information?

20
21 MR. KITKA: The harvest '87 to '90 we had a lot of snow
22 and there was a lot of deer killed right on the beach. '91,
23 '92, '93 we had mild winters and there was hardly any deer
24 killed off the boats. And then we had '94, we had snow late
25 October, a lot of deer was killed when the snow drove the bucks
26 on to the beach. '94, '95, '96, they started complaining we
27 had open winters, last year it was open too. And both years
28 they complained because they couldn't shoot any off the boats.
29 So the harvest rate varies according to the snow. When there's
30 a lot of snow then everybody that's out on the boats kill the
31 deer.

32
33 And subsistence hunters last year, they didn't tag
34 their deer while they were still hunting and protection
35 officers took them to jail, fined them, they got fined \$500 for
36 not tagging the deer. They were still hunting, and I didn't
37 agree with the process the protection officers were doing when
38 they were patrolling. I know a lot of times when I bring the
39 deer -- until we're going to town and then I put the dates on
40 the harvest ticket because a lot of times the protection
41 officers are there to greet us at the float. But when they go
42 out and arrest the subsistence hunters, I don't agree with it.

43
44 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Herman. Fred.

45
46 MR. CLARK: I was just curious if Lonnie is being able
47 to follow the conversations.

48
49 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Lonnie, can you hear us?

00058

1 MR. ANDERSON: You were fairly weak.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Well, if you need to hear
4 something along the way then just yell out and we'll repeat
5 what we need to.

6

7 MR. THOMAS: Raise your hand.

8

9 MR. ANDERSON: I've got both of them up.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, is that it for the team
12 presentation?

13

14 MR. WILLIS: (Nods affirmatively)

15

16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Is there agency information?
17 Mr. Dinneford.

18

19 MR. DINNEFORD: Thanks, Madame Chairman. Bruce
20 Dinneford with the Department of Fish and Game. Robert did a
21 good job of pretty well outlining our comments. I would point
22 out in our agency comments we also note that Federal
23 regulations do require salvage of edible meat, and as Robert
24 lined out the enforceability of such a regulation can be pretty
25 tough without a localized check station or a good way to
26 contact a great number of the hunters. So that's about all of
27 our comments.

28

29 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you. We have written comments.

30

31 MR. CLARK: There were five written comments on this
32 proposal. The first one is from the Petersburg Fish and Game
33 Advisory Committee in Petersburg who oppose this proposal.
34 They say that there are wanton waste laws on the books. This
35 proposal would place an unwarranted hardship on alpine hunters.
36 Every effort should be made to encourage hunters to hunt
37 further from the beaches.

38

39 The second comment is from Sitka Tribe of Alaska in
40 Sitka. They say, we recognize that the concerns and that
41 regulations prohibiting wanton waste are already in place. We
42 oppose the language in this proposal as it addresses only
43 ungulates and feel that all edible animals should be salvaged.
44 We realize that all legitimate hunters make every effort to
45 salvage all required portions of their hunt but we want to
46 encourage big buck contest consider making the whole dressed
47 animal to be turned in as an entry.

48

49 The next one is from Sitka Fish and Game Advisory

50 Committee in Sitka. They are opposed to the proposal. The

00059

1 committee does not feel there is a problem in Sitka area of
2 wanton waste.

3
4 The fourth is from Zeb Strong of Tenakee Springs. I am
5 against Proposal 15. Early in the season deer are commonly
6 harvested in alpine areas necessitating a long carry. Boning
7 meat on the spot reduces weight making for an easier and
8 potentially safer pack out. I'm not aware of any wanton waste
9 attributable to trophy hunters in my area. Moreover, any such
10 waste would be clearly unlawful and I don't think additional
11 language serves as a further deterrent. Snow does bring some
12 deer down to sea level, those deer are generally smaller, not
13 trophy bucks so this is not a factor in the perceived problem.

14
15 The final written public comment is by Mike Sallee,
16 Ketchikan who says, how will wantonly wasting hunters pay
17 anymore attention to this language than existing regulations.
18 This rule would make outlays of backpacking hunters who range
19 far afield and employ boning as a mechanism to salvage the
20 meat. If buck derbies contribute to wanton waste, ADF&G should
21 eliminate buck derbies.

22
23 That concludes the written public comments.

24
25 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Fred. Is there anyone in
26 the public audience that would like to comment regarding
27 Proposal 15? I think most of you are waiting for the proposals
28 for Unit 2. So we're up to Council deliberation. John.

29
30 MR. VALE: Move to adopt the proposal.

31
32 MS. McCONNELL: Second.

33
34 CHAIRMAN GARZA: It's been moved and seconded to adopt
35 Proposal 15, so it is on the table for discussion. John.

36
37 MR. VALE: Thank you. I'm -- I guess, have difficulty
38 supporting the proposal. The folks who hunt in Yakutat, I
39 know, even when they're only packing a short distance, many of
40 the hunters like to bone the meat out and just pack the meat
41 out, and don't want to pack the bones with them. And so with
42 the wanton waste language that's already part of the Federal
43 program that this is not necessary. That's all.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Patti.

46
47 MS. PHILLIPS: I'll be voting against the proposal. My
48 major concern was on the wanton waste issue that was brought up
49 for the Sitka area. My original proposal was to establish the

50 Sitka local use area, but I decided that wasn't my place --

00060

1 that it wasn't up to me to be making boundaries for the Sitka
2 area. And I appreciate the analysis that Staff put into the
3 proposal. And the written comments that were submitted pretty
4 much answer why this proposal shouldn't be supported.

5
6 And I'd also like to state that my first deer that I
7 ever got was hunted in the alpine and I boned it out and I
8 packed it out. So thank you, though, for your work.

9
10 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Patti. Are there other
11 Council comments to this proposal or are we prepared to vote?

12
13 MR. THOMAS: When I hunt them I'll move to the alpine
14 country.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Herman.

17
18 MR. KITKA: The State already has our wanton waste
19 already on the books, and Sitka Tribe in talking to those
20 people that put on the prizes for the largest horns, what we're
21 working on is trying to make it valid, they have to present the
22 horns still attached to the deer. That way we know they bring
23 in all the meat. So this is the things that outside of
24 regulations that Sitka Tribe is working with those people to
25 try to correct those things ourselves.

26
27 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Herman. Gabriel.

28
29 MR. GABRIEL: Yeah. I agree with the analysis that is
30 put forth in terms of how the hunts are carried out because
31 that's how the hunts go on around the Angoon area in terms of
32 the spring hunt and boning out. And this discussion goes on at
33 home in many of the homes in Angoon and in other places that I
34 know of because I've boned deer out and I've also been
35 requested to bring the bones home because that's how we make
36 deer meat stew and eat the marrow and all that. So that the
37 discussion of boning and not boning occurs not only in public
38 but at home.

39
40 Certainly in the spring time and I haven't been up on
41 top of the alpine for the last four years because the last time
42 I went up, I think I lost four toe nails trying to pack a deer
43 out and all, and I spent a lot of time and effort doing that.
44 So it is a real issue in terms of weight and being able to
45 carry and how young thy body is when one ventures up in places
46 where they shouldn't venture anymore. So I agree too that we
47 ought to oppose this regulation.

48
49 I also would like to state that at one point in my life

50 I saw the largest deer I ever saw on Admiralty and shot it and

00061

1 attempted to pack it out whole with horns -- well, without
2 guts, but with the head and horns on, and I was a young man and
3 I could pack a lot in those days. I was 20 minutes back and it
4 took me over two hours to get out, and I don't know how I got
5 it back on to my boat. But it was a tremendous ordeal. And I
6 was a young foolish kid then, so that's all. Thanks.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So now you're just old and foolish?

9

10 MR. GABRIEL: Yep. No, I'm just old now.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Oh, okay. So all of the comments seem
13 to be going in the same direction so unless there's someone who
14 chooses to support the proposal then I think we are ready to
15 vote.

16

17 MR. THOMAS: Question.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Question has been called. The motion
20 was to accept Proposal 15, so if you vote in favor all of the
21 motion you are voting in favor of this restriction. You must
22 vote against the motion if you do not support the intent of the
23 proposal.

24

25 All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

26

27 (No opposing responses)

28

29 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Opposed.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, motion fails. So we will
33 address Proposal 16 and then we will be ready to move on to the
34 Prince of Wales deer proposals. Again, we will start with the
35 team presentation, Mr. Willis.

36

37 MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Madame Chair. Proposal 16 was
38 submitted by this Regional Advisory Council last year. It
39 would lengthen the trapping season for marten, mink and weasel
40 on all of Chichagof Island except for the northwest Chichagof
41 Controlled Use area. The current season is December 1 to
42 December 31, this would extend the season from December 1 to
43 February 15.

44

45 You're probably all aware marten are an introduced
46 species on Chichagof Island. They were brought in during the
47 mid-1950s. However, population size was not monitored on the
48 island until about 1980. We had a down cycle in the marten
49 population a few years ago and the season was restricted

50 significantly. From 1984 through 1995 with one year's

00062

1 exception, catch rates decreased and then that particular
2 exception was the '91/92 season which had a very high catch
3 rate. That high rate that one year was probably attributable
4 to dramatic increase in the miles of road system on the island
5 because of all the timber harvest that was going on at the
6 time. Also there were an increased number of trappers
7 operating from the logging camps. At the same time there was a
8 big reduction in the small mammal populations which the marten
9 depend on for a significant portion of their food. What's
10 happened since that time is that the marten population has
11 rebounded to some degree. The small mammal population
12 increased significantly for a year or two. The marten
13 population followed that up and we had a year or so of high
14 populations and more liberal trapping opportunities. However,
15 we find they we're in a situation now where the population is
16 crashing again and it's happened only within the last year or
17 so.

18
19 We have most of the data in the written material in
20 front of you, but we also have Ted Schenck here with us who has
21 some updated information on the population size for martens and
22 for the small mammals and on the findings of Mr. Rod Flynn of
23 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game who has been studying
24 this situation extensively. So what I'd like to do at this
25 time is to bring Ted up and have him present his information
26 before we go on to a recommendation.

27
28 MR. SCHENCK: Thank you, Robert. I'll sit here and try
29 to use this overhead.

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So Lonnie, can you hear Ted?

32
33 MR. SCHENCK: Raise your hand if you can't see the
34 slides, Lonnie.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: He must have went out for coffee.

37
38 MR. SCHENCK: The first thing I'd like to do is show
39 you something about the marten harvest on northeast Chichagof
40 Island. We have data from 1984 through 1997 and 1998, this
41 last trapping season. As you can see there's been periodic
42 highs early in the cycle, 1984/1985. It dropped down to no
43 harvest during the season of 1990/91. And it peaked last year
44 at an all time high of 391 animals, 1996/1997. This year, 70
45 animals were taken from northeast Chichagof, and the major
46 trapper quit trapping after 14 days because of lack of success.

47
48 How do I know this stuff? This is the results of a
49 cooperative effort that's being done by Alaska Department of

50 Fish and Parks, Rod Flynn, working in cooperation with Forest

00063

1 Service and the University of Alaska in Fairbanks, some
2 graduate students have been working on this also. What this
3 graph shows is that on our Salt Lake base study area from 1992
4 through the winter of 1997, that the population went from
5 approximately 10 animals to over 40 and back on down to between
6 10 and 15 animals. We're pretty confident that the population
7 on northeast Chichagof is tracking through the same cycle. If
8 we do link capture/recapture indexes for this population, we
9 estimate that the population density on northeast Chichagof
10 right now is about .1 animals per kilometer square. And just
11 to give you an idea, we think that brown bear population there
12 is about .8 animals per kilometer square. So there's quite a
13 few less marten than there are brown bears on northeast
14 Chichagof.

15
16 Just a little bit about the age ratio of the animals
17 that are trapped compared to the total catch, the dark black
18 bars are the total catch and the line represents the ratio of
19 juveniles to adults in the harvest. And I just wanted you to
20 see that when there's -- that there was a difference. In the
21 last two years there have been many more adults in the harvest
22 than juveniles. Exactly how many, this last season there were
23 five adults captured for each juvenile that was captured. Last
24 year it was about 50/50. Why would we be concerned about that?
25 One of the graduate students that's been working with Rod Flynn
26 has had, as a part of his graduate study, investigating the
27 habitats that marten used for denning. So far 34 females that
28 we've had radio-collared in the last two years when we were
29 looking at this part, only one of those denned and she had been
30 in her den after only a short period of time in the den. So we
31 had not been able to document any reproduction in the females
32 that we've had radios on in the last two years.

33
34 Something else that we're concerned about is that as
35 trapping effort goes on, the longer you go into the trapping
36 season, the more females show up in the harvest. And it's okay
37 if the males get harvested because they can service quite a
38 number of females. The females we're a little bit concerned
39 about. In the last three years, we've had 52 percent females
40 in the harvest, 38 percent and 48 percent. And we'd like to
41 see that be much less than that. If we were down in the 20 and
42 30 percent, that would be much better.

43
44 Okay. What do we think is going on? Well, we know
45 that there's a relationship between how many young marten have
46 and an abundance of small mammals. On northeast Chichagof,
47 marten eat primarily two different kinds of small mammals, one
48 is a white-footed deer mouse and the other one is long-tail
49 vole. As a matter-of-fact, the marten prefer long-tailed

50 voles. And throughout the study we've -- the percent of long-

00064

1 tail voles in the diet has gone from 48 percent, when there
2 were a lot of voles, down to 35 percent when there's hardly
3 any. Here's what we've been tracking for rodent abundance on
4 northeast Chichagof. As you can see in 1992, there are very
5 low densities of small mammals. The population increased in
6 '94/95. And right now we see the population of small mammals
7 from dropping fairly dramatically past two years. And we know
8 that there's a relationship especially in the number of long-
9 tail voles in the diet and the number of young that are born.
10 More than that, I can't tell you, but there's a fairly good
11 relationship.

12
13 I have a good bit more information if you're interested
14 or have questions. That's what I wanted to show you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thank you, Ted. Patti.

17
18 MS. PHILLIPS: Ted, does timber harvest effect the
19 rodent abundance?

20
21 MR. SCHENCK: Indeed it does. Long-tail voles are one
22 of the few small mammals that actually increase on the edges of
23 openings. So after timber harvest we would expect an increase
24 in small mammals around the edges of the opening. The interior
25 of the opening would be a different story. But long-tail voles
26 like edges. So there is a relationship between the abundance
27 of small mammals and timber harvest.

28
29 MS. PHILLIPS: So what is causing the decline in rodent
30 abundance?

31
32 MR. SCHENCK: That's the 64-dollar question. One of
33 the things that we think is a change in habitat because of the
34 logging. Another one is that we think that there's real high
35 rodent mortality during open winters where the little critters
36 don't run around underneath the snow. They end up being
37 exposed to predation and there may be something to do with
38 micro-habitat and they die because they can't keep warm enough.
39 They can actually keep warmer underneath heavy snow cover.

40
41 MS. PHILLIPS: I notice you focused on the rodents.
42 But isn't birds a food of martens or small birds?

43
44 MR. SCHENCK: It turns out that marten eat a variety of
45 diets, and I didn't bring that overhead with me. But birds,
46 salmon or marine kind of forage base, and berries are also
47 found in the diet of marten. The most direct relationship that
48 we found is that the abundance of voles is related to the
49 number of corpora lutea (ph) that we find in the ovaries of

50 marten. And corpora lutea are the artifact of successful

00065

1 ovulation. So the marten produce more eggs when there's more
2 small mammals, more long-tail voles, apparently.

3
4 A couple of other things that I'll tell you, from this
5 study, last year marten were recovered from the west side of
6 Chichagof over in Kaz Bay on the shore of Peril Strait, and
7 actually west of Pelican on the west side of Chichagof. So
8 those little guys have gone from Salt Lake Bay south of Hoonah,
9 spread across the entire island. And this year, as in other
10 years, we found out that there's a very high correlation with
11 trapper's ability to catch a marten who's home range intersects
12 a road. If a marten has a road that's open to trapping in its
13 home range, there's a 90 percent plus probability that it can
14 be caught during a trapping season.

15
16 MR. KITKA: Years ago there used to be a lot of Native
17 trappers, but after the pellet size dropped, most of them quit
18 -- I know, my family used to trap them. And when we discussed
19 marten in Sitka, there's mixed feelings. A lot of them favor
20 that they should go off the island. The old residents used to
21 hunt ptarmigan in the winter time, the martens wiped them out.
22 And then in March they used to hunt grouse, the marten wiped
23 them out. We no longer have the grouse to hunt anymore. And
24 we have a lot of pheasants that were introduced from down below
25 and told they were plentiful all over, those are all gone. So
26 most of the older residents, they think we should do away with
27 the marten off the island, so I can't help you on your
28 preservation. I think Dale remembers some of those topics.

29
30 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Patti.

31
32 MS. PHILLIPS: On the radio-collared martens, did they
33 stay in that Nicuyia area?

34
35 MR. SCHENCK: The radio-collared ones have moved all
36 over northeast Chichagof. And we've actually gotten recoveries
37 from the radio-collared ones from Elfin Cove, Port Althorp, and
38 just above Pelican. As well as they got earmarked ones clear
39 down by Peril Strait, so no, they don't, just stay in the Salt
40 Lake Bay area.

41
42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And so the recommendation from Staff?

43
44 MR. WILLIS: Yes, Madame Chair. The recommendation is
45 to reject this proposal, since the Marten population and the
46 small mammal population which constitute a significant portion
47 of its food are both at their lowest levels since 1993, we
48 don't think that increasing a season length at this time would
49 be conducive to the conservation of a healthy population of

50 marten. And since Marten are often taken incidentally in traps

00066

1 set for mink and weasel, then the season those species should
2 also not be extended as well. So we recommend maintaining the
3 season the way it is presently and rejecting this proposal.

4
5 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thank you, Mr. Willis. We'll
6 now go to the written comments. Fred.

7
8 MR. CLARK: There were three written comments on this
9 proposal. The first one is from Zeb Strong, Tenakee Springs,
10 who says, as long as marten numbers continue to be healthy I
11 support Proposal 16. Last year we observed an abundance of
12 them at Tenakee inlet. On the other hand, ADF&G informed me
13 that according to State population models, 80 percent of the
14 marten on northeast Chichagof were caught by trappers last
15 season. I don't know how that number would effect the rest of
16 Chichagof and I would take the State population model with a
17 hefty grain of salt.

18
19 The second comment is from Mike Sallee of Ketchikan who
20 says, how is this not a significant commercial enterprise when
21 local hunters rely on the winter trapping season to supplement
22 their income.

23
24 The final comment is from the Sitka Fish and Game
25 Advisory Committee in Sitka who say that they oppose the
26 proposal. The information received from ADF&G and Federal
27 sources does not support this proposal.

28
29 That concludes the written public comment.

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Fred. Is there anyone in
32 the public who wishes to testify regarding Proposal 16?

33
34 MR. CLARK: Madame Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Fred.

37
38 MR. CLARK: Just a reminder for people who do wish to
39 testify on any of the proposals, there are small white sheets
40 on the back table that if you could fill those out and give
41 them to myself or to Michelle who's sitting in the front row
42 over here with her hand up, and then we'll pass them on to the
43 Council.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So now we're up to Council
46 deliberation on Proposal 16. This proposal was submitted by
47 this Council. Vicki.

48
49 MS. LeCORNU: I would like to agree with Herman because

50 I think we're not looking at what we're -- our objective here

00067

1 is not just trying to maintain the population of the marten,
2 our objective is to ensure that the subsistence needs are being
3 met. And so when we're protecting for marten and not saying,
4 well, there's something else being effected here and that's the
5 grouse and whatever else marten has to eat. So, you know, what
6 I'm saying is the Staff's analysis doesn't go far enough to
7 analyze what's being effected. The healthy population of the
8 marten is not the primary goal. So I have to agree with Herman
9 that I would not want to vote to maintain any marten
10 population.

11
12 CHAIRMAN GARZA: John.

13
14 MR. VALE: I'll move to adopt the proposal.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Is there a second?

17
18 MR. THOMAS: Second.

19
20 CHAIRMAN GARZA: It's been moved and seconded to adopt
21 Proposal 16 so it is now on the table. John.

22
23 MR. VALE: Thank you. I support the Staff's
24 recommendation on this one, you know, I think we do have a
25 responsibility to, you know, provide for a healthy population
26 and certainly there are conservation concerns here that don't
27 an expansion of the season.

28
29 And I guess, you know, when this proposal came out, we
30 were responding to information that said there were high
31 numbers of marten and we were really just trying to change the
32 regulations to provide that opportunity to take those animals.
33 And now the situation has changed. And I guess it just appears
34 to me that as far as managing marten with the fluctuations in
35 their populations that this process doesn't work very well in
36 terms of trying to change the regulations to respond to the
37 marten populations since they seem to be varying significantly.
38 So just an observation there. I don't know how we'd deal with
39 that in the future. But I support the Staff recommendation and
40 I won't be supporting the proposal.

41
42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Vale. I have a
43 question either for Robert or for Ted. It sounds like that
44 population can vary considerably depending on the winter
45 environment. Does the Federal agency which manages this
46 resource have the ability to extend the season through
47 emergency order if it's a good winter and it looks like the
48 marten population will do fine?

49

MR. WILLIS: I think we have that ability, I'm not sure

00068

1 that we've used it, at least, in my area. You know, I cover
2 Southeast, Southcentral and Kodiak/Aleutians, and we have not
3 done that. However, in some of the northern and western areas
4 where harvest of big game, especially is more seasonal as with
5 moose and caribou, seasons have been extended in order to give
6 people additional opportunity. Those are the instances I'm
7 familiar with where change has been made without going through
8 the normal process. That's about as close as I can come to
9 giving you an answer, Dolly.

10
11 I probably should point out that under Federal law the
12 agencies are required to conserve populations of beneficial
13 species. That's the term that's used. And marten is
14 considered a beneficial species. It was put on the islands to
15 provide trapping opportunity for people. And so as long as it
16 is considered a beneficial species, then we're required by law
17 to try to maintain healthy populations.

18
19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Ted.

20
21 MR. SCHENCK: Thank you, Dolly. Ted Schenck for the
22 record. One of the things that I'd like you to consider as a
23 Council is that furbearer population do go up and down and as
24 John pointed out, sometimes it's really hard to chase the
25 populations with a season. So what usually is done is a
26 conservative season is put into place some years and then the
27 trappers kind of regulate the harvest. In discussions with
28 ADF&G and trappers from a lot of other areas, I've found out
29 that contrary to what some might suggest, trappers are
30 conservationists, they want to use the resource very wisely.
31 So when they start catching a lot of females in the harvest
32 they generally restrict themselves. We've been finding that as
33 the seasons go later and later into January and February, the
34 take of females increased. And so the season that's on
35 Chichagof Island, a relative conservative 30 day season seems
36 to be appropriate so most agencies -- Federal agencies wouldn't
37 tried to chase the furbearer population because it would be
38 very difficult.

39
40 Bruce, did you or anybody from the ADF&G want to say
41 anything.

42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Patti.

46
47 MS. PHILLIPS: Ted.

48
49 MR. SCHENCK: Yes, Patti.

00069

1 MS. PHILLIPS: A lot of that information was for the
2 northeast Chichagof area?

3
4 MR. SCHENCK: Yes, Patti.

5
6 MS. PHILLIPS: How does that compare with the remainder
7 of Chichagof Island, the harvest?

8
9 MR. SCHENCK: Well, we don't have a formal study going
10 on. There's a group of trappers who trap out of Sitka who I've
11 been trying to keep in touch with. Lyle Johnson and his boy.
12 As a matter-of-fact, Lyle has looked at a lot of the carcasses
13 and serves as a sealer. And in talking to them, they're
14 harvest was down this year also. And Lyle checked the females
15 to see if they'd be pregnant later on and he was seeing a very
16 reduced rate of potential pregnancies this year, too. So it
17 looks like that same problem is tracking on Chichagof.

18
19 There's also a study going on on Mitkof Island with
20 marten. And their small mammal populations and their density
21 of marten is down there also. So it looks like in general that
22 may be going on on Chichagof as well as some other places in
23 Southeast.

24 MS. PHILLIPS: Do the marten populate year-round or
25 multiply year-round or is there a certain time of year they
26 bear young?

27
28 MR. SCHENCK: Well, marten have really interesting
29 reproductive systems, they breed in July and they have their
30 young in the spring -- the following spring. And we think that
31 there is a relationship between summer small mammal populations
32 and the breeding. They have what's called delayed
33 implantation. They breed and later on the eggs start to
34 develop during pregnancy over the winter and then they have
35 their young in the spring time in the den. So they don't have
36 them year-round, they typically have them in the spring time.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: I have a follow-up question to my
39 first question.

40
41 MR. SCHENCK: Okay.

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: If the intent is to ensure that
44 trappers have the maximum time depending on the resource for
45 trapping, would it be easier to extend the season into an area
46 that has not been -- into a month it has not been designated or
47 if we had a longer season, would it be easier to close December
48 31st if we have a year where the population doesn't look good?

49

MR. SCHENCK: We're fortunate to have the study that's

00070

1 going on on northeast Chichagof right now so we can track the
2 marten population prior to the opening of the trapping season.
3 Without that study, we'd kind of be operating in the dark. And
4 without that study, the small mammal trapping that we do in
5 August, we wouldn't be -- we wouldn't have this information, so
6 I'd say it'd be very difficult -- it's been difficult in the
7 past to close the season when we thought it needed to be closed
8 or to open it up later on.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So you don't get enough
11 information from the trappers during the month of December to
12 make that judgment call by the third week of December?

13

14 MR. SCHENCK: Typically not. The way that the trappers
15 do it is they might run their line and they don't bring their
16 carcasses in for sealing and stuff until after they get done
17 trapping. The answer's no.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Herman.

20

21 MR. KITKA: This problem came up before and a lot of
22 trappers testified in Juneau on the whole deal. At that time
23 when I testified, they should outlaw the small three-wheelers
24 that the trappers are using for the road system -- the Forest
25 Service road system. I know one of the trappers that's from
26 Sitka, he used to get only 60, sometimes when he's lucky. Most
27 of the time he just averages around 25/30 a year. Then he
28 bought himself a three-wheeler, he got 180 the next trapping
29 season. And when I testified I used that figure. I happened
30 to know the person pretty well, he used to fish with me so the
31 report was correct. And it seems like the same thing is
32 happening again. And most of the trappers out of Sitka, when
33 they find a good job they quit trapping. I used trap quite a
34 bit, we used to average from 300 to 700 animals a year, yearly,
35 one month trapping, that's how many animals we used to take off
36 the Chichagof/Slocum Arm area, year after year. And on account
37 of price, trapping went down to \$6, \$5, not even worth to kill
38 the animals, that's how come some of the trappers are not
39 trapping. And is that where you're getting your information on
40 the job in each area?

41

42 MR. SCHENCK: From the trappers?

43

44 MR. KITKA: From the trappers?

45

46 MR. SCHENCK: That's only a part of where we're getting
47 the information Herman. We're also getting information from
48 the animals that have the radios, too.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA: So I forgot where we are in the

00071

1 procedure. Have we made it to the -- okay, so we made it
2 through everything. So we're at Council deliberation. The
3 motion on the table is to adopt Proposal 16.

4
5 MR. THOMAS: Question.

6
7 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Question has been called. If we're
8 prepared to vote, voting in favor of the motion supports
9 Proposal 16, voting against the motion defeats Proposal 16.
10 Proposal 16 is to extend the season for the northeast Chichagof
11 Controlled area for marten, mink and weasel. All in favor of
12 the motion signify by saying aye.

13
14 MR. THOMAS: Aye.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Opposed.

17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19
20 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, the aye's have it. The proposal
21 is defeated. So we will take a five minute breather and then
22 we'll come back to Unit 2, Proposals 9, 10, 11 and 12.

23
24 (Off record)

25
26 (On record)

27
28 CHAIRMAN GARZA: We understand that there is a
29 possibility that there is a fund-raising lunch sponsored by
30 some sector of Saxman community, but we don't know that for
31 sure. Is anyone from Saxman community aware of such a
32 luncheon.

33
34 MR. CLARK: I'll find out.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So the intent is to break at
37 noon for lunch. If the luncheon is here, we'll probably come
38 back to order at 1:00, if not we'll come back to order at 1:30.
39 So we are now ready to go on to Proposals 9, 10, 11 and 12.
40 And I think that the reports, we'll take them as a whole and
41 then we will discuss them as Council deliberations as separate.

42
43 The proposals are somewhat similar. They deal with
44 whether or not there should be hunting for does in Unit 2. And
45 some -- several of the proposals deal with changing the season
46 for hunting in Unit 2.

47
48 MR. CLARK: Madame Chair.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Fred.

00072

1 MR. CLARK: I'd like to do, if I may, a few
2 introductory remarks since this is quite a package of proposals
3 and it's an important issue. I just wanted to point out to the
4 Council that we're going to be hearing from a number of
5 different people in the presentations today. Both from the
6 Federal Subsistence program and the Alaska Department of Fish
7 and Game and members of the public. We're going to be hearing
8 presentations that bring up a lot of different kinds of
9 information. What I've asked the presenters to do is try to
10 explain explicitly the benefits, the positive sides, and the
11 shortcomings of the different types of information sources that
12 we're going to be using. Each type of information has its own
13 upside and downside, things that it can appropriately be used
14 for and things that it cannot be appropriately used for.

15
16 The advantage of having all these different types of
17 information is that it provides the Council with the ability to
18 triangulate between different types of information. If you see
19 trends and information that persists throughout different
20 information sources, that builds some strength that what you're
21 seeing is actually what's happening. If you just use one
22 information source, it may or may not paint a good picture for
23 you.

24
25 So I'm really, really happy that a lot of extra effort
26 has gone into gathering and analyzing data for you folks to
27 listen to and to be able to base your recommendations on.
28 We'll start out with the biological analysis, and Robert will
29 be the lead on that. We will move from there to more of the
30 social analysis, and that will be presented by Bob Schroeder
31 and Mike Turek. But we'll -- in general we'll be keeping still
32 with the same procedure as outlined on the agenda. So after
33 those analysis and questions from the Council, as you wish,
34 then we'll do the summary of written comments, then the public
35 comments on the -- open the floor to public comments, and then
36 the Council deliberation.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So for those of you that are in
39 the audience intending to testify, the processes that we will
40 have, the team presentations, the biological, the sociological,
41 there may be additional agency information. We will then
42 review the written comments which are in the packet. Then we
43 will ask you if you wish to testify in which case you can come
44 up here and be sure and use the mic's so Salena can hear you.
45 All of the testimony and the comments, the whole meeting will
46 be transcribed and that's why we need to get it on audio. And
47 then the Council will deliberate each of the proposals
48 separately. Mr. Thomas.

49

MR. THOMAS: Yeah, Madame Chairman. I find this as an

00073

1 interesting approach. It's been specified every time we
2 mention this particular batch of proposals that they're very
3 important. I don't know if that's to imply that other
4 proposals we consider aren't important. Secondly, is this a
5 possibility of amending our format on dealing with proposals,
6 specifically in the future, we'll review with every proposal
7 the same way, and if not, why not?

8
9 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Well, I don't see how we're dealing
10 with this proposal different, we're following the same format.
11 I think it's probably identified as these are important because
12 we have a number of people in the audience who came here
13 specifically for these proposals.

14
15 MR. THOMAS: Okay. So that makes the other ones not so
16 important because there's nobody here for them; is that what
17 I'm hearing?

18
19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Well, I didn't say they were very
20 important. We could talk to Fred about his use of language
21 there. Okay. So let's start with the biological information,
22 Mr. Willis.

23
24 MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I'd like to
25 start off first by acknowledging some people who helped put
26 this analysis together. As most of you know I had back surgery
27 back in the fall and so I was working out of my home and
28 working part-time during the winter. And putting together an
29 analysis of this magnitude was something I couldn't have done
30 without a lot of help. I'd like to recognize Doug Larson with
31 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Mike Brown and Cole
32 Crocker-Bedord and Dave Johnson with the Forest Service and
33 also Dave Person who was doing the wolf study on the Prince of
34 Wales Island. And there may be some others, if I'm overlooking
35 anybody I apologize for that. But they were responsible for
36 putting together the graphs and so forth that you see in this
37 analysis, and I really appreciate their input this year.

38
39 CHAIRMAN GARZA: He wants to make sure that we know
40 that we could attack you guys too if we don't like the
41 information.

42
43 MR. WILLIS: That's right, I'm not alone up here. What
44 I'd like to do is to run through the four proposals, describe
45 them. We'll talk about the deer situation on the Prince of
46 Wales Island, in general, and then we'll deal specifically with
47 each proposal.

48
49 Proposal 9 was submitted by Jeff Nickerson, of our

50 Council. It would eliminate the harvest of antlerless deer in

00074

1 Unit 2 with no other changes. Proposal 10 submitted by
2 Sylvester Williams would eliminate the harvest of antlerless
3 deer in Unit 2 and would restrict the harvest of antlered deer
4 to those having forked or larger antlers. Proposal 11
5 submitted by Sylvester Williams also would shorten the deer
6 season in Unit 2 from the current August 1/December 31 to a
7 September 1 to November 30 season with the taking of antlerless
8 deer allowed only during the period October 15 to November 30.
9 Proposal 12, which was submitted by the Sumner Strait Fish and
10 Game Advisory Committee would eliminate the harvest of
11 antlerless deer in Unit 2 and would close Federal public lands
12 to deer hunting by non-subsistence users from August 1 to
13 August 31.

14
15 Speaking in general now, the current Federal
16 subsistence season in Unit 2 extends from August 1 to December
17 31 with a harvest limit of four deer. No more than one of
18 which may be an antlerless deer. An antlerless deer may be
19 taken only during a period October 15 to December 31. This
20 provision for allowing the harvest of one doe was added in
21 1995/96 season. During that season we also added a designated
22 hunter proposal which would allow individuals with designated
23 hunter permits to harvest multiple limits for other persons.
24 We estimate approximately 85 percent of the deer habitat and
25 the harvest in Unit 2 occur on Federal lands. The Alaska
26 Department of Fish and Game currently estimates the deer
27 population at approximately 54,000 animals and we all expect
28 deer populations to drop significantly some time in the next 10
29 to 12 years as the old growth forest that has been cut, the
30 clear-cuts reach a closed canopy stage and become of little
31 value for deer. However, we don't feel that we're in that
32 situation yet except in local areas where some of the very
33 older clear-cuts have already reached that stage. This habitat
34 related drop in deer numbers probably won't show up for another
35 10 or 12 years unless we have a severe winter in which case it
36 could show up very suddenly and very dramatically.

37
38 The deer pellet group data collected by ADF&G indicates
39 that the population in the unit has been stable for about the
40 past 10 years after peaking during the mid-1980s. We also have
41 the ADF&G questionnaire which provides the source of
42 information on hunter harvest. The harvest in 1996 was down
43 slightly, it was 2,512 compared to 3,277 harvested in '95.
44 What we found was that the harvest in all of Southeast Alaska
45 was down in 1996 because as it's been discussed previously, we
46 had an open winter. Hunters were just less successful all over
47 Southeast. And, in fact, harvest in Unit 2 was closer to its
48 long-term average than was the harvest in any of the other
49 units in Southeast Alaska. According to the survey, the number

50 of deer harvested per hunter per year did not change

00075

1 significantly. For 1996, in fact, it was up slightly, it was
2 1.9 as opposed to an average of 1.4 over the past 10 years.
3 The number of days required to harvest a deer declined very
4 slightly from 1994 to 1995. We don't have data for 1996
5 because the survey was changed and so it no longer records data
6 on total hunter days.

7
8 The doe harvest as reported by the questionnaire survey
9 for 1996 was 134 as opposed to a reported harvest of 320 for
10 1995, the first year of the legalized doe hunting. I think I
11 need to take time to put this into perspective though. The
12 numbers reported for does based on a questionnaire survey are
13 not an absolute number of deer harvested. What that is is an
14 expansion of a sample of data. For instance, if 20 percent of
15 the households in Ketchikan or in Craig are sampled and two or
16 three report harvesting a doe, then that number is expanded to
17 the estimated number of hunters in that community who would
18 have also harvested a doe. We need to be very careful about
19 using the doe harvest information as we currently have it.
20 Looking back to 1990, even during the years when there was no
21 legal doe season, we had does reported harvested in the
22 questionnaire survey for Unit 2. These ranged from a low of
23 62, 1994, to a high of 141 back in 1990. We had three out of
24 those five years we had does reported harvested from Ketchikan,
25 although there was no legal doe season for either in State or
26 Federal regulations. So these numbers are expansions. We know
27 that there are some does being harvested, it's probably within
28 the range of 100 to 400 deer, but since all we have is a
29 questionnaire survey which is an expansion of a sample, we
30 can't say absolutely how many does are being taken.

31
32 The designated hunter proposal or the regulation was
33 put in place in 1995/96 has not been used to any significant
34 degree in Unit 2. Of the data we have reported to us so far on
35 Prince of Wales Island, Craig had three applications for
36 permits and two hunters reported harvesting one deer for other
37 persons. Thorne Bay had only one application and that hunter
38 reported harvesting five deer for other persons, two of which
39 were does. And we've had no hunters at all from Hydaburg who
40 have requested designated hunter permits.

41
42 We know that harvesting does has a greater effect on
43 the deer population than harvesting bucks because the doe is
44 the production unit in the population. And therefore, we know
45 that you always have a certain amount of risk involved when you
46 harvest does out of a population. Given our current means of
47 obtaining harvest and biological data, it is possible that
48 there could be some bad things going on with the population and
49 we would not be able to detect it. This is not something that

50 would show up dramatically in short-term but might surface over

00076

1 a period of years. So this is a risk that you always take when
2 you institute a doe season. On the other hand, there's nothing
3 in any of our harvest data or the survey data to indicate that
4 the deer population is in a decline. Total harvest, hunter
5 success, number of deer harvested per hunter, all are in the
6 range of values that we've seen over the last 10 to 12 years
7 and this is in spite of the increasing numbers of hunters and
8 an increasing harvest. There is still abundant forage
9 available in the clear-cuts. And we haven't had a severe
10 winter to reduce the population. So all the indications are
11 that the population is stable at a relatively high level.
12 Although, below the carrying capacity of the habitat at the
13 present time. And the harvest of 100 to 400 does from a
14 population estimated at 54,000 deer, while it will reduce the
15 population somewhat, we don't believe that it will reduce it to
16 a level that we can detect it with the scientific measurement
17 tools that we have available to us at this time or to a level
18 where the hunter in the field will notice the difference in the
19 number of bucks available.

20
21 Currently, the deer population on Prince of Wales
22 Island is in a healthy state, sufficient to provide a number of
23 management options allowing deer hunters who hunt that area to
24 have just about any type of management that they desire.

25
26 The four proposals that were presented this year are
27 four options for management and there are also some other
28 options that I'll discuss after we cover those. At this time
29 I'll go into the specific proposals and discuss them
30 individually.

31
32 Proposal 9 would eliminate the hunting of does with no
33 other changes. Now, if the desire is to manage for the maximum
34 number of bucks in a population, then the obvious choice is to
35 eliminate the doe harvest because you will have a few
36 additional bucks produced by the does that are not harvested.
37 This also makes an assumption that those does that are
38 harvested legally would not be harvested illegally if there was
39 not a doe season in place. On the other hand, if the idea is
40 to maximize the opportunity to harvest a deer, then the doe
41 season certainly provides additional opportunity for harvest at
42 the current time. Hunters have shown a strong selectivity for
43 bucks everywhere that either sex hunting exists and Prince of
44 Wales Island is no exception to that. Even in the past year or
45 1996, which was an open winter making hunting somewhat
46 difficult for bucks, hunters still harvested many times more
47 bucks than they did does. And judging from that, I would say
48 that Unit 2 will follow the same pattern as the other units
49 that have had doe hunts in the past, that is, hunters will

50 harvest bucks to the exclusion of does unless they need to take

00077

1 a doe. Under those conditions it would appear that the doe
2 season is a benefit to those individuals who are either unable
3 to harvest enough bucks to meet their needs or who hunt late in
4 the year after the rut when the bucks are not as good eating as
5 the does are. Due to the variation and deer densities across
6 Unit 2 there's also the possibility that doe harvest will have
7 a greater impact in some localized areas and not in others.
8 This raises the possibility of differential regulations across
9 the unit for antlerless deer.

10
11 The biologists involved in this issue from the Alaska
12 Department of Fish and Game, the Forest Service and myself had
13 a conference meeting about a week ago and discussed that
14 possibility and our feelings were unanimous that an attempt to
15 subdivide Unit 2 and have different regulations for a doe
16 versus non-doe hunting areas would be impractical from both a
17 management and a law enforcement standpoint.

18
19 Going on to Proposal 10, it would also eliminate the
20 harvest of does and would restrict the harvest of bucks to
21 those having forked or larger antlers. Eliminating the doe
22 harvest would have the same effects as described previously.
23 Obviously there would be some additional bucks in the
24 population available for harvest, probably not at a level
25 that's detectible by us or by the hunters.

26
27 The problem with Proposal 10 protecting spike antlered
28 bucks while shooting forked antlered deers is that it's been
29 determined that in almost all -- not all ungulate species --
30 since both yearling -- yearling bucks may have either spike or
31 forked antlers. We find that those with spike antlers are
32 genetically inferior to those having forked antlers. And in
33 areas where these type of regulations are put in place, over
34 time, you eliminate your genetically superior animals by
35 harvesting them while protecting your genetically inferior
36 animals, and this often results in having a population with
37 fewer deer and probably smaller deer.

38
39 Proposal 11 would shorten the buck season by two
40 months. It eliminates the months of August and December. And
41 it would reduce the period of doe harvest to that period
42 October 15 to November 30. This proposal would significantly
43 reduce the harvest of bucks and to a lesser degree the harvest
44 of does chiefly due to the August closure. Data for 1996
45 indicates that 37 percent of the total harvest occurred during
46 those two months, 32 percent during August, but only five
47 percent in December. This proposal would significantly reduce
48 the overall total deer harvest. However, as was stated
49 earlier, we see no scientific evidence that there is a

50 necessity to reduce the overall harvest, especially of bucks.

00078

1 Proposal 12 would eliminate the harvest of does while
2 maintaining the same August 1 to December 31 buck season, but
3 it would also close Federal public lands to non-subsistence
4 deer hunting during the month of August. Now, this proposal
5 would eliminate a significant harvest during August, 21 percent
6 of the non-subsistence harvest occurred during that month.
7 However, some, possibly all of that hunting effort would be
8 redirected toward the September to December period, so it's
9 impossible to say really what effects that would have on the
10 overall harvest by non-subsistence hunters. Certainly it would
11 reduce competition for subsistence hunters during the month of
12 August, but again, there's no scientific evidence that there's
13 a necessity to reduce the buck harvest.

14
15 There are some other options for management of deer in
16 Unit 2 since the populations do vary from one part of the unit
17 to the other. Wolf populations vary from one part of the unit
18 to the other. And hunting pressure certainly varies from one
19 part of the unit to the other. It's possible that we could
20 make a detailed analysis of harvest within the different
21 wildlife analysis areas, compare that to the wolf harvest data
22 and tracking data that we have and come up with some
23 differential regulations for different parts of the unit. As I
24 discussed earlier, we don't really think that's a good idea, we
25 would prefer to manage on a unit level at this time. Even
26 sometimes even if you have the ability to micro-manage doesn't
27 necessarily mean that it's a wise thing to try to do, and the
28 fact that deer, wolves and hunters can all move freely about
29 the unit with no real discernable boundaries would also make it
30 difficult to manage this type of system and also to enforce it.

31
32 I think I'll summarize at this time the biological
33 analysis. And before I turn it over to Mike and Bob to present
34 the sociocultural analysis, what we find is that there's
35 nothing in the harvest or survey data to indicate a need to
36 reduce the deer harvest at this time. We don't find that the
37 doe harvest at its current estimated level is going to have a
38 noticeable effect. On the other hand, because of the wolf
39 population which keeps the deer at a level below carrying
40 capacity, neither is there any reason to have a doe season to
41 try to maintain population. It's strictly a tool to provide
42 additional harvest opportunity for the hunter.

43
44 We find that testimony that the deer population is
45 lower than in previous year is not supported by our biological
46 evidence. Certainly there are local declines. As the old
47 clear-cuts reach the exclusion stage and deer will disappear
48 from those areas. And also as areas are hunted harder,
49 especially along the road system, the deer will disappear from

50 those areas. This does not mean that overall in Unit 2 there's

00079

1 a decline in the deer population.

2

3 We find that because of hunter selectivity for bucks,
4 the doe harvest is not likely to be excessive, at least, not in
5 the foreseeable future. And the fact -- this fact serves to
6 limit the numbers of does harvested. Certainly though there
7 will be fewer bucks. You can't get around the fact that when
8 you take some does out of the population, those does will not
9 produce bucks which would be available for harvest in future
10 years. Protecting spike antlered bucks we feel is a bad idea
11 because it does tend to genetically degrade the population.

12 And we find that based on our current data, either
13 shortening seasons or limiting non-subsistence harvest is
14 unnecessary because we don't see the need -- we don't see a
15 conservation issue here or a need to reduce the harvest of
16 bucks or does at this time.

17

18 I guess at this time I'll turn it over to Mike Turek,
19 who's going to make a presentation of the data that was
20 gathered on Prince of Wales Island over the last few months and
21 then I'll come back and present the Staff conclusion.

22

23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Mike. While Mike is coming up,
24 I do want to announce that there is a fund-raiser lunch here.
25 Cape Fox dancers, who I assume are raising money to go to
26 Celebration, will have a soup and sandwich and they're
27 preparing the lunch for about 45, so we hope that you will all
28 stay and have lunch here. They will be showing up, they're
29 preparing somewhere else and they'll be showing up at a quarter
30 to noon and lunch will be at noon. So Mike and Bob, welcome.

31

32

33 MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chairman and Council. Mike and
34 I came before the Council two other times and talked about
35 research activities that might help inform the Council on the
36 Prince of Wales situation. This is following last years
37 controversial decisions. We presented some material to you and
38 some ideas at your Juneau meeting, and then we also discussed
39 further ideas and a plan for a project that would produce
40 information useful for this decision in the Yakutat meeting.
41 What we've circulated to you the draft results of that effort.
42 And hopefully everyone received a blue book, at least a couple
43 of weeks ago and right now we plan to give everyone a short
44 test on everything in the blue book, no that's just a joke.

45

46 What we attempted to do in this report was, frankly, a
47 little bit experimental in terms of the way that we would
48 present material to the Regional Council. Our goal was to give
49 you as much material as possible and to give a good deal of

50 detail to the Council. And the reason I say that it's an

00080

1 experimental choice is as because Robert Willis and other Staff
2 has pointed out, data don't always point in one direction and
3 any data set always leads to new questions. But we felt that
4 the best procedure with the Regional Council was to put before
5 you what we do know about deer on Prince of Wales and the
6 results of the interviewing that we conducted last fall and to
7 basically let you sort it out, that that was your main
8 function.

9
10 What I'd like to do for this presentation would be
11 first to very briefly describe the key respondent interviewing,
12 the methodology for that and then turn it over to Mike who
13 actually conducted the research to go through the key
14 respondent results for the communities where key respondent
15 interviewing was done. And then I'd like to very briefly
16 outline different sections of this report and highlight some of
17 the sources of information and the data that we presented and
18 then open to any Board questions. Given the time and how much
19 material we have we may run over lunch, so I suppose we'd break
20 and come back at that time, is that your intention, Madame
21 Chair?

22
23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Yes. Keeping in mind that Mr. Willis
24 has a 2:45 ferry to catch, so if you run over much we may go
25 back to him and have him do a summary recommendation. And for
26 the record I don't think you guys introduced yourself, although
27 we know you.

28
29 MR. SCHROEDER: Excuse me, I'm Bob Schroeder. I'm
30 Regional Program Manager for Division of Subsistence, ADF&G.

31
32 MR. TUREK: I'm Mike Turek. Subsistence Resource
33 Specialist for ADF&G, Division of Subsistence, Southeast
34 Regional Office.

35
36 MR. SCHROEDER: In deciding what kind of research.....

37
38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bob.

39
40 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

41
42 MR. THOMAS: Is this essentially the same material that
43 you gave us at our Yakutat meeting?

44
45 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Bill, yes and no. We're
46 considerably beyond where we were at the Yakutat meeting. At
47 Yakutat we pointed you at some of the first things that we saw
48 in the deer data as it existed but we hadn't done the
49 interviews at that time. So the main new source of information

50 is the interview data that was collected on Prince of Wales and

00081

1 then additional analysis that we've been able to do since that
2 time.

3
4 MR. THOMAS: Okay, thank you.

5
6 MR. SCHROEDER: In terms of methodology for adding
7 information to the questions that arise when considering what
8 to do with management of deer on Prince of Wales, we considered
9 a number of methodologies. Given the time and financial
10 constraints, we decided that the first research effort on
11 Prince of Wales should consist of key respondent interviews in
12 select communities on Prince of Wales.

13
14 Key respondent interviews -- I guess it's easy to say
15 what they're not. Key respondent interviews are not a survey.
16 Key respondent interviews don't come up with a number that says
17 50 percent of Ketchikan hunters favor one result or another.
18 Key respondent interviews aren't based on a statistical sample.
19 Key respondent interviews are based on -- are a methodology
20 that's based on pretty much what wildlife managers very often
21 do and definitely what social scientists do, to make a first
22 approximation of a situation in a community. To do that, key
23 respondents are selected as being persons who represent
24 community opinion, who are knowledgeable individuals and who
25 represent a range of opinion in a community, a range of opinion
26 and knowledge. Key respondents for the interviewing that was
27 conducted last fall were recommended by Fish and Game Advisory
28 Committees, by Fish and Game staff, by Council members, by
29 tribal governments, as well as they included persons who were
30 known to us from other work that we do on subsistence in these
31 areas. We attempted to have a range of opinion in communities
32 and if there are questions, Mike, can describe better than I
33 how that selection process went on.

34
35 In doing key respondent interviews we developed a list
36 of topics or questions. In the trade we call that an interview
37 schedule as opposed to a questionnaire. So when speaking to a
38 key respondent the goal is to open the person up to talk about
39 a topic. So a topic could be someone's hunting experiences and
40 how they see that their hunting success has changed over time.
41 The interview schedule would be followed the same way with each
42 key respondent and then the interviews would be written up and
43 then combined in the community summaries that Mike is going to
44 present. We received a good deal of assistance from both
45 Department of Fish and Game and Forest Service Staff in getting
46 this done and I would like to thank them at this time. We also
47 included interviews in Ketchikan because we recognize that
48 Ketchikan hunters have an important stake in hunting on Prince
49 of Wales. We'll answer some more questions on methodology if

50 there are any, but I'd like to, in the interest of time, turn

00082

1 it over to Mike to go through the interview results for the
2 communities where we worked.

3
4 MR. TUREK: What I could do is I could briefly go over
5 the interview results for the communities and sort of highlight
6 the main points. What I'd like to start off with is do Craig
7 and Klawock sort of simultaneously. We did present the
8 material separately in the report. But since the communities
9 had -- hunters we talked to in both communities had similar
10 views and the communities are very close to each other, for the
11 sake of time, and not so redundant with all this stuff I'll
12 just present this material for Craig and Klawock at the same
13 time.

14
15 The hunters in Craig and Klawock, the deer hunting
16 pattern for them has changed quite a bit since the 1980s.
17 Prior to 1980s and the increase in roads and logging on Prince
18 of Wales Island, the hunting was done primarily from boats and
19 skiffs running the beach and getting their deer that way.
20 Since 1980, that's changed and the current hunting pattern is
21 primarily a mix of methods, both the boat hunting, but the
22 majority of hunting is done from vehicles now on the island,
23 and that's true of both Craig and Klawock. So the road
24 corridor is the main route for hunters now and that's a big
25 change since 1980.

26
27 It was also the hunters in both Craig and Klawock
28 prefer hunting in October and November after the fishing season
29 is over. They're both fishing communities so August and
30 September are very busy times for the hunters -- many of the
31 hunters so they're hunting in October and November. Both
32 communities, the majority of respondents reported that logging
33 roads and clear-cuts have had detrimental effects on deer
34 population on Prince of Wales Island. There were several
35 hunters who disagreed with that, but by far the majority did
36 think that the logging had impacted the deer hunting on the
37 island. And many of those same hunters also believe that this
38 is just beginning to show up and that in the future this will
39 even be a larger impact on the deer due to the clear-cut
40 logging.

41
42 Also in both of these communities there was no --
43 nobody was really pointing their finger at the wolf saying the
44 wolf was part of the problem of the lack of deer. People in
45 both communities know that there are active wolf trappers on
46 the island and they feel that they're keeping the deer in
47 check, so there was no call for taking more wolves. People
48 think that they're being kept in check by the wolf trappers on
49 the island.

00083

1 Also in both communities, Craig and Klawock, the
2 respondents reported that they believe that most people in the
3 community do not support the doe season for all hunters. Some
4 people did suggest that an option for a doe hunt for elders and
5 others who couldn't get out, away from the roads, would be
6 acceptable.

7
8 Also in both communities the respondents believe that
9 the general perception of people in Craig was that competition
10 from Ketchikan and other non-local hunters was having an
11 adverse impact on the island's deer hunting. They see these
12 hunters as competition for them.

13
14 In Hydaburg, we'll now discuss Hydaburg. In Hydaburg
15 the deer hunting is primarily for subsistence use. Craig and
16 Klawock, people there said that it was a mix of subsistence and
17 sport. The long time Native and non-Native residents of Craig
18 and Klawock consider themselves subsistence hunters, but the
19 newer people in the communities, many of them consider
20 themselves sport hunters. Whereas in Hydaburg, it was pretty
21 much everybody that hunted there considered themselves
22 subsistence hunters. Hydaburg, about half of the residents are
23 taking their deer by boat still, the other half are using the
24 roads. And the roads that are being used by most Hydaburg
25 hunters is the road system fairly close to the village, they're
26 not going north to the areas that Craig and Klawock people hunt
27 and primarily staying close to the village in that road system,
28 the southern part of the island.

29
30 And in Craig and Klawock, most of the people -- most of
31 the hunters we talked to said that most hunters can still get
32 their deer but they're having to spend more time and effort to
33 get their deer. It's not as easy as it used to be. And the
34 same thing was said in Hydaburg, that you're having to travel a
35 little bit farther and work a little bit harder. The days of
36 getting a deer close to the roads appears to be over, you have
37 to get away from the road system to be a productive deer hunter
38 now.

39
40 Also two of the responses we spoke to in Hydaburg
41 believe that the deer population has declined and over the last
42 five years in particular they've seen a decline in deer
43 population. The third respondent in Hydaburg believed that the
44 deer population had been stable over the long term. But it may
45 have declined a bit in the last year due to weather. And also
46 two of the people from Hydaburg, two of the hunters, believe
47 that the logging was not helping the deer population but one of
48 them thought that it was, that it had improved the brows and
49 opened up the country for -- to make hunting a little bit

50 easier.

00084

1 None of the hunters we interviewed in Hydaburg liked
2 the doe season and they said that they didn't hunt for does.
3 The three hunters we talked to from Hydaburg said that they
4 didn't care for the doe season and that they personally didn't
5 hunt for does. But they also said that does are taken and
6 they'll be taken whether it's legal or not. Also in Hydaburg
7 the respondents, they thought the people didn't like seeing the
8 Ketchikan hunters on Prince of Wales Island, though, they
9 didn't see -- the didn't impact them as much as Craig and
10 Klawock and the other communities in the northern part of the
11 island.

12
13 And Point Baker and Port Protection, their deer hunting
14 patterns have also changed, prior to the 1980s it was strictly
15 boat hunting there were no roads, it's not a road connected
16 community. You have to get there by a boat. But after the
17 1980s and the logging started coming in and the roads became
18 available to them then more people started hunting from the
19 roads and the northern part of the island. Presently, you
20 know, most of the hunters that we -- the hunters we talked to
21 in Point Baker and Port Protection, their primary concerns were
22 that they felt where they had traditionally hunted was very,
23 very -- was hit very hard by the logging and is no longer very
24 productive for deer. So that was their primary concern in
25 Point Baker and Port Protection. Many of the hunters that we
26 talked to said that what they're beginning to do now is they're
27 taking the -- they're getting four or five hunters together on
28 one of the fishing boats and going either to southern Baranof
29 Island or Kuiu Island for deer hunting since they can't get
30 deer very easily in the areas they used to hunt right close to
31 the village. So they're having to travel quite a distance to
32 get their deer now.

33
34 And for Point Baker and Port Protection, all the
35 hunters agree that the hunting there is strictly subsistence
36 hunting. These are just small isolated communities and this is
37 the only way you can get fresh meat is by hunting deer. So
38 it's strictly subsistence hunting for their community members
39 there.

40
41 Also we spoke to people in Whale Pass, Coffman Cove and
42 Thorne Bay, and we combined those three communities. We
43 presented those results together because these three
44 communities -- these are all logging communities that were
45 originally temporary logging camps that grow into communities,
46 and the communities -- the people we spoke to had the same
47 similar views of the deer and the hunting on Prince of Wales
48 Island. So we combined those four interviews that we did in
49 those three communities into one -- and presented them as one

50 part of the report. In these communities, Whale Pass, Coffman

00085

1 Cove and Thorne Bay, reply primarily upon for their deer
2 hunting. Very little hunting there is done from boats or
3 skiffs. So there they're very dependent on the roads. And
4 they also consider themselves subsistence hunters in those
5 communities, they don't consider themselves sport hunters. And
6 also in these communities, they don't believe that the logging
7 has really had negative effects on their deer hunting. They
8 think that the logging has improved the hunting and it's
9 brought -- it's opened up the country, made it easier to see
10 deer and get deer and has also created more brows, and they
11 especially like the roads, which has given them more access to
12 the country and they think that this also spreads out the
13 impact of the deer hunting. The more roads that are open, the
14 less that hunters in those communities will be impacting one
15 area. So they were very supportive of the logging and the
16 roads.

17
18 Again, in these communities, most of the people did not
19 support the doe season. And there are also mixed opinions in
20 these communities towards Ketchikan hunters. Some of the
21 people in these communities benefit from the Ketchikan hunters
22 with the small businesses, stores and some lodging, so there
23 was a mixed opinion there about the Ketchikan hunters. Others
24 didn't like it, they saw them as competition. This area, the
25 Whale Pass, Coffman Cove, and Thorne Bay hunters hunt, is the
26 area that the Ketchikan hunters also tend to like hunting in.

27
28 Then we also interviewed nine hunters from Ketchikan,
29 and the hunters we spoke to in Ketchikan told us that the
30 reason that they like hunting on Prince of Wales Island is
31 because of the easy access by ferry and the ability to take
32 their vehicles over to Prince of Wales Island and then hunt
33 from the roads with their vehicles. So the primary --
34 primarily they're road hunters from Ketchikan, using the roads
35 for access to other -- through the back country sometimes --
36 taking with them sometimes ATVs or motorcycles. And they tend
37 to, unlike the rest of the communities, unlike the communities
38 on Prince of Wales Island, the Ketchikan hunters tend to like
39 hunting in August. Go over in the early part of the season and
40 many of them do go out and get away from the road and get up
41 into the alpine country and that appears to be the most popular
42 time for the Ketchikan hunters. They prefer hunting in the
43 northern half of Prince of Wales Island in the areas near Whale
44 Pass, Coffman Cove, Red Bay, Nakati, Thorne Bay. These are
45 very popular areas for the Ketchikan hunters. Ketchikan
46 hunters also tend to come over to Prince of Wales Island for a
47 number of days and align their hunting with camping and some --
48 you know, some sport fishing.

49

The Ketchikan hunters we spoke to, they considered

00086

1 their deer hunting for both recreational and meat values, and
2 some did consider themselves subsistence hunters and others
3 considered themselves sport hunters. So there's sort of a
4 mixed approach to hunting from Ketchikan. The Ketchikan
5 hunters liked the idea of the roads, they liked the ability to
6 be able to drive the island for hunting, and most of the
7 Ketchikan hunters also thought that the clear-cut logging had
8 improved the deer hunting on Prince of Wales Island. But
9 Ketchikan hunters also thought that the deer population of
10 Prince of Wales Island appeared to be declining the last few
11 years. And also according to the respondents we spoke to, they
12 thought that most people in Ketchikan did not support the doe
13 season.

14
15 And that is briefly a review of the work we did on the
16 communities, and if you have any questions I'd be more than
17 happy to answer them for you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Before the questions, Dale you
20 had wanted to talk before noon, is that still what you would
21 need to do?

22
23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't have to talk before noon,
24 probably before 2:00 o'clock.

25
26 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, so after lunch we'll start with
27 you.

28
29 MR. THOMAS: How come we're getting all these special
30 requests?

31
32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And all the papers you dripped on.
33 Okay, Vicki.

34
35 MS. LeCORNU: Mike, I have a problem with this study,
36 out of one respondent, you extrapolate they, they are not going
37 or they are not.....

38
39 MR. TUREK: Well, what we did is we asked -- what we
40 were asking hunters is their view of the communities on these
41 issues.

42
43 MS. LeCORNU: Um-hum.

44
45 MR. TUREK: And that's where we got this.

46
47 MS. LeCORNU: Yeah, well, that's the danger in this.
48 That doesn't prevent any person in Hydaburg from saying, well,
49 I might want to go north and now it says in black and white,

50 those hunters they don't go there, but everybody else in

00087

1 Ketchikan they can get on a ferry and go, well, we're not, we
2 don't like to.

3 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Vicki, the key
4 respondents we interviewed, perhaps I should have gone further
5 into the methodology. We were able to do 34 interviews spread
6 over these communities. In Hydaburg we did three interviews
7 and we asked people to represent the views of their community.
8 We hope that they did. Whether they did or not is up to you
9 folks to evaluate. So what we've been able to do is to
10 summarize the interviews that were given to us. We do have a
11 follow-up piece of work which is going on right now which is a
12 household survey in Craig, Klawock and Hydaburg where we do ask
13 people some key questions on what they think of the doe hunt.
14 What they think of the deer population levels and whether deer
15 hunting's gotten more difficult for them in the last years.
16 That work isn't completed right now and we, in fact, were only
17 able to begin the second week in February. So that would give
18 you the kind of numbers that I think you're looking for.

19
20 MS. LeCORNU: Well, Bob, you know I talk to the Forest
21 Service about this regarding their -- this interview and I knew
22 there would be problems extrapolating huge things out of three
23 respondents. Those respondents are in no way representative of
24 Hydaburg, they cannot be. They cannot extrapolate their needs
25 or their uses because it just can't happen with one person.
26 When one person says we don't take bucks or does, well, is he
27 speaking for every person in Hydaburg, it sure does, yes. So I
28 cannot support extrapolating from three people.

29
30 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, that's some very detailed
31 information. Through all this, are you leading to a suggestion
32 to offer.

33
34 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Bill, I think when we're
35 through with the data presentation and when you take what we
36 present in conjunction with Fish and Wildlife Service analysis
37 and any questions that you have to raise on the biological side
38 from other Staff, I think that should lead to a conclusion.
39 We're not making a recommendation on these proposals from this
40 report.

41
42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Willis was going to present the
43 Staff recommendation after we were done with Mike and Bob's
44 presentation.

45
46 MR. WILLIS: This might be an appropriate time to go
47 ahead and present the Staff's conclusion and then the Council
48 can go to questions and then hear the other testimony of you
49 like.

00088

1 The Staff preliminary conclusion is not to support any
2 of these proposals, 9, 10, 11 or 12. We feel that there is not
3 a conservation issue here and therefore no information to
4 restrict deer harvest through any of these measures. We find
5 that based on the information coming into us which is about
6 four different types of hunter information plus the deer
7 harvest -- or the deer pellet count survey, there's no
8 indication that the population is currently in a state of
9 decline. Nor, do we think that it's likely to go into a
10 decline because of the harvest of the relatively small number
11 of does that are being taken right now.

12
13 What we believe we have here is an opportunity to look
14 at some different options to look at deer management and let
15 the local people decide if they want to take a conservative
16 approach or a more liberal approach to how they harvest deer.
17 As I stated earlier, if you want to maximize the number of
18 bucks out there and the overall population size, you would
19 eliminate the doe harvest which will add some additional bucks
20 to the population. We don't think it will be enough to be
21 noticeable, certainly not enough for us to measure with the
22 techniques that we now have available. On the other hand if
23 you want to maximize the harvest -- actually what you're doing
24 is to allow people who need a doe to take one. We find with a
25 strong hunter selectivity for bucks, that the number of does
26 taken is relatively small, and we have no way of knowing if any
27 of those does or all of those does would be taken anyway if
28 there was not a regulation in place to allow them to do so
29 legally.

30
31 On the other hand, even though we don't feel there's a
32 conservation issue, certainly there is a lot of strong feeling
33 about the doe harvest in this area. And if the Council elected
34 to go with the more conservative harvest and vote to eliminate
35 the doe season, the Staff would support the Council in that
36 recommendation also. I need to make that clear, that while we
37 don't support any of these proposals because we don't see a
38 conservation issue and therefore a need to restrict, if the
39 Council and local people come to the conclusion that they,
40 themselves, want to place this restriction on themselves, then
41 we will support them in doing that.

42
43 That concludes the Staff analysis.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thank you, Mr. Willis. John
46 Vale has a question for Mike.

47
48 MR. VALE: Yeah, Mike, I was wondering how you went
49 about identifying your key respondents?

00089

1 MR. TUREK: Well, we talk to people that we worked with
2 in the communities in the past and got recommendations from
3 them. We've also talked to community leaders in the community,
4 both tribal and governmental leaders. And we also talked to
5 people from Ketchikan Fish and Game, Doug Larson was very
6 helpful, especially in Ketchikan. So we got together a list of
7 potential people and we started contacting some and then as we
8 interviewed the hunters we would ask them for recommendations
9 of other hunters. So we were primarily looking for people that
10 have lived and hunted on Prince of Wales Island more than five
11 years, preferably 10 years or more. And we had a range of
12 opinion from different -- from people with different views and
13 people that work in different areas on the island. We tried to
14 make sure and get people that work in the timber industry,
15 fishing industry, charter boat operators, some what different
16 age. Primarily most of the ages of the hunters were the same,
17 in their mid to late 40s. Most of the people were married and
18 had families, raising families on the island. So we wanted to
19 get a range of opinion, but we also wanted to get people who
20 have been here and hunted for a number of years on the island.

21
22 MR. VALE: Okay, thanks.

23
24 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Gabriel.

25
26 MR. GABRIEL: Yeah, a couple of things. One for
27 Mr. Willis since you opened up the genetic pooling and
28 selectivity and all about whether, and again we come back to
29 horns, whether it's a forked horn or whatever in terms of
30 selection, and you're taking the if we go one way we're taking
31 the crop and maybe making it weaker or less desirable, breeding
32 less desirable deer, is there anything done in terms of the
33 gene pool of the does since the does certainly provide half of
34 the genes of the offspring? So as to determine whether one is
35 more favorable than the other? That's just -- I don't know if
36 that's a real question or not.

37
38 MR. WILLIS: That's a legitimate question, Gabe. To my
39 knowledge there has not been research done on does, and I
40 personally would not know how -- I can't tell you off the top
41 of my head how we'd go about that. But I would say because the
42 buck is passing on half the genes to their offspring, as you
43 degrade the population, or as you go more and more to smaller
44 deer breeding, obviously that's going to effect the does
45 produced out of that union over a period of time. That
46 information was gathered by watching deer -- penned deer, so
47 that you knew when they were born and watch them over their
48 entire lives and keeping track of them, which ones develop
49 spike antlers, which ones develop fork antlers in their first

50 year. And what was found, not only with deer, but with elk and

00090

1 with moose, that the ones that have spiked antlers the first
2 year never catch up to the ones that have forked antlers.
3 They're smaller in body as well as smaller in antler size as
4 the years go by. And those that -- I don't have a figure for
5 percentage of what percent of the yearling deer have spike
6 antlers and what percentage have forked antlers, but the ones
7 that have been studied in pens so we knew exactly how old they
8 were and exactly what type of antlers they developed, the ones
9 that started out with their first set of antlers as forked
10 antlers are always larger deer, superior deer than the ones
11 that started out with spiked antlers.

12

13 MR. GABRIEL: So in reality if we're -- if the hunters
14 favor going after bucks and big bucks, then we're genetically
15 -- we're selectively taking out the stronger deer and the more
16 larger deer as far as reproductiveness is concerned and all?
17 And does that hold true to moose and deer a like or do they k
18 know?

19

20 MR. WILLIS: Well, if you protect spikes and shoot the
21 ones with the forked antlers, you're doing yourself a
22 disservice if what you're after is large antlers.

23

24 MR. GABRIEL: Or larger deer?

25

26 MR. WILLIS: Or larger deer, true. In fact, that's how
27 this was discovered years ago was that people down south who
28 had hunting clubs were trying to produce larger and -- larger
29 volume and larger antlered deer and they felt they could do
30 that by protecting them for that, you know, protecting your
31 spiked deer and shooting only the ones that had forked antlers,
32 and it didn't work for them obviously. And so people started
33 wondering why and they started studying this to find out by
34 penning up deer and following them, making sure they had the
35 same food, and so it works in reverse of what you might at
36 first think it would.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. I need to clarify the process.
39 First, will there be other agency reports regarding these
40 proposals? Okay. Second, in terms of the public testimony,
41 people who submitted a sheet, everyone did not indicate if they
42 were going to testify on these proposals, so I would like to
43 clarify that for this afternoon. Also, if the ferry schedule
44 has not changed, there may be some people who would like to
45 catch the 4:00 o'clock ferry back to Prince of Wales, if that's
46 the case let me know so we can have you testify if things start
47 running late before you go.

48

49 I have Mike Douville, you're testifying on these

50 proposals, will you be going back on the ferry?

00091

1 MR. DOUVILLE: (Nods affirmatively)

2
3 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, so we'll get to you first. Tom,
4 will you be testifying on these proposals?

5
6 MR. ABEL: At this point I don't think so.

7
8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Loren Stanton, not on these
9 proposals?

10
11 MR. STANTON: I will testify.

12
13 CHAIRMAN GARZA: You will, okay. Mike Sallee. And
14 you're testifying on these proposals?

15
16 MR. SALLEE: (Nods affirmatively)

17
18 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Tillie?

19
20 MS. KUSHNICK: (Nods affirmatively)

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Yes, okay. Were there other people
23 who intended to testify on these proposals?

24
25 MR. BURGESS: Yes, Madame Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, Victor. And are you catching
28 that afternoon ferry back?

29
30 MR. BURGESS: (Nods affirmatively)

31
32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, I saw another hand over here.
33 Okay. Are there other questions on the recommendation or the
34 report by the team presentation or by Division of Subsistence.
35 Patti.

36
37 MS. PHILLIPS: Who was -- Coffman Cove, there were
38 three communities that you did altogether, it was Coffman Cove
39 and who else?

40
41 MR. TUREK: Whale Pass and Thorne Bay.

42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. And I noticed like factors
44 influencing Whale Pass hunting, it says, others such as harvest
45 competition from non-local residents or other groups, local
46 presence of non-harvesting groups in traditional harvest areas
47 and effects of logging activities are more discreet, effecting
48 some communities, but not others. What do you mean by are more
49 discreet?

00092

1 MR. TUREK: That may be from an earlier report from the
2 back there.

3
4 MS. PHILLIPS: That's IV-83 -- no, it's like in the
5 middle, is that number IV, roman numeral IV-83.

6
7 MR. TUREK: Where are you again, Patti?

8
9 MS. PHILLIPS: IV-83, Whale Pass, factors influencing
10 Whale Pass hunting.

11
12 MR. TUREK: It will just take me a second to get caught
13 up here.

14
15 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Second from the bottom paragraph.

16
17 MR. TUREK: Yeah.

18
19 MS. PHILLIPS: Last sentence.

20
21 MR. TUREK: I believe what that means is that the
22 effects of logging are more localized, in other words, it will
23 effect certain areas and it won't effect others. If the
24 logging is -- there's more logging in one area than others then
25 it will effect that area. I believe that's what that paragraph
26 means. I think you can see that real well, I think -- we saw
27 that by talking to Point Baker, Port Protection, they're very
28 upset by how the logging has really impacted their deer
29 hunting, probably more than any other community because the
30 logging has really been heavy there. So that's a real good
31 example of that one area of the island being effected much more
32 by the logging than some of the other areas.

33
34 MS. PHILLIPS: So that's what you're saying about
35 competition from non-local residents, it might effect some
36 areas but not other areas?

37
38 MR. TUREK: Yeah, exactly.

39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Feller.

43
44 MR. FELLER: Thank you, Madame Chair. I just wanted to
45 ask Bob or Mike some more questions about Point Baker. See
46 they must have been -- from that last comment, they must have
47 been against Ketchikan hunters being there, right?

48
49 MR. TUREK: Not as much. Actually they felt it

50 impacted them more with the Lap Bay -- when the Lap Bay camp

00093

1 was there, the Lap Bay hunters -- there's no more Lap Bay, I
2 mean the camp's closed now. But they felt they had been much
3 more effected by the Lap Bay hunters than the Ketchikan hunter.

4
5 MR. FELLER: It's so far north, I guess.....

6
7 MR. TUREK: Yeah. Though the Ketchikan hunters do go
8 up there, but the problem is that there is -- it's getting
9 harder and harder to get deer in that area so the Ketchikan
10 hunters have figured that out also.

11
12 MR. FELLER: It's a long haul to get there.

13
14 MR. TUREK: Yeah.

15
16 MR. FELLER: And I think, I'm not sure, but I heard
17 them talking before when I was out halibut fishing there, they
18 were against the doe hunt; is that true?

19
20 MR. TUREK: Right.

21
22 MR. FELLER: Yeah, I didn't have that -- yeah, so thank
23 you. Thank you, Madame Chair, that's all.

24
25 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Are there other questions? Gabriel.

26
27 MR. GEORGE: I'd just like to point out that I think
28 what Vicki said is true for the Council members consideration,
29 that there are two types of data. In my mind and in my
30 opinion, there's quantitative data which you can go out and do
31 a random sampling of the community and get and expand that to
32 the whole community. I think there's qualitative information
33 in which you go out and ask key respondents or other people in
34 the community and I believe that they represent themselves and
35 not the community, whether it is in terms of do you support the
36 doe hunt or you do not support the doe hunt, whether it's
37 whether you hunt in this area or that area or where does the
38 community hunt? Certainly people know where other people go
39 but not the community as a whole. So quantitatively, I think
40 it's just a personal opinion so that when they bring out things
41 like, well, Point Baker, Port Protection is against the doe
42 season, whether they are or they're not, they may be 80 percent
43 against it or 50 percent against it, we don't have that
44 information. We have information from three key respondents
45 that may or may not represent the community as Vicki pointed
46 out. So take key respondent information as additional
47 information and not information that we need to base our whole
48 decision on on whether people favor or disfavor a doe season.

49

And I do know that generally speaking, and I'll speak

00094

1 in generalities, that people don't like change so that when
2 change come about, you know, if you asked people around
3 Southeast about the ferry system in the past; before the ferry
4 came in people would be violently opposed to it. If you ask
5 them, if you want the ferry system to be taken out now, ask
6 who's leaving on the ferry if they don't like the ferry system;
7 they will jump up and say you're ruining their way of life and
8 everything else by taking the ferry system out. So change is
9 always hard. And a certain percentage of the people are
10 opposed to it. But I agree with Vicki is my statement in terms
11 of how we view the key respondent analysis that was given as
12 part of this testimony for deer hunting and whether it pertains
13 to doe season and where people hunt, that we take that, you
14 know, into consideration.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Gabriel. We have Mim and
17 then Bill and then Mary.

18
19 MS. McCONNELL: Yeah. I'm interested in the difference
20 of opinion about the effect of the clear-cutting on
21 communities, Point Baker/Protection area as compared to the
22 comments that you've got from people in the Thorne Bay area.
23 Although, I also find it interesting that in the Thorne Bay
24 area they said that the clear-cuts were improving their hunting
25 and yet they've seen a decline in the number of deer. So
26 there's kind of a contradictory statement coming from them.
27 But I'm curious about the age of the clear-cuts in those two
28 different areas? I haven't been to either area in a long time,
29 so I don't physically know what it looks like there. Has there
30 -- what's the age difference in the clear-cuts and would that
31 effect what's happening on the ground for the hunters in those
32 areas?

33
34 MR. SCHROEDER: I remember some specific comments up in
35 Port Baker, Port Protection about how there were some areas
36 that people couldn't get to anymore because regrowth was just
37 impenetrable. And so that's a real clear indication of, you
38 know, what an effect is. And also Point Baker, Port Protection
39 those people maintained a lot more of a boat hunting focus, and
40 so that kind of sets a range of how far you can go. And if
41 your good area for either leaving your boat or going in and
42 looking around for deer was changed, you're out of luck.

43
44 MS. PHILLIPS: Um-hum.

45
46 MR. SCHROEDER: The Thorne Bay, Coffman Cove area
47 people have a road hunting pattern and as long as there's fresh
48 clear-cut coming up, the deer hunting could be productive. So
49 that could kind of explain some of the thinking there. As to

50 whether or not people are answering based on their employment,

00095

1 I'll leave that up to the Council to figure out.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Bill. Mary. And then Herman.
4 I can see that they're getting ready in the kitchen so when
5 someone sticks their head out and waves at us then we'll break
6 for lunch.

7

8 MR. THOMAS: Then we'll have more public comment after
9 what we're going doing here?

10

11 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Yes.

12

13 MR. THOMAS: Okay. I would suggest we go to public
14 comment before bringing it to the Board.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So Mary and Herman, were your
17 -- did you have questions to Staff? Mary.

18

19 MS. RUDOLPH: I have comments.

20

21 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So shall we hold off on the
22 comments until Council deliberations?

23

24 MS. RUDOLPH: That's fine.

25

26 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Jeff.

27

28 MR. NICKERSON: I have some questions for Mr. Willis,
29 but you know, I'm at the wishes of yourself.

30

31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Herman, did you have questions
32 for them?

33

34 MR. KITKA: Not yet.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Jeff, go ahead.

37

38 MR. NICKERSON: Okay. One of the things that came to
39 my mind was when I was listening and reading here, you know,
40 we're talking about our -- the pellet group which was on Figure
41 1, and I was wishing we had a map of Prince of Wales Island
42 here. And I was wondering, how many areas is this taken out
43 of?

44

45 MR. WILLIS: To answer that, Jeff, I think I'll defer
46 to Doug Larson from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, who
47 runs those surveys every year. If I could prevail upon him to
48 come up to answer that question, he can do it in much more
49 detail than I can.

00096

1 MR. LARSON: Thank you. My name is Doug Larson, I'm
2 the Ketchikan area wildlife biologist with the Alaska
3 Department of Fish and Game. And the area I'm responsible for
4 is Game Management Unit 2 and Game Management Subunit 1(A),
5 which is the immediate Ketchikan area.

6
7 In response to the question about the pellet group
8 transects, as a result of all the interest that was generated
9 last year, the Fish and Game Department, together with the
10 Forest Service, this is a cooperative effort, decided that it
11 was responsible to go out and try to collect as much
12 information across as big an area as possible. So last year,
13 unlike previous years, we actually went out and surveyed Prince
14 of Wales Island much more intensively than we have in the past.
15 So we surveyed 17 different areas across the island. Seventeen
16 VCU's or watersheds across the island, which is substantially
17 greater than what we've gotten in the past. In the report and
18 I'm not sure if it shows it in the figure, we had the numbers
19 of areas surveyed as an indication above the means that were
20 generated for those particular years because they have varied
21 substantially from as few as three to as many as last year we
22 had 17 different areas, which constituted over 4,020 square
23 meter plots. And I don't know that you need to get into the
24 details of that, but its a lot of sampling.

25
26 MR. NICKERSON: Thank you. In regards to communities,
27 could you tell me how many were done on the north part of the
28 island and maybe in the middle like around Winter Harbor and
29 then the south part of the island and the Thorne Bay area?
30 Where were these areas located?

31
32 MR. LARSON: Actually the areas are mostly located
33 north central Prince of Wales and north. There are some down
34 around Kitkun Bay, which is down in Chomly Sound. Primarily we
35 work that north end because that's where we have the largest
36 concentrations of people, and the most interest in deer
37 population fluctuations. We have sampled all the way from
38 Mount Caulder to Red Bay, Coffman Cove, Exchange Cove, Sarheen,
39 SarCar, Twelvemile Arm, I'm doing this off the top of my head,
40 but there's a substantial, I think, spread of areas that are
41 sampled. Again though, to answer your question, Jeff, they
42 predominately are done central to northern Prince of Wales.

43
44 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Is luncheon ready, do you know? Are
45 you checking? Okay. So the luncheon is ready, we invite
46 everyone to stay, it is a fund-raising luncheon for Cape Fox
47 dancers who intend to go to Celebration this year. So we will
48 recess until 1:30. We'll come back and we'll see if there were
49 additional questions to Staff, realizing that Mr. Willis is

50 leaving, we'll make sure that Mike has a chance to testify

00097

1 before he leaves and then we'll go on to public comment.

2

3 (Off record)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, we do have a quorum and we do
8 have a number of presentations that need to be made and several
9 people on time constraints so I need to call the meeting back
10 to order and we'll start with Dale. That's the official hot
11 seat right there, Dale, so Dale needs to make a presentation
12 because he has another meeting to go to and then we'll go back
13 to the Staff reports from the Division of Subsistence. Dale.

14

15 MR. CAIN: Thank you. My name is Dale Cain and I'm the
16 District Ranger with the Forest Service in Craig. And at the
17 moment I'm heading up a regional task team that is looking into
18 a Forest Service regional policy for the Chugach and Tongass
19 National Forest that would regulate the commercial harvest of
20 what we call special forest products so we're talking about
21 things like mushrooms and ferns and devil's club and berries.
22 And our approach at the moment is to come up with a draft
23 proposal that's based largely on what they've already got in
24 terms of policy in Region 6 which is Oregon and Washington.
25 And then to take that policy and, I'll be presenting it next
26 week to our Regional leadership team in Juneau and if they say
27 go ahead with that as a draft policy, our first approach will
28 be to go out with the tribes here in Alaska and run it by them
29 and that's because of the sensitivity that this issue has with
30 a lot of the indigenous people especially when we're talking
31 devil's club. And we'll get interaction going there for 45
32 days worth of review and dialogue. And then based on that
33 we'll come out with another draft which we will go out to the
34 public, the other Federal and State agencies and get comments.
35 So we're looking at a process that will have about four
36 different drafts in it. Take about a year. And hopefully have
37 lots of input to it, beginning with the tribes.

38

39 At the moment the policy has preference and priority
40 for a rural residence based on Title VIII over commercial or
41 other uses. We did have a preference and priority for tribal
42 people in there. Our legal counsel has struck that out and at
43 present we don't have any, but we're kind of in the initial
44 stages of the process. And conservation of the resources is
45 probably the number one priority, sustaining the integrity of
46 the stand and the ecosystem; it's a very conservative policy.
47 We are also going to provide a recommended interim policy
48 because this -- we think our final policy will take about a
49 year to get through the system. The interim policy basically

50 says, if you're going to issue commercial permits, do it in

00098

1 areas that have already been through the NEPA process and
2 cleared and are slated for timber sale harvest. And again,
3 it's a fairly conservative approach for interim strategy and
4 that's where we are right now.

5
6 And the Regional Council is one of the groups that the
7 Regional Forester has told us to work with very closely. So
8 probably once we get our draft approved by the Regional
9 leadership team we'll be getting you all copies and you can
10 start going after it with your red pens.

11
12 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Dale, for Salena, I'm not sure that
13 you introduced who you were.

14
15 REPORTER: He did.

16
17 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Oh, you did, okay. So are there
18 questions of Dale? John.

19
20 MR. VALE: I was just curious how much commercial
21 interest is there in these other types of resources?

22
23 MR. CAIN: Right now it's actually pretty small. We've
24 had some people who have been trying to get permits for five
25 years and our agency has really been struggling because of the
26 sensitivity of some of the species that are involved. But
27 there are about a dozen people from botanist to tribal liaison
28 folks working on this and right now it appears that the amounts
29 we're talking about and the value is pretty low. I have talked
30 with the regional corporations about them making their lands
31 available and the ones I have talked to tend to think that the
32 value is so low that it would not be worth their time
33 administering the permits and it would not justify the
34 financial liability on their lands. But I would say it's a
35 growth industry. Certainly down south people are killing
36 people in the woods over some of these products down south,
37 so.....

38
39 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Bill is next, but reminding you
40 that we can't use foul language. Okay, he has nothing to say
41 because of that -- no, he's whispering to me.

42
43 MR. THOMAS: You were talking -- I'm sorry I missed
44 your presentation but you mentioned something about
45 commercializing something? Was that different plants and
46 stuff?

47
48 MR. CAIN: Yeah.

49

MR. THOMAS: What are the reasons for the

00099

1 commercializing?

2

3 MR. CAIN: Well, for a number of years we have had
4 people requesting commercial permits to harvest plants on the
5 national forests in Alaska. And it's -- our manual, if we can
6 do it on a sustainable basis, we're to try and make these
7 products available.

8

9 MR. THOMAS: Are you going to make a sustainable plan
10 before you allow this to occur?

11

12 MR. CAIN: Well, inventory monitoring are a big part of
13 the policy, and one example would be moss and likens, there is
14 no commercial harvest right now in our present draft. Two
15 months is very drafty, draft -- there is.....

16

17 MR. THOMAS: Commercial?

18

19 MR. CAIN:no commercial harvest because the study
20 is being done down south right now, the region on moss and
21 liken so we are not proposing any kind of harvest numbers or
22 dollar value for those.

23

24 MR. THOMAS: Is this something that will happen on a
25 national level or a regional level or a local level or what --
26 how is the approach on this?

27

28 MR. CAIN: Well, I'm working on a regional policy, but
29 the left hand just found out that the right hand back in the
30 Washington office is also working on a national policy. And so
31 for the last month I've actually been coordinating with them a
32 little bit. And I'm not sure where -- what kind of time line
33 the national policy is on. But they're trying to -- you know,
34 there's a lot of overlap and I will do my best to make sure
35 that -- to the best of our ability that, at least, regional
36 differences are recognized. For example, in the Lower 48,
37 those policies do have special preferences and deferences for
38 tribal people. But that's based on Lower 48 treaties with
39 seeded lands and off reservation treaties that were made and
40 commitments, and that's the legal basis for those. But they
41 don't have any kind of preference or priority for rural
42 residents, such as we have up here under ANILCA. So those
43 kinds of differences in our administrative regs, we can't
44 violate any treaties or legislated laws.

45

46 MR. THOMAS: You talking about Uncle Sam?

47

48 MR. CAIN: Pardon?

49

MR. THOMAS: You talking about Uncle Sam?

00100

1 MR. CAIN: Yes.

2

3 MR. THOMAS: Oh. One more Madame Chairman. You know,
4 when you enter the forest to do that kind of thing, it's very
5 similar to managing fish and wildlife in a sense. I'm
6 wondering what scheme are you going to use to manage, how are
7 you going to monitor, how are you going to evaluate, you know,
8 all that should be in your plan.

9

10 MR. CAIN: Yeah, it will be. It has to be. Especially
11 after watching what happened with the sea cucumber harvests for
12 lack of a monitoring plan initially.

13

14 MR. THOMAS: I hope it will be. Thank you, Madame
15 Chairman.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Patti.

18

19 MS. PHILLIPS: I was wondering if you could kind of
20 explain to me like a nagoon berry. Is there a subsistence
21 priority for nagoon berry?

22

23 MR. CAIN: I'm an engineer, now, you have to tell me
24 what a nagoon berry is?

25

26 MS. PHILLIPS: It's like a, you know -- are you
27 serious.

28

29 MR. VALE: It's a species of raspberry.

30

31 MS. PHILLIPS: It's a little tiny, highly.....

32

33 MS. McCONNELL: They taste terrible.

34

35 MR. CAIN: Now, I know what a -- if we're talking
36 terrible, I know what a soapberry is.

37

38 MS. PHILLIPS: No, it's delicious.

39

40 MR. CAIN: Tillie fed me soapberries once.

41

42 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, anyways, you take -- it's highly
43 regarded as a delicacy. And they only come in small patches.
44 But is there a subsistence priority for that, it's a berry --
45 you know, a local berry?

46

47 MR. CAIN: Well, there would be a subsistence priority
48 for it and if it's in short supply, then hopefully we would get
49 input from the public not to allow that to be commercialized.

49

MS. PHILLIPS: Because what's happening is that local

00101

1 tourism related businesses are commercializing it by
2 highlighting it on their web pages, we have the most delicious
3 nagoon berries around, you know. And there's not enough for
4 the local population even to all harvest it. So I was just
5 wondering, that would sort of fall in that category then.

6
7 MR. CAIN: Right. And those would hopefully not be
8 commercialized. If there was a shortage as far as meeting the
9 local needs in the rural communities, then we would have no
10 business commercializing those.

11
12 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So, Dale, just to summarize then, a
13 draft policy has been developed. It will first go to tribes
14 for review, they will submit comments to your office?

15
16 MR. CAIN: Yeah, actually we're hoping it will be more
17 -- it won't be just comments, we hope to be dialoguing as soon
18 as it goes out to the Native liaisons and stuff will be working
19 -- so there's interchanging. It's not just like a NEPA process
20 where you send in your comments and we thank them.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. And then it will be redrafted
23 and go out to the public?

24
25 MR. CAIN: Right.

26
27 CHAIRMAN GARZA: At what point will we be involved as a
28 Council in that first step with the dialoguing with Native
29 organizations?

30
31 MR. CAIN: Yeah. As soon as I have a draft that I can
32 go out with, as soon as the -- hopefully next week the regional
33 leadership team will say, yeah, this looks like it's close
34 enough, let's go ahead and fly it, then I'll get a copy to Fred
35 Clark who is strategically placed on our committee, by the way,
36 and we'll get it out to the Council.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So you're basically just
39 letting us know what's going to be happening for the next year?

40
41 MR. CAIN: Right. This is a warning.

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

44
45 MS. PHILLIPS: Only a warning.

46
47 MS. McCONNELL: Thanks for the heads up.

48
49 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thank you, Dale. So we need to

50 get back to the Staff presentations regarding Proposals 9, 10,

00102

1 11 and 12. We have Mr. Willis who needs to leave here by 2:25
2 at the absolute latest, were there other questions from Council
3 to Mr. Willis regarding biology? Jeff is shaking his head yes.
4 Jeff.

5
6 MR. NICKERSON: Yes, thank you, Madame Chair. The
7 question I asked earlier was how many areas had been done and
8 you said 17.

9
10 MR. WILLIS: That's correct. That was Mr. Doug Larson
11 from ADF&G provided that information.

12
13 MR. NICKERSON: Yes, well, Mr. Larson said that, yeah.
14 And I was wondering, how many areas within the last five years
15 had been done each year previous to the 17?

16
17 MR. WILLIS: Again, I would defer to Doug on that. It
18 does vary from year-to-year depending on need and available
19 personnel, but I think some are done every year. But I better
20 let Doug come up and answer that question also since he and the
21 Forest Service actually did the work.

22
23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Doug.

24
25 MR. LARSON: Thank you. My name is Doug Larson,
26 wildlife biologist with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
27 As has been mentioned we vary the numbers that are done
28 typically as a result of budgets and personnel that are
29 available. Last year we made a concerted effort to do more
30 because of the interest in the issue. But to answer Jeff's
31 question specifically, and I assume you're interested just in
32 Unit 2?

33
34 MR. NICKERSON: In Unit 2, yes.

35 MR. LARSON: Okay. In Unit 2, just as an example,
36 Mount Caulder, which is up on the northwest coast of Prince of
37 Wales is a fairly difficult one to access. And as a matter-of-
38 fact we were able to access it last year only because we had
39 participation from some volunteers from Point Baker and Port
40 Protection. Prior to last year, Mount Caulder had been
41 surveyed in 1988, so several years had passed between the time
42 that we surveyed it. Red Bay, we do more frequently. We did
43 Red Bay in 1994, 1996 and again in '97. Exchange Cove we did
44 in 1988, '92, and '97. Sarheen we did in 1989, 1996 and 1997.
45 We also established a new transect at Point Baker because of
46 local interest in what deer populations were doing there and
47 that was done for the first time last spring, spring of '97.
48 Sarcar we have done in 1988, '92, '94 and '97. So roughly
49 every couple of years. Mormchuk (ph) which is on Pekeda (ph)

50 Island, 1984, '85, '89, '91, '96 and again '97. Baker Island

00103

1 '91, we had very low counts and we didn't revisit Baker until
2 1997 and still have very low counts in that area. Thorne Lake
3 1992, '94, '95 and '97, pretty consistent. That's a relatively
4 easy one to access and so we're able to get more data from that
5 point. Snakey Lakes, also near the Thorne Lake system, 1988 --
6 excuse me, '86, '88, '89, '93 and '97. Little Rats, '92 and we
7 hadn't done it in five years, but did it in 1997. And that's
8 -- that one actually showed remarkable -- almost a doubling of
9 pellet groups between 1992 and '97. And then at Tuksukan(ph)
10 we did them in '88 and '97. Twelvemile pretty consistent, '85,
11 '86, '87, 88, '89, '90, '91, '92, 93, '94, '97, so that one in
12 '97, it had only been a couple of years since it was done.
13 Trocadero '95 and '97, that's a fairly new one. Port Refugio
14 has been done fairly consistently, '91 through '97, about every
15 year. Kitkun Bay, which I mentioned earlier and that's the
16 last one we have for Unit 2 is in Chomly Sound, a little more
17 difficult to access, in fact, it takes aircraft to get in
18 there, so it's weather dependent, we've done that one in '88,
19 '89, '95 and '97.

20
21 MR. NICKERSON: Okay. I was -- the reason I was asking
22 is because we're always giving these graphs similar to what we
23 have here, we're always showed that but we're never given
24 anything behind -- we never know where the material was
25 gathered from and that's why I was asking the question. And I
26 was -- my next question, I guess, is how -- all you're counting
27 are their droppings, right?

28
29 MR. LARSON: Correct. Pellet groups, correct.

30
31 MR. NICKERSON: Can you explain to me how that tells
32 you how many deer are in an area?

33
34 MR. LARSON: Sure. Actually there is a couple of
35 things to keep in mind on that, I assume -- am I to answer
36 this?

37
38 MR. WILLIS: Yes.

39
40 MR. LARSON: Okay. There's a couple of things, Jeff,
41 one is that the pellet group transects were not designed to
42 give actual numbers of deer. They were actually designed as a
43 trend indicator, in other words, to determine whether
44 populations were stable or increasing or decreasing from
45 previous years. And so that's really what our focus has been,
46 is to look at what the trends are. Now, in looking at numbers
47 of deer, which of course human nature is that you want to know
48 how many animals are out there; that's a pretty difficult thing
49 to come up with. It's not like trees where you can go out and

50 count them, it's much more dynamic. But what we've done is as

00104

1 a result of a study that was done on Portland Island several
2 years ago, where deer were put on the island, they didn't exist
3 there, they were radioed and as a result of having the deer on
4 the island, a known number of deer, the Department was able to
5 come up with an estimate of how you could relate pellet group
6 transect data to actual numbers of deer. As a result of that
7 effort, we now have a figure that we can use to extrapolate and
8 it is roughly one pellet group per plot, which I'll discuss if
9 you need that kind of detail, equals approximately 32 deer per
10 square mile.

11
12 But again, I would reemphasize that for our interests
13 and for the purposes of managing, really the critical thing is
14 to know what the trends are. And that's really what we try to
15 do in looking at those data.

16
17 MR. NICKERSON: So one of the things I heard -- Madame
18 Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Go ahead, Jeff.

21
22 MR. NICKERSON: Is that it's hard to tell at first when
23 did you -- what island did you say you did the study on?
24

25 MR. LARSON: That was on Portland Island up near
26 Juneau.

27
28 MR. NICKERSON: Okay. And what year was that?
29

30 MR. LARSON: I don't recall. Do you remember, Bruce?
31

32 MR. DINNEFORD: It was '89/90, somewhere around there.
33 MR. LARSON: The late '80s it sounds like roughly.

34
35 MR. NICKERSON: Okay, thank you. I appreciate this
36 information because there is so much put into this by decisions
37 that are made off of this information and I just feel that with
38 Prince of Wales Island there's -- from what the scientists are
39 saying and what the people are saying are so different that
40 that is why I'm asking questions here. And, could I ask more
41 questions?
42

43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Go ahead, Jeff.
44

45 MR. NICKERSON: I was wondering, to get off the
46 droppings, thank you. And one of the things that have come up
47 -- I know the lady from Saxman yesterday talked about it when
48 she was talking about the different fisheries that come in here
49 and I think maybe there's somebody out there that could tell

50 me, how many fisheries have been off the west coast of Prince

00105

1 of Wales within the last couple of years? I mean every year
2 it's a -- it's a cycle, I understand that, but it certainly has
3 grown within the last three or four years, I believe. And I
4 may be wrong, I apologize for that because I am not a fisherman
5 so that's why I'm asking and I wanted to -- i want to see how
6 many fisheries there has been off the Prince of Wales Island?

7
8 MR. WILLIS: Jeff, I have no idea how to answer that
9 question.

10
11 MR. NICKERSON: Is there anyone in the audience that
12 might be able to answer that as far as commercial fisheries?

13
14 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Jeff.....

15
16 MR. WILLIS: I believe we have a winner.

17
18 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Please introduce yourself.

19
20 MR. HOFFMAN: Madame Chairman, my name is Steve Hoffman
21 and I'm a sport fish biologist for ADF&G in the Ketchikan area.
22 I can help you a little bit in relation to the commercial
23 fisheries for the west coast. You know, we have the commercial
24 seine fishery and then we have the herring fishery in the
25 spring and then there's been some sea urchin fisheries.

26
27 MR. NICKERSON: And abalone?

28
29 MR. HOFFMAN: a nd some -- a limited abalone fishery,
30 correct.

31
32 MR. NICKERSON: And sea cucumbers?

33
34 MR. HOFFMAN: Correct.

35
36 MR. NICKERSON: I'm not sure if that's all of it.

37
38 MR. HOFFMAN: And from then there is the shell fish
39 fisheries, shrimp has been a big one.

40
41 MR. NICKERSON: Now, these are going on off the west
42 coast of Prince of Wales all year-round, right?

43
44 MR. HOFFMAN: Well, they are seasonal fisheries that
45 are made up of by the Board of Fish.

46
47 MR. NICKERSON: Something's always being fished out
48 there, right?

49

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, most of the time. Yes.

00106

1 MR. NICKERSON: Thank you.

2
3 CHAIRMAN GARZA: John.

4
5 MR. NICKERSON: Madame Chair, I'm sorry, I have a
6 couple questions.

7
8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

9
10 MR. THOMAS: A couple is two Jeff.

11
12 MR. NICKERSON: Okay. On each hand? You know, in the
13 analysis it talks about, I think it's Figure 5, the reported
14 doe harvest. And of all the fisheries that go on out there
15 also on Prince of -- on the west coast of Prince of Wales, are
16 any of these people sent surveys, do you know, as far as
17 hunting?

18
19 MR. WILLIS: Not to my knowledge. I have no
20 information on that.

21
22 MR. NICKERSON: So again, I will say that I am not a
23 fisherman, but I know that it's common sense for them and I
24 don't blame them, if the season's open and they say, hey, you
25 know, let's get a deer and lets -- we'll live on it this week.
26 You know, I have no problem with that at all. But that isn't
27 taken into any consideration here, I believe. And you know,
28 that is something that -- there are so many things that impact
29 our deer population and I just wanted to see if that was taken
30 into consideration? And along the same line, if our surveys
31 for Prince of Wales Island just sent to people in Prince of
32 Wales and Ketchikan, are there any sent anywhere else?

33
34 MR. WILLIS: They're sent to probably all or almost all
35 communities in Southeast and people report then where they
36 hunted. It doesn't necessarily mean that only people who
37 hunted -- or live in Unit 2 would have reported hunting in Unit
38 2 if they were in Juneau or Anchorage or wherever and hunted in
39 Unit 2, then they would have reported that on their
40 questionnaire/survey if they returned it.

41
42 As far as the illegal harvests that may be occurring by
43 fishermen fishing the west coast of the island, illegal
44 harvest, either there or on the road system are shooting
45 whatever.....

46
47 MR. NICKERSON: Excuse me. I didn't say there was an
48 illegal harvest, okay.

49

MR. WILLIS: I thought you were talking about illegal

00107

1 harvest by boat.....

2

3 MR. NICKERSON: No. I thought I said when the season
4 was open that, you know, I don't have any problem when they are
5 -- if they want to take.....

6

7 MR. WILLIS: Okay. You're talking about a legal
8 harvest. Whether or not we caught that would depend on whether
9 those people were sent a questionnaire/survey and whether or
10 not they returned it.

11

12 MR. NICKERSON: And of the total amount of people that
13 are sent surveys, I'm sorry -- of the total amount of hunters
14 that are out there, how many are sent surveys? What's the
15 percentage?

16

17 MR. WILLIS: I'd probably have to defer to ADF&G for
18 that question because it is an ADF&G survey. I have an idea
19 what it is but I'm sure Bruce Dinneford has a much better idea.

20

21 MR. DINNEFORD: Bruce Dinneford with Fish and Game.
22 Yeah, Jeff, the way that survey is done, it is a mailout survey
23 and to the smaller communities in Southeast we send 100 percent
24 mailers. In other words, everyone who got a harvest ticket --
25 deer harvest ticket will get a survey. In the larger
26 communities we sample at about 25 percent level. Out of every
27 100 hunters with a deer harvest ticket, 25 will get a survey.

28

29 MR. NICKERSON: For the large communities, right?

30

31 MR. DINNEFORD: That's correct.

32

33 MR. NICKERSON: Even this year? Even the surveys that
34 were sent out, the latest ones?

35

36 MR. DINNEFORD: Yes, sir. It was a different format.
37 We were experiencing a decrease in response rate and that's not
38 unusual in surveys. Survey burnout, people say, gee, I've
39 gotten this thing for the last 10 years, bologna, I'm not going
40 to answer it, so we went to a smaller, just a postcard format
41 and it did increase our response rate, but we did not have a
42 couple of items that we had been getting.

43

44 MR. NICKERSON: I brought a survey and I think it's in
45 my hotel room, but that survey was for my wife and i didn't
46 receive one. But of the total numbers of surveys that are sent
47 out, what, of the -- of the total, what percentage is answered
48 about?

49

MR. DINNEFORD: What percentage is answered, that we

00108

1 get back from hunters?

2

3 MR. NICKERSON: Was that 25 -- you said -- did that
4 include the villages?

5

6 MR. DINNEFORD: In the villages, most of the villages,
7 there's a cutoff there, I think it's around 800. Below 800 we
8 send out 100 percent. Above 800, if that is the right number,
9 it's 25 percent.

10

11 MR. NICKERSON: Okay. My question is, if you send out
12 800, what percent will be returned?

13

14 MR. DINNEFORD: About two-thirds. We shoot for a 66
15 percent return rate but we don't always get it. We were, I
16 believe we were down around a 45 percent response right. At 66
17 percent we feel we can extrapolate the way the statistics work
18 -- we're told that from 66 percent you can extrapolate out and
19 have a fairly accurate picture of what the -- all the hunters
20 did.

21

22 MR. NICKERSON: Okay, thank you. Madame Chair, if
23 someone has questions I'll stop here.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GARZA: John Vale.

26

27 MR. NICKERSON: Okay.

28 MR. VALE: Yeah, Mr. Larson, I guess a question for
29 you. You peaked my interest when you talked about the study
30 there with trying to ascertain a number of deer per pellet
31 groupings, and you said 32 deer per square mile for a pellet
32 grouping per plot. And I was wondering if you meant per plot
33 -- don't you have two methods, you have a plot, a little square
34 area where you check every year and then you have transects
35 where you check pellet groupings along the transects; is that
36 correct? Is that what you meant by per plot, a specific little
37 location?

38

39 MR. LARSON: Yeah. Actually it's a little different
40 than that but I think you're on the right idea there, John.
41 The way the pellet group transects work, and I'll try and make
42 this real brief.

43

44 MR. VALE: Yeah.

45

46 MR. LARSON: Is that we have specific transects that we
47 try to duplicate. That is, we try to walk the same compass
48 bearing at those locations every time that we do them, whether
49 that's every other year or every year. When we do those, those

50 transects are either 125 plots, and a plot is equal to 20

00109

1 meters long by one meter wide. So it's actually a rectangle,
2 20 square meters. Within those plots that we're doing along
3 the transects, again, whether it's 125 or less if we get to
4 1,500 feet because our intent is to try to measure use on
5 winter range, so we figure 1,500 feet's a good cutoff. Within
6 that then we get these numbers of pellet groups within each of
7 these 20 square meter plots, okay, so when we come up with an
8 overall average what that is is number of pellet groups per
9 plot on the average for the 300, 250 plots for that watershed.
10 So when I talk about one pellet group per plot average, that
11 is, for every 20 square meters, we have one pellet group, if
12 that is our average, then we extrapolate that to about 32 deer
13 per square mile based on the Port Island study.

14

15 MR. VALE: Okay, thanks.

16

17 MR. LARSON: Sure.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Patti.

20

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Does the State, are you guys developing
22 plans based on these studies and what might be the result of
23 those plans?

24

25 MR. LARSON: Maybe you can help me, Patti, you say
26 plans on.....

27

28 MS. PHILLIPS: Like, you know, here we have Federal
29 subsistence and we have State management and right now the
30 State doesn't have a doe hunt and it's looking like there's no
31 biological problem, but does the State -- are they planning on
32 changing the way deer are being harvested and the quantity
33 they're being harvested or shortening the season or lengthening
34 it?

34

35 MR. LARSON: Okay, thanks. I understand, I think,
36 better now. The State and I think the Federal government as
37 well, in the cooperative efforts that we've done with
38 specifically the pellet group data, the intent there has never
39 been to develop a plan based on pellet. What those data are
40 collected for is to respond to changing populations or
41 conditions. So what we have done in the past is we will have
42 these data that we have collected and if there is a concern
43 about populations, either there's more animals around than
44 there were previously and therefore we feel it's appropriate to
45 propose a liberalization or if the populations appear to be
46 down from what they were, then we would go to either this
47 Council or in the past, the Board of Game and say, we feel,
48 based on these biological data, that it might be prudent and
49 responsible to do some kind of management changes and there's

50 several options. You can do methods and means, you can do

00110

1 season reductions, you can do bag limit reductions. Those are
2 the typical tools that can be used to adjust, depending on what
3 those data show. So that's really the purpose of collecting
4 that information.

5
6 MS. PHILLIPS: So will ADF&G be submitting proposals to
7 the Board of Game based on the studies, immediately?

8
9 MR. LARSON: Well, the next Board of Game meeting is
10 here in Ketchikan in October, and I don't, right now, have any
11 plans or see anything that would suggest to me that we have a
12 specific issue, at least, here in southern Southeast where I'm,
13 for example, responsible, that I would put a proposal in.
14 That's not to say that other parts of Southeast there wouldn't
15 be some because I don't know enough about what's happened with
16 different populations and what other biologists are finding
17 out. But certainly if information was available through any of
18 the Staff, that there was a concern in a specific area, those
19 would be brought to the Board of Game meeting.

20
21 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Larson, you had indicated to me
24 that you needed to do a short 10 minute presentation, is this
25 what your presentation was encompassing or were you presenting
26 on something else?

27
28 MR. LARSON: I was actually going to present something
29 more on the specifics of Proposal 9 that's been submitted.

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Do we want to hear from him now
32 or go back to Division of Subsistence on the socioeconomic
33 work?

34
35 MR. VALE: Let's go ahead.

36
37 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, go ahead.

38
39 MR. LARSON: Madame Chair, could I get my notes real
40 briefly?

41
42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Sure.

43
44 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. does anyone have any questions
47 of Mr. Willis before he slips out?

48
49 MR. THOMAS: What's your phone number on the airplane?

00111

1 MR. WILLIS: Say again, Bill?

2

3 MR. THOMAS: What's your phone number on the airplane?

4

5 MR. WILLIS: 555-1212.

6

7 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Well, thank you very much.

8

9 MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

10

11 MR. THOMAS: Thank your, Robert, have a safe flight

12 back.

13

14 MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Bill.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

17

18 MR. LARSON: Okay.

19

20 CHAIRMAN GARZA: I just want to double check, Lonnie,
21 are you there now?

22

23 MR. ANDERSON: I'm here.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Can you hear us?

26

27 MR. ANDERSON: I hear you loud and clear.

28

29 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. We're going to start with
30 Mr. Larson, who is with ADF&G talking about deer in Unit 2. If
31 you can't hear him let us know.

32

33 MR. LARSON: Can you hear me okay, Lonnie?

34

35 MR. ANDERSON: I hear you.

36

37 MR. LARSON: Good. Okay, I'll try and speak close to
38 the microphone and hopefully that will help. In starting off
39 -- would it be better to clip it on?

40

41 REPORTER: Yes.

42

43 MR. LARSON: Is that better -- if I look down I suppose
44 it's better, uh? Okay. Before I get into the actual content
45 of some points I wanted to make with regard to the proposal, I
46 did want to mention one thing that I talked to Robert about.
47 During Robert's presentation, he mentioned that populations in
48 Unit 2 were high and I asked him about that during a break and
49 he told me that it was his intent to indicate that the

50 populations are stable, not high. And I think that's something

00112

1 that needs to be very clearly understood. Unit 2 does not, nor
2 has it ever had what we would call high populations of deer.
3 And when I use that term, high, there's obviously got to go be
4 some reference. But when you look at other parts of Southeast,
5 Unit 4, for example, we see as much as three times the
6 densities, again, based on pellet group data. So the numbers
7 in Unit 2, while they may be stable and they may increase and
8 decrease, they are not high levels, okay. And the primary
9 reason for that is the difference in the ecological system. We
10 have wolves in Unit 2, there are no wolves in Unit 4. That has
11 a big effect on the population. So I wanted to just mention
12 that before I get going on some points.

13
14 With regard to Proposal 9, I guess one thing I would
15 like for the Council to be clear on is that it is not the
16 State's intent to unnecessarily restrict any hunters. Rather,
17 it's our intent to ensure the long-term viability of
18 populations and as a result of that, the long-term sustainable
19 harvest by resource users, regardless of whether they're rural
20 or non-rural. From our perspective, the long existing liberal
21 buck season in Unit 2, together with the overall stability of
22 the deer population illustrates to us the usefulness and the
23 effectiveness of this particular management strategy for this
24 particular system.

25
26 We concur with the assessment that the Federal
27 government has presented, but we don't concur with the
28 position. That is, we support Proposal 9. And frankly we feel
29 it's our obligation and our responsibility to provide
30 information and insights about the implications of implementing
31 various management or resource use strategies. In this case,
32 the strategy before us whether or not to have a female harvest.
33 Doe hunts reduce population, however, imperceptibly they do
34 reduce populations. Therefore, from a management perspective,
35 doe seasons should be implemented when there's a desire to
36 reduce the populations because of inadequate or limited
37 habitat. In other words, if the carrying capacity has been
38 reached or exceeded, it would make perfect sense to do that.
39 There's examples of where that has been the case, Unit 4.
40 We've had doe seasons in place in Unit 4 for many, many years.
41 And I think very effectively and they have not compromised the
42 integrity or the care of the deer resource in that particular
43 system. In Unit 2, does taken along easily accessible areas,
44 for example the road system and we've heard other comments that
45 have been presented to you, that these harvests are fairly
46 localized and they become more localized as we've seen more
47 access available as a result of the expanding road system.
48 Well, as the road system has expanded, so has opportunities to
49 harvest deer, whether they be does or bucks.

00113

1 If we just look for a moment at the implications from
2 harvesting does in localized areas I think it might help,
3 hopefully, to get a better perspective on what this means in
4 terms of the resource and the resource users. Harvesting 300
5 does along a road system may not be critical at all to the well
6 being of the unit wide, the total 3,600 square mile area of
7 Unit 2. But it could substantially effect numbers of deer in
8 those localized areas. Okay, if we have 300 does harvested off
9 of a road system and if we assume, which we -- I think we can
10 based on biological data, that each doe produced roughly a fawn
11 and a half per year, then what you're looking at in the first
12 year is a loss of 300 does, plus the loss of potentially 450
13 fawns. That's 750 deer in one year from a fairly localized
14 area. Now, when people come to me and say they don't see deer
15 on the road system, I'm frankly not surprised. Because if
16 you're concentrating harvests along an area like that, even if
17 the population is doing well outside of that corridor it
18 certainly does have an effect on that resource in that area,
19 and consequently because people are interested in those easily
20 accessible areas to hunt, it has an effect on their use as
21 well.

22
23 The other thing is there's been indications that
24 hunters prefer to take bucks. Well, if you assume that these
25 does have 450 fawns, roughly 225 of those are going to be
26 bucks. Again, that's 225 bucks out of that small isolated area
27 in one year. Now, you can see that if you expanded that
28 through time it would be fairly substantial. Another point I
29 wanted to make was that the variability that we saw in the
30 respondents perspectives and feelings about Unit 2 deer
31 populations, and we've heard, some think that populations are
32 okay, some say, wow, they're down, others say, gosh, I've never
33 seen it so good. That is not at all unlike the pellet group
34 data that we have. For the 17 areas that we looked at, we had
35 areas that were up, we had areas that were the same and we had
36 areas that were down. so that the perspectives that people
37 bring to the table, their observations, they're not wrong, it's
38 just they are very indicative of what that population is doing
39 on a large base.

40
41 The last thing I wanted to mention is that I just want
42 to say that I've interacted with numerous hunters who have come
43 to me to talk about the Unit 2 deer situation, rural
44 hunters/non-rural hunters, both. And I can honestly say that I
45 have had more people come to me and express concern about the
46 doe season than they have about not being able to find deer.
47 And that's all I wanted to share. I would be happy to answer
48 questions, Madame Chair, if there's time.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bill.

00114

1 MR. THOMAS: I have one question, good presentation,
2 Doug. You mentioned that shooting does decreases the
3 population, right, what happens when you shoot bucks?

4
5 MR. LARSON: You decrease the population for that
6 season. I mean when you take an animal out, you've got to be
7 straight forward, you've reduced the population for that time.
8 The difference is when you reduce a buck versus a doe, a doe
9 has the potential, as I said, to produce another one and a half
10 times the following year. So she actually -- by taking her
11 out, you've actually effected the overall potential for growth,
12 whereas by taking out that buck, you have not, because when you
13 take out a buck, that can be replaced by another deer and a
14 half, potentially, through the reproductive process. So it's
15 -- Bill, it's not really so much that deer numbers aren't
16 reduced for the short-term by taking bucks, but there's a very
17 clear distinction between taking bucks and taking does for the
18 long-term implications for the population.

19
20 MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN GARZA: John.

22
23 MR. VALE: Yeah. You know, we heard a number of times
24 that the deer are not near their carrying capacity and I was
25 just wondering if you care to estimate how close to carrying
26 capacity the deer population is on the island there?

27
28 MR. LARSON: I don't know exactly, John, but I can tell
29 you that right now with our estimate of 54,000 deer for 3,600
30 square miles, that's about 15 deer per square mile. If you
31 look at places like Unit 4, the carrying capacity up there is
32 probably not much different than it is in Unit 2, with the
33 exception that you have wolves in Unit 2 and not Unit 4. But
34 in Unit 4, what you see is an ability for that population to be
35 much closer or even exceed carrying capacity, okay. In Unit 2,
36 I guess if I was to hazard a guess at 54,000, I would think it
37 would be fair to say that we could support at least another 20,
38 maybe 30,000 deer if we extrapolate that over the entire unit.

39
40 MR. VALE: So.....

41
42 MR. LARSON: Excuse me, one minute. And that's for
43 right now, at this point in time. We've heard others talk
44 about changing habitat characteristics and that will certainly
45 have an effect in the long-term. In fact, in the reports that
46 we prepare and have referred back to on numerous occasions is
47 the fact that by the year 2054, which is when we get into the
48 proposed second rotation, we would anticipate about a 60
49 percent reduction in habitat potential or carrying capacity at

50 that point.

00115

1 MR. VALE: You answered my second question without me
2 asking it.

3
4 MR. LARSON: Telepathy.

5
6 MR. VALE: Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Are there any other biologically based
9 questions? If not, we still have a presentation from Division
10 of Subsistence. You'll be here for the rest of the day?

11
12 MR. LARSON: Yes.

13
14 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

15
16 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much.

17
18 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thanks. So Mike and Bob. And
19 if you could give me a clue as to how long you'll take because
20 we need to make sure that Mike Douville gives his public
21 testimony before he heads off to the ferry.

22
23 MR. SCHROEDER: We'll attempt to be fairly brief. A
24 lot will depend on how many questions the Council chooses to
25 ask.

26
27 MR. THOMAS: Madame Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bill.

30
31 MR. THOMAS: Your presentation, is it intended to have
32 an influence on the outcome of the decision-making of these
33 proposals or is this something that can wait until tomorrow?

34
35 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Bill, the reason for
36 presenting this material is so you have information before you
37 for making this decision, and that's our sole purpose at this
38 point.

39
40 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

41
42 MR. SCHROEDER: What we presented so far is we've gone
43 through the key respondent interview data. We have a thick
44 book of information here. What I'd like to do in the next few
45 minutes is to highlight what's in that book and then if the
46 discussion turns in that direction to guide Council members to
47 some of the information that we have provided.

48
49 Our document has a number of sections and just to let

50 you know what they are, we worked on the deer harvest data from

00116

1 the harvest ticket information which has come up a number of
2 times in the discussions with Robert Willard (sic) and Doug
3 Larson and we have some graphics concerning those, and also
4 some indication of which portions of Prince of Wales are most
5 heavily hunted. We have background information on the human
6 population of Prince of Wales because that's very relevant to
7 the changes that have occurred in the competition level that is
8 experienced on the island. A fourth section, we've provided
9 resource use summaries. I won't be talking much about those,
10 those provide background information on subsistence uses in
11 communities on Prince of Wales Island. Our fifth section
12 includes harvest data for all resources on Prince of Wales
13 Island. They're provided by means of reference, if there's
14 some question as to what do people on Prince of Wales use for
15 subsistence uses. We've also been able to update data for
16 Point Baker and Port Protection based on survey results that
17 were done last year. I think Council members who have been
18 interested in that have looked through it, we won't be
19 referring to that information right now. But it provides up to
20 date information on harvests in those communities. We also
21 have three sections which are listed as appendices. One are
22 relevant sections from a report prepared by Alana and Sherrod
23 looking at the effects of timber harvest, and we've pulled out
24 the sections that describe deer hunting on Prince of Wales.
25 We've provided a summary of regulatory history for Prince of
26 Wales. And finally, in this document we have appended maps
27 which show the subsistence use areas of different communities,
28 basically showing which parts of the island they use. We also
29 have a very brief presentation of early results from a
30 household survey which is being done right now in Craig, where
31 we asked people how many deer they harvested as well as their
32 opinion of certain of the issues that we're dealing with right
33 here.

34
35 For highlights on the deer harvest data, we'll note
36 first off.....

37
38 REPORTER: Wait a second, can you put the microphone up
39 here because I can hear that fan over your voice?

40
41 MR. SCHROEDER: Sure. Okay, I'm wired now. We've been
42 talking about the deer harvest data which is based on a mailout
43 survey which is being conducted by Division of Wildlife
44 Conservation for a number of years. We actually have about 10
45 years of time series data that we can look at. I think you've
46 explored some of the plus' of that information, that it's a
47 regular means of data collection, and it's done on a sample
48 basis around Southeast Alaska.

49

We believe that these data provide excellent indication

00117

1 of the trends of harvest and a pretty good indication of
2 magnitude of harvest for individual game management units.
3 When we do closer looks, however, we do find that there may be
4 under reporting a survey of this sort, a mailout survey for
5 small communities. We did find in, looking at '96, that the
6 reported harvest in our face-to-face household survey in Point
7 Baker, Port Protection was quite a bit higher than what came
8 through in the mailout survey. In this year we found that the
9 harvested deer in 1997 in Craig looked like it was quite a bit
10 harvest than the mean harvest as shown by the mailout harvest
11 ticket survey. Now, this doesn't mean that mailout surveys are
12 bad, they're a very efficient means of collecting information.
13 Household surveys are expensive and intrusive. But this is
14 simply to say that numbers may not have an absolute precision,
15 there may be more or for that matter, fewer deer harvested that
16 are shown.

17 In looking at this data set over time, which is the
18 mailout data set, we find that there is a good deal of
19 variability over time on Prince of Wales. You can see that '96
20 was the lowest GMU 2 harvest on record, and that harvests
21 around Southeast were generally lower.

22
23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bob, is there some way that we
24 could.....

25
26 MR. SCHROEDER: Can we see this?

27
28 CHAIRMAN GARZA:change this so that the audience
29 can see it because there are some people that need to. I don't
30 know if we can move that back or to one side or bring chairs up
31 here?

32
33 MR. CLARK: Yes.

34
35 MR. THOMAS: They don't need to see it.

36
37 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Pardon?

38
39 MR. CLARK: It would be easiest to move the chairs.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. This presentation could last a
42 bit so if you want to just bring a chair over so you can get
43 comfortable, you're welcome to.

44
45 MR. THOMAS: And bring some popcorn.

46
47 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

48
49 MS. McCONNELL: Are there any handouts?

00118

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Do you have any handouts?

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: I don't have handouts of these, these
4 are reproduced in the deer book and I'm not sure we have extra
5 copies.

6

7 We've segregated the harvest for Prince of Wales into
8 urban and rural harvest based on the Federal definition. This
9 gives those same harvests in terms of percent. There's really
10 no.....

11

12 MS. McCONNELL: What is the black?

13

14 MR. SCHROEDER: The black is urban.

15

16 MS. McCONNELL: Okay, thanks.

17

18 MR. SCHROEDER: And there's no particularly discernible
19 trend there. In fact, in Prince of Wales, there is possibly
20 less variability than in other parts of Southeast. If we look
21 at the same sort of data for GMU 4, this is again, the
22 magnitude of harvest. The overall harvest levels in GMU 4 vary
23 quite a bit more than in GMU 2. So GMU 2 has had a more
24 regular harvest over time as well as GMU 4 has had a stranger
25 distribution of urban versus rural percentages over time with
26 more of a difference between -- from year-to-year in who's
27 getting deer.

28

29 What we find from this is overall that the harvest
30 level -- the total harvest level has been relatively stable in
31 GMU 2. And the percentage of deer take by urban residents has
32 remained roughly stable.

33

34 Mim.

35

36 MS. McCONNELL: Yeah, I just had a question about the
37 urban and the rural for both GMU 2 and 4 there. Are the urban,
38 is that so hunters coming from, say, Ketchikan, hunting in GMU
39 2, is what the urban reflects?

40

41 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. Mim, what we did was we coded the
42 data so that anyone who was in a Federal/urban category would
43 fall into that urban category -- in the urban bar there. And
44 for GMU 2 the preponderance of urban hunters on Prince of Wales
45 would be from Ketchikan, there would be a few hunters from
46 Anchorage or from Juneau or from someplace else that was an
47 urban area. But almost all hunters would be from -- all urban
48 hunters would be from Ketchikan and virtually all rural hunters
49 are from Prince of Wales.

00119

1 MS. McCONNELL: Thank you.

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: Overall, in looking at an eight year
4 trend, urban residents took about a third of the deer, 33.6
5 percent, rural residents took 66.4 percent. We looked at the
6 data and we found four Prince of Wales hunters almost all their
7 deer came from Prince of Wales. Ketchikan hunters took 54
8 percent of their total deer from Prince of Wales.

9

10 We next wanted to see where these deer were coming
11 from, our research showed in interviews with people indicated
12 that hunting pressure wasn't evenly distributed. What we did
13 was we looked at the wildlife analysis areas on Prince of
14 Wales, there are 31 wildlife analysis areas. These are simply
15 geographical coding units. When and if you turn in your
16 mailout report, you indicate where you got deer. What we did
17 here was code the wildlife analysis areas by the frequency --
18 by the absolute number of deer that were taken. In this scale,
19 the red indicates the wildlife analysis areas that -- from
20 which the top ranking five wildlife analysis areas in terms of
21 the total number of deer that came out of the island over this
22 eight year period. Those of you familiar with Prince of Wales
23 can probably see in your mind's eye the road's corridor and the
24 roads going through the major logging areas.

25

26 We next looked at -- we wanted to see what the pattern
27 was for rural hunters, and you have to remember that last
28 picture in your mind, rural hunters in this categorization
29 include all the -- primarily the hunters on Prince of Wales
30 Island. This is a fairly similar pattern. A little bit less
31 intensity of use in these areas and a little bit more intensity
32 of use down in this area, so this is looking at only the rural
33 harvest. And finally in this series, this shows where urban
34 hunters hunt and according to this data source there's
35 relatively low levels of hunting activity by urban residents in
36 this lower part of the island and there's a real concentration,
37 obviously in the red areas.

38

39 So we have a situation which Doug alluded to well where
40 hunting is a concentrated activity. Overall, we found that --
41 let me see here, 34 percent of all the deer on the island are
42 taken from just three of these 31 wildlife analysis areas. If
43 you include the top 13, you'd account for 80 percent of the
44 deer that are taken. It is similarly for the rural harvest, 46
45 percent of the deer come from the top three wildlife analysis
46 areas. Those would be the ones in red on the deer area. And
47 78 percent of the deer taken by rural residents come from just
48 10 wildlife analysis areas. So could have a situation where
49 deer hunting is pretty concentrated on the island.

00120

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bob.

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GARZA: In looking at those three different
6 graphs, do you think that you are able to represent the
7 fishermen that Jeff had alluded to earlier, who may be coming
8 through on boats and fishing somewhere along the west coast or
9 east coast of Prince of Wales? Is that data in there at all or
10 not?

11

12 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Dolly, those data would
13 be in there to the extent that those fishermen were sampled.
14 And so we really -- we wouldn't have any way of saying.
15 Assuming they're Alaska residents, just like the rest of us who
16 are hunters, they'd get mailout surveys. If they put them in
17 they'd be in there. We basically have no other way of saying
18 what's going on and probably, you know, we have heard reports
19 from local hunters that they believe there's a significant
20 harvest there. But we have no other way of tracking it, it
21 would be in here.

22

23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you.

24

25 MR. SCHROEDER: Any other questions on the deer
26 information at this moment? Oh, let's see, there's one other
27 -- since we're talking about areas, let me pull something else
28 up here. We also looked -- Doug was talking about the likely
29 effects of timber harvest on the island -- let me get myself in
30 order here. We did look at what habitat has been lost so far
31 due to logging on Federal land.

32

33 This overhead gives you a picture of all of Southeast
34 Alaska. These data are based on Tongass Land Management Plan
35 information. If somebody's in the dark green that means that
36 we've lost zero to five percent of the deer habitat in the 1954
37 to '95 time period. If you're getting into light green, that's
38 five to 10 percent. And as we move up in the colored scale,
39 we've lost successfully more deer habitat due to logging on
40 Federal lands. That's -- this is the same information looking
41 only at Prince of Wales. And I'll point out that this overhead
42 doesn't include any logging that may have taken place on
43 private or Native corporation lands.

44

45 Something kind of interesting here is that, now, I know
46 all of you have memorized these other graphics which also
47 showed that a lot of deer have been coming out of this same
48 area, which is also the area that has lost a lot of habitat for
49 deer, and it's also the area that has a really finely meshed

50 road network. So we have quite a few things going on here in

00121

1 this very heavily roaded and logged area. We have first the
2 loss of habitat, we have a lot of concentration of hunting
3 pressure.

4
5 Just to continue, I do have a graph that moves that out
6 of the future, if I can put my fingers on it here.

7
8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Gabriel, you had a question while he's
9 looking?

10
11 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, just while he was looking I was just
12 going to ask the pellet counter how that overlaps with the
13 information he's putting up there now and the hunter success or
14 kill areas and wondering if they correlate somehow in terms of
15 deer density or not?

16
17 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So could we have the pellet man back
18 up there?

19
20 MR. GEORGE: Yes, I was just wondering.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And then after that.....

23
24 MR. GEORGE: Just generally speaking.

25
26 MR. LARSON: You know, I've been called the bear man
27 and recently the wolf man, this is the first time to be called
28 the pellet man, so that's a new distinction.

29
30 MS. McCONNELL: Thank you for small blessings.

31
32 MR. LARSON: To answer your question, Gabe, I guess
33 it's fair to say that the harvest rates, success rates across
34 Unit 2 as a whole have remained relatively constant in the 60
35 to 70 percent range. I haven't looked specifically as Bob has
36 at the specific laws, so I can't answer that directly other
37 than to say, again, the primary focus for hunters has been
38 those easily accessed areas, which coincide with the road
39 system. So to that extent, there is overlap.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Jeff, you had a question.

42
43 MR. NICKERSON: I was just wondering, if I understood
44 correctly, could you go over the graph for me again?

45
46 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Jeff, I've been going really fast,
47 so.....

48
49 MR. NICKERSON: From the green, you know?

00122

1 MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. What we have here is deer
2 habitat decline due to logging on Tongass National Forest land.
3 Now, this follows -- these aren't real deer, these are model
4 deer, so the habitat capability model looks at what the
5 vegetation is and other factors and says that over time this
6 unit of habitat can support this many deer. What this is
7 measuring and depicting is the decline that the Tongass Land
8 Management Plan believes occurred during this time period due
9 to industrial logging on Prince of Wales.

10
11 So just going through it again, if something's dark
12 green, that suggests that we loss zero to five percent of the
13 habitat capability, which is basically zero to five percent of
14 the deer on the dark green land. Again, the Native corporation
15 land isn't considered here. The lighter green says that you
16 lost five to 10 percent. The still lighter green means that
17 you lost 10 to 20 percent. So in these clear-cuts that we
18 drive through when we go across from Hollis, a good deal of
19 that these data would show that overall in these wildlife
20 analysis areas, you've got 10 to 20 percent lower habitat
21 carrying capability than you did in 1954.

22
23 When you get to a red area, the only red area that
24 shows up at this time is this area right here. That says that
25 40 to 50 percent of the deer capability is gone.

26
27 CHAIRMAN GARZA: What community is that by?

28
29 MR. SCHROEDER: Excuse me?

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: What community is that by?

32
33 MR. SCHROEDER: Where are we Mike?

34
35 MR. TUREK: This is.....

36
37 MR. SCHROEDER: Where's Thorne Bay -- we're further
38 north.

39
40 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Wait, is that Whale Pass?

41
42 MR. NICKERSON: That'd be Whale Pass.

43
44 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

45
46 MR. SCHROEDER: We're up by Whale Pass, I believe.

47
48 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

49

MR. SCHROEDER: Right. And I'm sure that those of you

00123

1 who are on Prince of Wales, maybe you can help us out with
2 local information on what's going on.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GARZA: I was going to ask either Tom or Jeff
5 if you could go up there and just show where the logging --
6 where Shaan-seet Klawock Village Corporation logging is so we
7 have an idea that some of those dark green areas are no longer
8 dark green.

9

10 MR. NICKERSON: If you -- I have one comment.....

11 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Go ahead, Jeff.

12

13 MR. NICKERSON:if I might before I go, Madame
14 Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

17

18 MR. NICKERSON: We have this graph that's saying that
19 we lost so much habitat which is a model, I understand, but at
20 the same time we're being told that our deer population is
21 stable. And to me, if we're going by this information, they
22 should be saying the same thing. I'm sorry, I'm getting away
23 from the microphone.

24

25 REPORTER: I've got it just fine, thanks.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So you're saying if we're losing
28 habitat we should be losing deer?

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: Sooner or later.

31

32 MR. SCHROEDER: Jeff, perhaps one of my colleagues
33 would like to take a stab at that one. This is over the '54 to
34 '95 time period.

35

36 MR. NICKERSON: Um-hum.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: And I believe that the statement that
39 Doug was making concerning stability, we're talking about that
40 longtime span but we're talking about a relatively shorter time
41 span.

42

43 Let me do one more on this habitat -- a couple more and
44 then if.....

45

46 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Just a second, there's.....

47

48 MR. SCHROEDER:it may clear up some questions.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA:one more question. Bill.

00124

1 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Madame Chairman. This brings
2 me back to a recollection of an event that recently occurred on
3 the Kenai where the moose have been deemed to be starving and
4 moving into neighborhoods and being more aggressive and looking
5 for food. And the article went on to say that was because of
6 man exploiting their habitat, getting rid of the habitat, and
7 by virtue of that, removing the food they typically eat. Is
8 that a correlation that can be compared down here in Unit 2?
9 Not so much of the development, but the interference in
10 habitat?

11
12 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Bill, I'm a little bit
13 out of my league in explaining the deer habitat capability
14 material. If we have questions on that, could we hold on that
15 for a second and I could show these other things and then we
16 could get a wildlife biologists who's actually worked on.....

17
18 MR. THOMAS: You're the only one I believe.

19
20 MR. SCHROEDER: Well.....

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, we'll see your next overhead.

23
24 MR. SCHROEDER: I've got one more that shows decline,
25 again, from the same planning document. Now, one thing that's
26 changed on here, it's even worse -- the colors have changed.
27 To make this work, I needed to change scales, so this scale is
28 different than the other one otherwise everything turned red.
29 And I couldn't spread things out enough.

30
31 This one, if we project out the planned logging on
32 Prince of Wales to the effects of 209.5, which is the planning
33 horizon for the Tongass Land Management Plan, a lot of the
34 island turns flesh color or red which -- and please note the
35 change in scale. The dark green areas would mean, on this map,
36 that you lost zero to 10 percent, the lighter green which now
37 encompasses this whole area, would mean that you lost 10 to 20
38 percent, the lighter green 20 to 30, the light blue 30 to 40,
39 et cetera. I'm putting this in here -- I don't know if any of
40 us will be around in 2095, but hopefully there will be people
41 who are interested in hunting deer on Prince of Wales, and we
42 do need to make actions at this time that effect their
43 abilities.

44
45 The last deer graph that I'll show which may answer
46 some of the question, this one is a little bit -- if you
47 thought the others were complicated, this one's more
48 complicated. What I looked at here was to take the harvest
49 that has been occurring according to the data sources we have,

50 and to compare that to this habitat capability. So this

00125

1 provides some sort of measure for how many deer you're taking
2 out of an area relative to its ability to produce deer. and
3 this may be why the population -- well, let me just explain
4 this. So what this would mean is that in the dark green areas,
5 people are taking out zero to five percent of the total deer --
6 the model deer per year. If it's this lighter green, it means
7 that we're taking out five to 10 percent of the modeled deer
8 per year. If it's blue, we're up to 10 to 15 percent. Now,
9 Mr. Larson suggested that we really weren't at habitat carrying
10 capability at this moment on Prince of Wales. I'm providing
11 this -- this shows -- it provides an indication of the
12 magnitude of deer that you're taking out relative to how many
13 deer could be there.

14
15 Those are some graphics related to the deer data. If
16 there are questions, maybe we can get Doug to answer more
17 specific biological things or I'll leave it.

18
19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Let's just check with questions
20 for you first. John.

21
22 MR. VALE: Yeah. I'm wondering, looking at that, you
23 know, we saw that there's much higher harvest in the top end of
24 the island and lower harvest in the lower end and I'm trying to
25 look at this one and -- to this it seems like there's less
26 harvest proportionately coming out of the top than the lower
27 end, am I looking at this correctly? I'm trying to.....

28
29 MR. SCHROEDER: Well, the lighter green areas we'd have
30 higher harvest relative to that harvest capability. So what
31 this looks like right now, I guess if we could sum up, we could
32 say relative to the habitat capability POW isn't in real bad
33 shape right now. We're not bumping up -- harvests aren't
34 bumping up against the habitat capability. Now, Doug's the
35 person to talk to about whether deer within that habitat
36 capability are lower or higher.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So that sort of aquamarine, is that
39 the 20 to 30 percent, is that the Craig/Klawock area?

40
41 MR. SCHROEDER: This is an area that -- yes.

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

44
45 MR. SCHROEDER: And we have a fair number of roads
46 through there.

47
48 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Right.

49

MR. SCHROEDER: And so that would be 20 to 30 percent.

00126

1 Are there any further questions on this deer data? If not,
2 I'll move along.

3

4 MR. THOMAS: I guess I do have a question.

5

6 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: I'm -- maybe should try to answer
7 on the habitat capability model if you wanted clarification.

8

9 MR. CLARK: If you want to speak you have to go to the
10 mic.

11

12 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Oh, no.

13

14 MR. THOMAS: I have a question.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Bill.

17

18 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Madame Chairman. Last fall, I
19 submitted a letter to the Fish and Game wanting to get as
20 accurate of data, the most recent data I can gather,
21 specifically for dealing with these proposals. And I asked
22 them to have it available to me by the middle of January, and
23 this request went out before our Yakutat meeting. At our
24 meeting in Yakutat -- I can't remember the gentleman's name,
25 but it was in Yakutat, yeah, anyway, he says, we got your
26 request and we got every department working on getting that
27 information for you in the time frame requested, and somehow
28 I'm not recognizing any of your information in the information
29 that was provided to me through that correspondence. Was that
30 request not made available to your office? It was written
31 specifically to Doug Larson and then from there he forwarded to
32 the Juneau office?

33

34 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Bill, I was gone over
35 Christmas. I did speak with Doug about your request for
36 information and I think to my knowledge, we're not presenting
37 anything in conflict with what Doug provided you. I think we
38 just had a little bit more time to do some work in preparation
39 for this meeting.

40

41 MR. THOMAS: I see.

42

43 MR. SCHROEDER: And so I think we may have been able to
44 do some graphics and some other things that we weren't able to
45 do at that time. I just finished up quite a few of these maps
46 just last week, so we didn't have that -- we weren't able to
47 provide that to you earlier.

48

49 MR. THOMAS: Okay, thank you.

00127

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Jeff.

2

3 MR. NICKERSON: There are a number of Native
4 corporations on the land on Prince of Wales, what is the total
5 acreage that they -- we don't have control over, do you know?

6 MR. SCHROEDER: I defer, Jeff, to Forest Service Staff
7 if they -- I guess -- I don't have that information with me.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Dave.

10

11 MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chairman, Council, I don't know
12 the exact -- Dave Johnson is my name. I don't know the exact
13 numbers, but I've seen numbers batted around in the Forest Plan
14 and in other information, there's somewhere between seven and
15 nine corporations, village and regional corporations, and I
16 don't understand the exact process, but corporations to the
17 north have been able to select lands on Prince of Wales and the
18 adjacent islands. There's approximately between 180 and
19 220,000 acres is my recollection. Now, I can get those exact
20 numbers for you, but I believe that's the approximate acreage.

21

22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So do you know what the approximate
23 acreage of Prince of Wales is?

24

25 MR. JOHNSON: The approximate acreage of the entire
26 area of Unit 2, which includes several outside islands, I think
27 there's approximately five major islands and no less than
28 probably another eight to a dozen islands, the Thorne Bay
29 district -- Thorne Bay Ranger District and the Craig Ranger
30 District encompass approximately two million acres, and that
31 includes Native corporation lands as well. That total area is
32 about slightly under two million acres.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Dave. Okay, so then we
35 will have a bit of explanation on the modeling for habitat for
36 deer.

37

38 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Yes, thank you. I'm Cole
39 Crocker-Bedford. I'm the wildlife program leader for the
40 Forest Service, Ketchikan area.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Could you say your name again, please.

43

44 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Cole Crocker-Bedford. It's a
45 hyphenated last name.

46

47 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

48

49 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Could I have that one back up

50 there that showed through 1995? Is it the actual -- right --

00128

1 will you tell me which document this is out of; is this out of
2 Central Prince of Wales EIS, it looks like, I'm guessing?

3

4 MR. SCHROEDER: No, this was provided by Tongass Land
5 Management Plan, these numbers.

6

7 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Okay. The question I really
8 wanted to address was one of Mr. Nickerson's, why does the
9 habitat capability show on the big downward trend, why is that
10 not showing up in, say, deer pellets and things like that. And
11 there's two answers. One, is that the habitat capability
12 model, and I can't tell which this is, but this looks like the
13 model based upon the logging through 1995 of the effect that
14 would happen after the second growth really became older second
15 growth, like 30 years old. And a lot of the models are
16 actually run -- often times that's the key element being looked
17 at, is what is going to be the eventual effect of the
18 harvesting.

19

20 The second portion is sometimes all the models are run
21 in looking at an immediate effect -- the immediate effect has
22 to do with the conversion to clear-cuts, and is the clear-cut a
23 good habitat. Well, there is about a four year study, radio
24 telemetry study was funded on western Prince of Wales in the
25 area of Naukati vicinity, and that study showed very
26 conclusively that as long as the clear-cuts were not covered by
27 snow or as long as the snow was only like less than 10 inches
28 deep, that it really had no effect at all on the deer herd.
29 The deer did really -- in fact they were preferring the use of
30 clear-cuts just as much of the old growth forest. But a heavy
31 snowfall, if and when that -- or when that heavy snowfall
32 finally hits, then those clear-cuts will not be available. The
33 Forest Service habitat capability model is based upon assuming
34 that -- it's a longer term look at it. So it's looking at when
35 the heavy snow happens, there will be a massive deer
36 starvation. But until the heavy snow happens, the deer are
37 just fine. Or the second thing is when the forest actually
38 closes in, then of course they'll also lose their forage when
39 it's like the clear-cuts are 25 or 30 years old.

40

41 That's all I wanted to get in, to basically answer the
42 question -- if nothing else, I will adjourn.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mim.

45

46 MS. McCONNELL: I'm not sure who would answer this
47 question, it relates to one I asked earlier that didn't really
48 completely get answered, and I am curious about the age of the
49 clear-cuts on Prince of Wales. I don't -- you know, the

50 industrial clear-cutting, you know, it shows on the map there

00129

1 back to 1954, how many -- what kind of varieties or information
2 available about where these cuts occurred and when and it'd be
3 nice to see a color-coded map of that kind of information. You
4 know, is there some overlaps of where the deer are being taken.
5 Anyway, do you understand what I'm asking?

6
7 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Yeah. The information is
8 available. I haven't seen any of those maps here. I don't
9 have any of the maps with me. And basically it started in the
10 early '50s, well, actually logging on Prince of Wales goes back
11 to the beginning of the century, but it started intensively in
12 the early '50s. Ran fairly constant -- on the Forest Service
13 lands there has been relatively even harvest up until just the
14 last couple of years. The Forest Service has decreased its
15 harvest other than that. It's been vary stable. The Native
16 corporation lands in the period of around 1981 through 1994, in
17 that, well, something like 13 year period harvested as much as
18 were harvested on Forest Service lands over -- since 1954. So
19 there is a big bump during -- since 1980 in the amount of
20 harvest.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Cole.

23
24 MR. CROCKER-BEDFORD: Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, so Bob did he finish your
27 presentation for you or do you still have more?

28
29 MR. SCHROEDER: No, I still have the microphone.

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

32
33 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd like to switch from deer back to
34 people if we're done with the deer model questions.

35
36 I also provided in your document, some population --
37 human population information. Now, this -- you may think
38 you're not here to regulate human populations and that your
39 spirit of interest is mainly wildlife, however, I think we have
40 to consider what's going on in Prince of Wales with the
41 regulatory system there.

42
43 As you well know, the population of Southeast Alaska
44 has been growing very rapidly as illustrated in this first
45 overhead. And what we've had happen on Prince of Wales, has
46 been even more dramatic than shown in this graph. This is
47 simply looking at the Prince of Wales population using all
48 available data. It's kind of fun going through old census
49 records. I'd just point out that in these first few years, we

50 really didn't have a good census procedure operating in Alaska,

00130

1 so they're a little suspect. But basically from 1868, 1880 on
2 were probably pretty correct.

3 So what you'd see going on here is really something
4 pretty amazing, in that, the population of Prince of Wales is
5 actually declining in the post-war years down to 729 and we now
6 have 5,000 people on Prince of Wales. Well, we've really
7 changed the demand. If we were looking at this as a graph of
8 deer populations, this would be something truly amazing. So
9 what we have going on on Prince of Wales is this obvious, very
10 rapid population increase which accompanies the other rapid
11 social changes on the island.

12
13 Some other factors of that population change include a
14 real switch from Prince of Wales being basically a Native place
15 where the main population centers are Hydaburg, Klawock and
16 Kasaan with some people in Point Baker and Port Protection and
17 at other locations to the situation at present where there are
18 quite a few new communities, communities that didn't exist in
19 1970. And the current Native population being a minority at
20 about 25 percent of the total population of the island. If
21 anyone's interested, I do have details on other population
22 changes that have occurred, but I don't think we need to
23 present them right now.

24
25 The next piece of information I wanted to show you is
26 -- and for those of you whose eyes aren't any better than mine,
27 this is also in your book. But this is a regulatory history
28 for deer going back to 1925 based on what we could find in the
29 records. And Doug Larson at one time helped correct some
30 things in here. I'm just putting this up to indicate that
31 this is GMU 2, so we'd be concerned with the information that's
32 presented next to the GMU 2, starting in 1925 going to 1997,
33 including the Federal hunts and the State hunts. Now, the
34 reason I put this up here is just to indicate that although
35 we've had pretty stable seasons and bag limits for some years
36 now, that these haven't existed since biblical time, that there
37 have been other times when the agencies who have been dealing
38 with deer hunting on Prince of Wales had determined that it was
39 just much better to have more restrictive hunts. For quite a
40 while there were hunts, bucks only with three inch or greater
41 antlers. We've been down to hunts in 1950, only one deer could
42 be taken, et cetera. This -- I'm simply presenting this to
43 show there's some variability. Perhaps Gabe was right, no one
44 likes change, but we've been stuck with change here.

45
46 This other graphic also shows -- provides a graphic of
47 the seasons when deer hunting has been open in GMU 2 from 1925,
48 again to 1997. Since '88 we've had the current season of the
49 beginning of August through the end of December. December was

50 added in '87. In '73 we didn't have an August season, we had a

00131

1 three month season. And going back in time, you can see that
2 in response to the condition of the herd, seasons were quite a
3 bit shorter even though the demand for deer with the lower
4 population wasn't very great.

5
6 That's all I had there.

7
8 Finally, I'd like to present some information from our
9 Craig survey. And now the test will be whether anyone can read
10 my writing other than myself. We've been doing a household
11 survey in.....

12
13 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So 167 bugs taken?

14
15 MR. SCHROEDER: Bugs, yes, bugs. You know, we
16 recognized early on that doing key respondent interviews was an
17 excellent way of getting something of the pulse of a community,
18 of getting expert information and tapping into a good
19 approximation of what community opinion would be. We're
20 following that by including some of the same questions in a
21 household survey which will produce a statistic of what people
22 think about these certain questions.

23
24 Mike, maybe I can turn this over to you and then I can
25 highlight these things, how many you interviewed and so -- you
26 can read my handwriting?

27
28 MR. TUREK: Yeah. So far we've interviewed 113
29 households in Craig. We plan on doing 170. From those 113 we
30 asked how many bucks and does -- how many deer were taken and
31 we asked bucks and does, and out of that we got 167 bucks and
32 five does taken. And that projects out to -- expanded to 937
33 bucks and 28 does for a total of 968 deer from this last year
34 from Craig for our estimation for this process.

35
36 We also asked on our supplemental question for deer
37 hunters, we asked in the Prince of Wales Island areas where you
38 have hunted over the past five years and your opinion, has the
39 deer population been stable, increased, declined or don't know.
40 And five percent said that increased, 25 percent said stable,
41 57 percent said decreased and 13 percent said they didn't know.

42
43 The next question we asked was about the doe season,
44 Federal subsistence regulations currently allow rural residents
45 to take one doe from Federal land each season, what is your
46 opinion of this hunt and the answers were strongly support,
47 support, neutral, oppose, strongly oppose or don't know.
48 Strongly supported was two percent, support was 20 percent --
49 excuse me 26 percent, neutral was 12 percent, opposed was 15

50 percent, and strongly opposed was 46 percent. And then on

00132

1 don't know was three percent.

2

3 Then we also asked, are Ketchikan and other non-Prince
4 of Wales hunters having an impact on your household's deer
5 hunting success and the options we gave for answers were a very
6 negative impact, a slight negative impact, no noticeable
7 impact, a slight positive impact, a very positive impact, and
8 don't know. And of that, we came up with 30 percent.....

9

10 MR. GABRIEL: Before you go on, what was the middle --
11 after -- you know, on the doe hunt, that one, yes?

12

13 MR. TUREK: Neutral.

14

15 MR. GEORGE: Neutral, okay, thanks.

16

17 MR. TUREK: For the Ketchikan hunters, asking how they
18 impacted the hunter's household, very negative was 30 percent,
19 negative 35 percent, no impact 18 percent, slightly positive
20 seven percent -- or is that zero?

21

22 MR. SCHROEDER: Zero.

23

24 MR. TUREK: Zero percent. And very positive five
25 percent and unknown is another five percent. So that's our --
26 sort of preliminary results from our survey at this point.

27

28 MR. VALE: That's from Craig then?

29

30 MR. TUREK: Just from Craig.

31

32 MR. SCHROEDER: And it's only with some trepidation
33 that we present these results at all because they are
34 preliminary and they only come from Craig but we may have real
35 different results from Klawock and Hydaburg. We could have
36 really different results if we're able to continue this work in
37 other communities.

38

39 Ms. Chairman, that concludes the material that I wanted
40 to put before you and we'll answer any questions that you have.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. When will your survey continue
43 for the rest of Craig, and then Hydaburg and Klawock?

44

45 MR. SCHROEDER: Craig and Klawock are underway at this
46 present time. We're planning to start Hydaburg next week. And
47 then those communities will be wound up -- the field surveying
48 will be done in about a month or possibly six weeks, then a
49 delay until we can get our data processing done.

CHAIRMAN GARZA: At the Yakutat meeting, you were

00133

1 concerned about funding, is funding no longer an issue?

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: Is subsistence no longer an issue? No,
4 we've had good cooperation with Forest Service on funding the
5 survey project. That's come out of Tongass Land Management
6 program funds. We're only partially funded to do surveys on
7 Prince of Wales. Last year we were only able to do Point
8 Baker, Port Protection. Right now we're setup to do the three
9 communities I mentioned. We'd like very much to provide data
10 on all the communities on Prince of Wales, but we're not setup
11 to do it and I could leave it at that.

12

13 I would appreciate, again, you know, the Council's
14 support over time in helping us have the ability to get the
15 data that you need to make decisions.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GARZA: One of the requests that has been
18 brought up from this Council when you were looking at these
19 studies, either from the Sitka or the Yakutat meeting, was a
20 question of are the rural the rural residents on Prince of
21 Wales getting amount of deer that they need? Is that a
22 question that was in your survey?

23

24 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. We approached that in a couple of
25 places in our survey. Very specifically, in our supplement we
26 asked, to what extent did the deer harvest in 1997 and '98
27 season meet your community's need for deer. So we're asking
28 that very directly. And then we're also asking -- we're asking
29 quite a few questions about how many deer are required to
30 fulfill your household subsistence needs for a year. So we're
31 adding that in in addition to asking the nuts and bolts, how
32 many did you kill, how many did you give away, how many did you
33 receive. We're also asking a question of how many people
34 believe would fill their households needs. And that was in
35 response to a lot of suggestions from many sources, including
36 the Council.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Mim, and then Bill.

39

40 MS. McCONNELL: I'm going to pass.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Bill.

43

44 MR. THOMAS: How accurate were you expecting when you
45 asked them what quantity would serve their needs over a year's
46 period of time?

47

48 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Chairman, Bill.....

49 MR. THOMAS: What's the reason for that question?

00134

1 MR. SCHROEDER: The reason for that question is to
2 start to get a handle on subsistence needs. That's an area
3 that really hasn't had as much work as other areas, as the
4 actual harvest. What we've done -- in my own personal
5 experience, I did research on Kodiak Island where there were
6 abundant deer and deer were extremely easy to harvest, so in
7 that situation you'd expect someone's need to be the same as
8 their harvest and that.....

9
10 MR. THOMAS: How would a number serve in your survey or
11 your analysis or your management approach?

12
13 MR. SCHROEDER: A need question, Bill?

14
15 MR. THOMAS: Yeah. On what any household would require
16 to satisfy their subsistence needs?

17
18 MR. SCHROEDER: It's another piece of information. And
19 my own view is that the way subsistence operates from doing a
20 lot of interviews with people, most of which were key
21 respondent interviews, that people have a real idea of what
22 they like to put up for a year and what works for their
23 household. This is really clear when you talk about fish.
24 Somebody will say, well, we use 50 red salmon, that's right for
25 us and they budget it out and they know how many cases there
26 are. Well, people tend to do the same with deer. It's a
27 little bit more variable because hunting success enters in.
28 But I believe that subsistence households do have notion of
29 what the right budget is. And once that -- another idea of
30 that is that once the subsistence need is met, then someone
31 lays off the resource because there's no reason to harvest
32 more. In other words, an economist could say the marginal
33 value of the 51st salmon is zero because you've got what you
34 take. So I think that it's a valid thing to do and perhaps it
35 will figure into management scenarios in the future. That's
36 basically up to management bodies to decide whether or not they
37 care to regulate on that.

38
39 MR. THOMAS: Will that approach then be implemented to
40 other user groups on the same resource? Like commercial
41 fishermen, sport fishermen, sport hunters, will they be subject
42 to provide the same information for the same reason? How much
43 their household needs? What is reasonable for them? If not,
44 why not?

45
46 MR. SCHROEDER: I don't know if I'm the person to
47 answer that. Sport fishermen get asked a zillion questions all
48 the time.

49

MR. THOMAS: I realize that. You know, subsistence

00135

1 people get those same amount of questions regardless of what
2 they're harvesting.

3
4 MR. SCHROEDER: Um-hum.

5
6 MR. THOMAS: I'm asking then, are other user groups
7 going to be subject to the same scrutiny. Since subsistence
8 harvest, overall, in the State of Alaska represents less than
9 four percent, that's a lot of scrutiny. Thank you, Madame
10 Chairman.

11
12 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Jeff.

13
14 MR. NICKERSON: Thank you, Madame Chair. I just had a
15 comment on the population graph.

16
17 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, sir.

18
19 MR. NICKERSON: That he showed us on the Prince of
20 Wales.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Of deer or people?

23
24 MR. NICKERSON: Of people. And I wanted to point out
25 that I'm sitting here and I'm listening to some of the
26 information and I've brought up these questions to myself
27 before, and I'm pretty amazed that a deer population could stay
28 stable when the population of people, which I know, you can't
29 go to Prince of Wales Island hardly and not be a hunter. You
30 know, how that has increased so much over the past and our deer
31 population has been stable along with everything else that's
32 happening to deer. You know, I have a hard time accepting
33 that. And one thing I would like to see on this study, Madame
34 Chair, if it's possible, is how this compares, the numbers that
35 they get out of this study, how it compares to the harvest
36 tickets that they send out?

37
38 MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, Jeff, since we haven't
39 been able to do surveys in many communities, we can't do too
40 much on that. We did find just the three places where we've
41 been able to do this updated household survey, Point Baker,
42 Port Protection and now Craig. Point Baker, Port Protection,
43 the harvest ticket data didn't pick up as many deer as our
44 household survey picked up. And with Craig, we gave you the
45 figure of 965 deer for Craig this year, it's our first rough
46 estimate, don't say I really mean it sort of estimate, our
47 long-term mean harvest for Craig is quite a bit less than that.
48 It's about 550 deer over this eight year -- the previous eight
49 years and the high point in there was about 750. So you know,

50 this is something that, I think, all of us would like to have a

00136

1 better handle on on deer harvest. It's a question of how we do
2 it, both on a funding basis and also how intrusive do you want
3 to be on people's lives.

4
5 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. We have two, Mim and then
6 Patti.

7
8 MS. McCONNELL: Yeah, I was just wondering about
9 whether any estimates have been done on population on Prince of
10 Wales since the closing of the long-term contracts? Has there
11 been a drop in population, that chart just shows to '95? Do
12 you have any information on that?

13
14 MR. SCHROEDER: Mim, basically you can't see it right
15 now. The population figures come out from Department of Labor
16 and you know, we'll really see effect when a good census is
17 done at the millennium. I don't think there's been a real drop
18 off just yet, is my impression from looking at those data
19 sources.

20
21 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Before Patti, so Mike, you have
22 to leave at 4:00 or you have to be there at 4:00?

23
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm a little bit late now, so it
25 doesn't matter.

26
27 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So do you want to testify?

28
29 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll wait.

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So you're okay then?

32
33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Nods affirmatively)

34
35 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Well, sorry if we made you miss
36 the ferry. Okay, Patti, Mary, John.

37
38 MS. PHILLIPS: Kind of going down the same line Jeff's
39 going down, the chart in our SERAC book on Page 86, shows that
40 the population is at 54,000 animals and that 10 years ago in
41 1984 we were at 54,000 animals. And on the next page it shows
42 deer harvested has been an average of 2,900 deer annually. But
43 what I'm hearing is that there's under reporting of harvest.
44 If we had an under harvest of deer in 1980, then in 1990 our
45 population has doubled, but we're still having that annual
46 average take according to harvest surveys, then wouldn't you
47 say our under reporting has doubled? And then you go from 1990
48 to 1995, and your population has gone up by another 25 percent,
49 then your under reporting has gone up by another 25 percent.

50 so from 1980, you've really have an under reporting of 75

00137

1 percent increase. So that's the way I'm looking at it, is that
2 75 percent of 2,900 is what -- so about we're under reporting
3 by about 2,000 animals. I don't know, I'm not a mathematician,
4 but that's the way I look at it.

5
6 MS. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, Patty, I think it's
7 really hard to tell. You know, one thing about under reporting
8 is you can't tell what was under reported unless you have
9 another technique to get at information.

10
11 I just make a comment, if I may, in managing fish and
12 wildlife populations there's always a portion of pull between
13 how you always would like better information on things, but you
14 also want to put less burden on the hunter or the fisherman.
15 In other words, you really don't want to force them to do
16 things and you also want to save budget. So the real question
17 is, do you have the tools available to provide the information
18 necessary to make decisions. And that's kind of where it is.
19 And you know, when we start pushing these different data
20 sources, then you mind that well, maybe there is an under
21 reporting in this area or maybe there's some other questions
22 about data source. And believe me it isn't because the
23 wildlife management professionals couldn't figure out how to do
24 it better.

25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, so if we're at a stable right now
27 -- or the scientists say that we're at stable, what is the
28 number of deer where it starts to be a decline? How many deer
29 harvested is it at a decline instead of stable?

30
31 MR. SCHROEDER: Maybe we can get Doug up here to talk
32 about how many deer you could pull out of a population.

33
34 MR. LARSON: These guys are bending the raft here. I
35 guess, Patti, to answer your question really, when we talk
36 about stable, increasing or decreasing, those are relative
37 terms. And they depend on what the population has done up to
38 that particular time that you're looking at it. So when we
39 talk about a stable population, we're talking over the last --
40 well, I think the graph showed nine or 10 years of data, so
41 over that time period we've seen what we believe is a
42 relatively stable population, but it, over time, has gone
43 through increases and decreases, which I think are reflected in
44 the historical harvest seasons, bag limits that you saw on the
45 overhead.

46
47 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, right now we're at 2,900 deer
48 harvested annually. What would the number need to be to show a
49 decline, do you think? 4,000 animals, just estimate?

00138

1 MR. LARSON: That's a real difficult thing to answer,
2 Patti, because there's a lot of other variables that play into
3 that. Weather conditions, for example. In most all responses
4 that you see in the changes and regulations for deer and for
5 many other species as well are really dictated by things
6 outside of human control. Weather conditions come in, well,
7 that means there's less of a biological surplus available for
8 harvesting and so that's going to effect the harvest. When you
9 have very mild winters and you have population increase then
10 you're in a position to recommend liberalizing seasons. So
11 it's really a moving target.

12
13 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, thanks.

14
15 MR. LARSON: Good questions.

16
17 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, Mary.

18
19 MS. RUDOLPH: I was just wondering, reading the report
20 there, you said there's a decline in some areas in the report
21 you and Mike did, the deer. And the growth, how deer is able
22 to survive on the growth and eventually it grows so tight that
23 it's hard for them to feed off of these. And I was wondering,
24 you said, it's stable and you couldn't really tell how the deer
25 was surviving or if they're on decline or they're stable, but
26 then in your report you talked of hunters going from Ketchikan
27 to Wrangell and down to Hoonah. So that kind of tells you that
28 there is starting to be a decline in this area if they're
29 starting to move that far. I know out of Hoonah, they're
30 moving down further to hunt. So what's there now is eventually
31 going to happen the same as Prince of Wales for us in the
32 Hoonah area. So I was wondering why you couldn't answer the
33 question on why you say you couldn't tell whether the use of
34 the deer was stable in one book and the other book says there
35 was some decline? And there is some -- you read the survey,
36 the interviews you guys did, some said it's fine, and then some
37 said, no it's not fine. So how do you balance all that out to
38 make your report so that we can make the right decision on
39 this?

40
41 MR. SCHROEDER: I don't know if that's an answerable
42 question. But maybe getting back to when Fred introduced this
43 topic dealing with GMU 2 deer. He noted that you're going to
44 get a whole lot of information and it would be really great if
45 we all of it pointed in the same direction, and that you could
46 simply see that every -- that the pellet group supported
47 exactly what hunters said which supported exactly the harvest
48 tickets and supported the key respondent interviews. But
49 things go in slightly different directions and I think that's

50 basically the Council's responsibility at this point.

00139

1 MS. RUDOLPH: Well, it makes me wonder about it because
2 you know the price of fuel and everything and I know a lot of
3 the guys that will go together will usually bunch up on one
4 boat and stuff. But to go that far out of their way to hunt
5 gives you a real negative picture for an area that's supposedly
6 supposed to be stable. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Go ahead.

9
10 MR. LARSON: I guess, Mary, I'll try and take a stab at
11 your question, I think that's a very good one and very
12 legitimate one and I hope this will help shed some light on
13 this issue for you.

14
15 First of all, with hunters, for example, leaving
16 Ketchikan to go to Wrangell or other places that you indicated,
17 I guess I'm not personally aware of that. I think what we've
18 seen in our information is that the bulk of the hunting that
19 Ketchikan hunters do, if it's not immediately in proximity to
20 Ketchikan, that is, Gravina Island, the Cleveland Peninsula,
21 for examples, or Gravina, then they go to Prince of Wales Island
22 and I think that's been the case for many, many years.

23
24 The question about variability in data, I personally
25 don't see that. As a matter-of-fact, when I look at the
26 harvest and I listen to hunters and as I said earlier, I have
27 hunters that tell me, boy, we're just not seeing the deer,
28 other hunters say, gosh, where I went, man, I haven't seen as
29 many deer there as I did this year, and other people said, oh,
30 it's about average for me. And so because of that variability
31 I look at my pellet group data, which does show variability,
32 this area is up somewhat, this area's down somewhat, this
33 area's about the same, that to me says, all these pieces of
34 information actually do fall together fairly nicely.

35
36 So what that means in terms of a decision in this
37 instance, I can't answer that. I think Bob's point's a good
38 one, that's something that you have to take on as a
39 responsibility. But I would not say that the data show very
40 opposing perspectives on this issue.

41
42 MS. RUDOLPH: Are you able to separate like the big
43 fish that got away?

44
45 MR. LARSON: I'm sorry, you'll have to help me with
46 that one, Mary.

47
48 MS. RUDOLPH: Well, some say, well, there was about 50
49 there, or we ran into -- they were all marching around there

50 and some will say, well, that big fish that got away and it

00140

1 wasn't that big, so are you able to -- do you usually go by
2 more than one person saying, well, I was just overwhelmed with
3 this amount of deer that was in this one area?

4
5 MR. LARSON: Well, generally if a person says they see
6 a lot of deer, there better be some proof in the pudding. And
7 if a guy says he saw a lot of deer and he has no deer to show
8 for it, then I have to question his truism. But in most cases,
9 I think that a guy that comes and says he sees a lot of deer is
10 going to back that up by saying, hey, and here's my three deer
11 tags or my four deer tags that I have to show for it.

12
13 MS. RUDOLPH: Yeah, that's what I was asking. Thank
14 you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. I think, unless, you're quick
17 John, I want to take a quick break.

18
19 MR. VALE: Sure, I'll be fast.

20
21 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

22
23 MR. VALE: I was just looking for a response to Jeff's
24 question that he had earlier. He asked, you know, when you see
25 a population trend that increased in the last couple of decades
26 and yet the harvest seemed to remain stable. And I guess when
27 I look at that I see the harvest trend then, for the last 10
28 years, whereas the population trend goes back many decades, and
29 I think that would be the answer to Jeff's question. Would you
30 agree with that or -- is that your question, Jeff?

31
32 MR. NICKERSON: (Nods affirmatively)

33
34 MR. LARSON: There's a couple of things. One is, I
35 find it personally fairly remarkable that we have a system that
36 was a pretty isolated refuge for wildlife for many, many
37 decades, centuries; I mean we're talking centuries old here.
38 In human times, a lot of that island has remained isolated,
39 refuge for wildlife. We've gone in there and roaded a good
40 portion of it, opened up all sorts of accessibility and that
41 has resulted in more harvest and we would anticipate that.
42 What's remarkable to me is that that population has been able
43 to stay, at least, from what we can tell of it, pretty darn
44 healthy. And that may, to a large extent, be a function of the
45 weather conditions we've experienced, which as we all know have
46 been relatively mild for several years now. So otherwise I
47 think we'd be faced with a lot different scenario today. We
48 might not be talking about whether or not to have a doe hunt,
49 but whether or not to have a hunt.

00141

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So what I would like to do is
2 take a 10 minute break and then ask the Council to defer
3 further questions to Staff until after public comment. We've
4 had people sitting here since 9:00 this morning because they
5 were told that we were going to cover these topics in the
6 morning so they need to testify.

7
8 MR. NICKERSON: Just one more, Madame Chair?

9
10 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Jeff, if you're very, very, very
11 quick.

12
13 MR. NICKERSON: This is a question for the people from
14 the Forest Service, I was wondering if anyone had a map of the
15 Prince of Wales that shows the road system?

16
17 MR. THOMAS: You mean Prince of Wales didn't bring a
18 road map?

19
20 (Off record)

21
22 (On record)

23
24 CHAIRMAN GARZA: We'll call the meeting back to order.
25 And I will go out of order and do the written comments after
26 public testimony so the people who have been sitting here
27 waiting to testify have that opportunity. On the list on
28 testifying for Proposals 9, 10, 11 and 12, I have Mike
29 Douville, Loren Stanton, Mike Sallee, Tillie Kushnick, Victor
30 Burgess, Millie Stevens. And Embert, were you intending to
31 testify to these proposals?

32
33 MR. JAMES: (Nods affirmatively)

34
35 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And Embert James. So we'll start with
36 Mike. Please identify yourself for Salena.

37
38 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm Mike Douville, I'm a resident of
39 Prince of Wales Island. I'm a commercial fisherman. I'd like
40 to speak in favor of Proposal 9, I believe it is. Most of the
41 residents, including me, believe that we -- we don't believe in
42 taking does. We think that it will be a threat to our hunting
43 down the road. Not only that, our habitat is being destroyed
44 through logging so we have smaller areas to hunt in so we need
45 a healthier population. And it's not just the habitat that was
46 a factor, also there was a lot of wolf, which we were able to
47 take a few of those the last few years and we think -- at
48 least, I think that they're stable now, and those wolf
49 populated areas will start to come back for deer. But I don't

50 feel that they will if we continue to harvest the does.

00142

1 Could I respond to a question that she asked?

2

3 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Yes.

4

5 MR. DOUVILLE: You were wondering how come that survey
6 indicated like a real small percent thought it was -- the
7 hunting was getting better. Some of those areas are freshly
8 opened up logging roads into like Chaunsee (ph) area and it
9 could have been people working for them that have access. They
10 get a lot of deer off the roads, and they might think that it's
11 pretty good, and that would be a reason.

12

13 The other thing I'd like to mention is we were doing
14 really fine without this doe hunt. Everybody was happy. And
15 you didn't see the concern that you see now. I'm amazed at how
16 much there is about the doe hunt. I'm not saying that we're
17 running out of deer, but the population is growing and what we
18 want is more deer. And one of the ways to accomplish that is
19 to not harvest does.

20

21 Let me think for a minute. I mentioned that we didn't
22 ask for this hunt and the majority, by far, are opposed to it.
23 We have representatives on this Council and to my knowledge,
24 not one of them came and asked me if I wanted a doe hunt. All
25 of a sudden we're bussed by it and we've been opposing it now
26 for a couple years through various methods. And I know there's
27 complications in how the law is wrote and so on as to how to
28 get rid of it again. But in my mind we're a democratic
29 society. If the majority of us don't want something, we should
30 be able to change it and that's basically the way I feel.

31

32 Prince of Wales could easily be over harvested.
33 There's literally hundreds and hundreds of miles. It's a
34 drive-by hunters paradise. That's what you're saying. Deer
35 are being harvested in places where they were ever hunted
36 before. I think that closure of some of those roads would help
37 some. So you have a principal amount and you feed off the
38 interest.

39

40 And the other thing is there's virtually no
41 accountability. In theory if I had all my tags when the season
42 opened, if no one was checking me, I could take four does, and
43 no one would be the wiser. My suggestion is we have more
44 accountability, whether it's does or bucks. So I would propose
45 a tag attached. So when you take a deer you have to fasten the
46 tag, right now you're on your honor to validate a tag and keep
47 it in your pocket or whatever. I know a lot of people that
48 will admit to driving down the road with a tag here and if they
49 see the authorities, well, they'll validate it otherwise they

50 won't, so that's why you see a much higher numbers coming out

00143

1 in these surveys with no names on it. You know, I think -- I
2 don't know, I hate to dispute a professional's numbers on deer,
3 but I don't think there's as many deer as some of those numbers
4 indicate. And I think several other people feel the same way
5 as I do because they're also opposed to the doe hunt. It's
6 certainly feels that that is the intent. So if you have the
7 ability, I would like to see some accountability, at least on
8 Game Unit 2. There's a lot of people, there's a lot of road,
9 there's only maybe two people in enforcement. And you're sort
10 of on your honor and it doesn't work that well.

11
12 There's one proposal to save the spiked deer and I
13 don't know if anybody understood that. This person was -- had
14 in mind the first opening of the week, when the season opens,
15 we get an influx of hunters from -- off the island and the
16 easiest deer to get are the spikes, they're not smart enough to
17 get out of the clear-cuts, and they take quite a number of
18 those, and I believe that's the reason that person submitted
19 that proposal.

20
21 I don't have much comment on the other ones. I'm not
22 in favor of closing the August season or -- I would be in favor
23 of closing it at the end of November. Most of the people
24 living there have got their deer then and we protect the rest
25 for the next season from say Christmas vacation hunters from
26 over here or, you know, wherever. They're simply too easy to
27 get then.

28
29 But I'm sure I missed out on a lot of things, but that
30 about covers what I have to say. Also trapped wolves, I have
31 different methods of counting deer than the biologists do. And
32 I know if there's any around or not. I catch between 20/25
33 wolves a year, so I know how many there are around and what
34 they're doing. In any case, I would appreciate your serious
35 consideration of the proposal.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Thank you, Mike. We certainly
40 appreciate you coming over from Craig to testify. Public
41 testimony is very important to this process. I'd like to ask
42 the Council if they have any questions to you? Okay, thanks
43 Mike. Loren Stanton.

44
45 MR. STANTON: I'm Loren Stanton. I was born here in
46 Ketchikan and my family has been here since the beginning of
47 the pulp mill in the early '50s. Since the early part of my
48 youth I have hunted for deer in southern Southeast Alaska. I
49 have hunted for deer all over southern Southeast Alaska. In

50 the last 15 years my family has gone to Prince of Wales Island

00144

1 to hunt for deer. I think that what we've discovered over the
2 years is, yes, of course it's easier to get the deer near the
3 roads, but there are a lot of deer on the Prince of Wales
4 Island. There were more deer in the mid-80s. We could go and
5 in two days we could count deer -- we're deer counters, we go
6 on August 1st of every season, my family, that is my extended
7 family and we're deer counters and we could all the deer that
8 we see, big, small, does, bucks, we count them all and then we
9 choose the ones that we shoot. And deer counts from '84, '85,
10 on up to today, we've always been able to count within the
11 first two days of the season we've always been able to count
12 over 100 deer, wherever we go, we've been able to count 100
13 deer.

14
15 I find that the testimony and the thoughts of people
16 from Point Baker to Craig to wherever, people who live there, I
17 find their comments regarding the impact of Ketchikan hunters
18 on the deer and the comments regarding the reduction in the
19 number of deer can be explained in a couple of ways. One the
20 stupid deer are dying at a much, much greater rate than the
21 smart deer. We see the smart deer. We know where the smart
22 deer are. We know where the big bucks are. They're not down
23 on the road, they're not in the clear-cuts, they're hiding.
24 They know when it's hunting season. They become very difficult
25 to find and you have to get off the road to go get them. You
26 can drive to the end of the road, to the top of the clear-cut,
27 you can see where they've been, they might cross the clear-cut
28 occasionally, you can see where the big bucks have gone, but
29 you can't kill them in the clear-cuts, occasionally you can but
30 they're much harder to get. So you're killing the stupid deer,
31 you're killing the small deer and I'd agree with the
32 biologists, that the spikes -- I mean if they say that spikes
33 don't ever grow up to be big deer, then I accept that. And the
34 good thing about spikes is that we have children. And my
35 children and my nieces and my nephews can go and kill an easy
36 deer. They can kill a small deer when they're young, when
37 they're eight and nine, like I was when I started. When I
38 started hunting deer when I was eight and nine, there weren't
39 roads on Prince of Wales Island like there are and I had to
40 hike a long ways and that was tough. But now, children can be
41 introduced to hunting in a way that makes it easier for them
42 and I appreciate the ability to do that. I have a niece who
43 desperately wants to kill a deer and she's 12 years old, but
44 the only way she's going to be able to do that is to go to
45 Prince of Wales Island and find an easy deer on the road system
46 and allow her to take a good shot and to get that deer. So
47 these are the personal aspects of it.

48
49 I'm a believer in science. I believe that we're going

50 to have to show a bad winter and we're going to have to show

00145

1 that there was a reduction in deer before we make a drastic
2 change in the situation. None of these proposals, as I see
3 them, are drastic changes. But I'd like to talk about my
4 family tradition in the sense that taking that -- the month of
5 August out would be a disaster for my family, because children
6 are in school from September 1 on. You can't get your child --
7 to go to Prince of Wales Island on a weekend and come back in
8 the middle of September and the middle of October, there's too
9 many things going on and they have too much to do as far as
10 their schooling goes for them to do that. I think that that
11 would have an indirect detrimental effect on children and young
12 people who are interesting in hunting.

13
14 The same goes for fishing. Because quite often our
15 trips to Prince of Wales are a combined trip, camping, hunting,
16 fishing, exploring, rock hunting, whatever it is, we do it over
17 there all at the same time in August. There is no other time
18 of the year to be able to do that. To get it all combined.

19
20 I really don't understand hunters who can't find deer
21 because I always find deer there. Deer over there, you can
22 always find deer. And that's the second part of my explanation
23 about the people's interviews. And I know that Mr. Nickerson
24 has expressed a great deal of concern regarding this
25 contradictory situation. I'm a lawyer, I go to trial, I hear
26 people testify under oath about their lives, about their
27 children, about what they do and what they don't do. Well,
28 let's face it, people have the tendency to exaggerate and
29 that's being kind. And I think when you're self-interested,
30 when you have a self-interest, you're going to lean towards
31 your self-interests. If somebody says, yes -- if 75 percent of
32 the people over there are saying yes Ketchikan hunters have a
33 detrimental impact on my deer what they're saying is, yeah, and
34 if I can say this now maybe I'll be able to get deer easier
35 next year. And it's a question of ease of getting deer. Which
36 to me, gives a bit of testimony toward the laziness of our
37 society today. But I think we're just talking about how easy
38 it is, not about whether or not the deer are there. I think
39 the people exaggerate and I think that people are always
40 looking at the barbarians outside the gate. It's always
41 somebody else's fault that I can't do what I want to do. And I
42 think this committee should take very careful look at that sort
43 of thing because the testimony you receive, by and large, is
44 almost always self-interested. I'm here out of self-interest
45 because of my family and because of me personally. Maybe if I
46 didn't hunt on Prince of Wales Island and I didn't hunt for
47 deer I wouldn't be here. Maybe I'm not a disinterested
48 observer, of course I'm not. And I think you need to realize
49 that everybody who comes here before you is going to be a

50 biased person in regards to this particular proposal.

00146

1 So let's go back and do as the law says you have to do
2 and that is rely on the science. If there's no reduction in
3 the population then you can't make a reduction in the take. I
4 think that Proposal -- I don't know if you even can accept
5 Proposal 9 given the regulations as they are today, as I
6 understand them, because that is a reduction in the take. You
7 gave a doe season now you may not be able to take it back.
8 Even if I was in favor of getting rid of the doe season because
9 quite obviously mathematically 300 does are going to produce
10 thousands of deer in a five to 10 year period, you may not be
11 able to take that back and you may not be able to take back the
12 month of December and you may not be able to make any reduction
13 of any kind because first you've got to find that there's been
14 a reduction in the population.

15
16 I would like to say that people over estimate their
17 impact on deer, and this is my final point. Pennsylvania has
18 the largest deer population per square mile in America.
19 Pennsylvania is also one of the most roaded areas in America.
20 I lived in Philadelphia, 50 deer a year were killed a year
21 within the city limits of Philadelphia on the road by cars
22 every year. I mean what we're talking about -- how much
23 logging or how much the increase in population of people
24 impacts deer and why is the population still stable, well, why
25 don't we just admit it, people don't have as much impact as
26 we'd like to think we do. Weather has a great -- a much larger
27 impact on the deer population than people do. Weather and
28 wolves have a greater -- much greater effect than we do and
29 let's just admit it. We're not so omnipotent as we think we
30 are. And I thank you for allowing me to testify on this and I
31 wish you the best luck in making decisions on all the
32 proposals.

33 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. One question,
34 so you are not speaking in favor of any of the proposals?

35
36 MR. STANTON: I would like to remain neutral because I
37 don't perceive that -- I don't perceive that -- you have to
38 reach that first step to reduce and I don't think you've gotten
39 to that point. And if I had to do something, I would take out
40 the doe season. But we have to understand that as a lawyer, I
41 know people are going to take does if they want or need does,
42 they're going to do it anyway. But if we don't have the doe
43 season it does look a lot better. And five percent -- I
44 believe that one of the statistics was that five percent of the
45 deer taken in the month of December, that would still be a
46 reduction if you took out the month of December. I don't know
47 if you can do that, but those would be my first two proposals.
48 That you take out the month of December and that you would take
49 the doe season out.

00147

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. John.

2

3 MR. VALE: How do you feel about taking does?

4

5 MR. STANTON: I have never in my life taken a doe and I
6 never will, and I don't believe any of my family ever will
7 either.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Bill. And then Gabriel.

10

11 MR. THOMAS: I rest my case, Madame Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Gabriel.

14

15 MR. GABRIEL: Loren, you understand though or you've
16 read ANILCA and you understand the subsistence priority law and
17 how things fall into place.

18

19 MR. STANTON: I do.

20

21 MR. GABRIEL: It' not that we can't take out the doe
22 season, you know, if there is a problem with the deer
23 population maintaining a healthy population, the first people
24 that we cut out are the sports hunters so that if we have to
25 reduce the season or bag limits on those people before we take
26 out the does or we may take out the does along with a reduction
27 in a sports harvest and season or bag limits, so that there is
28 a methods and means of doing that in order to protect the
29 stock. But you're right in terms of, you know, the position
30 that we're in in terms of reducing the take, that we have to
31 consider other things first before we eliminate the doe season
32 right now whether people like it or not. 95 percent of the
33 people may not like the doe season but if it's a subsistence
34 resource that someone takes, whether it's only five percent or
35 three percent or whatever as the data indicated, we have to
36 provide for their use of that resource as a subsistence
37 species. So whether 95 percent don't wish to and we hope they
38 don't wish to, if they want to maintain healthy populations, I
39 think that's great, and I think you think that's great also,
40 but recognize that there are a few people that rely on it and
41 that's where we're at.

42

43 MR. STANTON: That's why I hesitate to make a
44 recommendation, because I understand that historically the
45 Native populations did take does. And that's not my place to
46 say that if, indeed, that was true then you -- then you do have
47 a right and an obligation to ensure that that subsistence use
48 remains. Thank you for clarifying that.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. I think that

00148

1 policy debate will come out under Council deliberations as to
2 what we can recommend as a Council based on the policies
3 established in ANILCA. But next for public testimony is
4 Mr. Sallee.

5
6 MR. SALLEE: My name is Mike Sallee, I live on Gravina
7 Island. And from my perspective I am pretty much a rural
8 resident all my life even though I've had a rapidly expanding
9 communities seemingly grow around me. And I'm also faced with
10 this situation now where apparently this small four percent, as
11 Mr. Thomas mentioned of the resource is going to subsistence
12 users and in some cases I find it's the particular four percent
13 that I have been targeting that seems to be getting taken away
14 from me. I've hunted deer, not as early as the previous
15 speaker mentioned, I probably started when I was 13 or 14. My
16 mother taught me to hunt. I was raised in a single parent
17 household and pretty much supplied a lot of the deer for our
18 family through my teens and then even after that as I started
19 working on a fish packing boat and went to college in
20 Fairbanks, even there, why I was getting sheep and moose and
21 stuff, and sending it back home because my mother was still
22 pretty much living off of deer and wild meat.

23
24 I do have a difficulty with subsistence. I consider
25 myself a meat hunter, but when it comes to subsistence I have a
26 difficulty with that one because I use an outboard boat, I use
27 a high powered scope rifle, I use binoculars, I use all of the
28 newfangled modern technology to go out and take game even
29 though I don't take as much as I used to, I'm using those
30 things. And so I recognize that a person that takes resources
31 is going to have to pay attention to the technology he is using
32 and the tremendous advantage that he has over what he had in
33 the past.

34
35 Be that as it may, I've already written responses to
36 the proposals, the subsistence proposals so you have those or I
37 would assume you have those. And I don't have any specific
38 response to the proposals under consideration right now because
39 I don't do a lot of hunting on Prince of Wales Island. One of
40 the things that has come to my mind though is a recent thing I
41 heard on a news where somebody in Hydaburg was saying that they
42 couldn't live a healthy lifestyle because they couldn't take
43 the foods that they used to be able to take and I would never
44 advocate taking away food from somebody that has used that food
45 all their lives. I think that they should be able to eat those
46 things. On the other hand, I worked on a fish packing boat
47 that also packed produce that serviced a lot of the rural
48 communities in Southeast Alaska back in the early '60s to late
49 '60s. That boat was called the Christian. It used to go into

50 all the communities on the west coast, it used to stop in

00149

1 Ketchikan and Metlakatla first, alternating between trips. It
2 would stop in Metlakatla the first trip and the next trip it
3 would stop in Ketchikan and then it would go whichever one it
4 hit first, why it would hit the other community later, and then
5 it would go to the other communities in Southeast, Craig,
6 Klawock, all of the logging camps, Thorne Bay, Red Bay, Coffman
7 Cove, Myerschuck, Port Protection, Point Baker, Port Alexander,
8 we stopped in Kake a few times, and Angoon, we stopped in
9 Wrangell, Petersburg and Sitka a few times, and some of the
10 other communities that I can't think of right now. And I will
11 have to say that the Native people in those Native communities
12 came down and they bought potatoes, they bought apples,
13 oranges, bananas, carrots, just about everything that we sold
14 on that produce boat. And so I do not find that Natives had a
15 tremendous different diet than any of the rest of us or any of
16 the other rural communities, they also bought those things,
17 whether they were Native or White or whatever the community
18 was.

19
20 I think that's about all I have because you have my
21 written response already and I did not come today prepared to
22 give a lengthy response to these proposals.

23
24 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Sallee. We do have
25 your written comments down here in the packet and Fred Clark
26 will read them into the transcript at the end of the public
27 comment. We didn't do it at the beginning because we have
28 people who would like to testify and we wanted to offer that
29 opportunity so it will be read into the minutes. Okay,
30 questions, Bill.

31
32 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Madame Chairman. Mike, you
33 described subsistence, are you of the mind that if you're going
34 to be a subsistence user, you should use the most primitive
35 means available?

36
37 MR. SALLEE: That, to me, is what subsistence means.
38 It means that you're using primitive means. And when you move
39 into using modern technology, yes, you're using the resource
40 but you are not a subsistence user any longer. You are
41 something else. And I think subsistence is kind of a misnomer.
42 I just have a real difficulty.

43
44 MR. THOMAS: Do you have a reference that a person
45 could look up that would reflect that? What I'm saying is
46 there somewhere in some document that you've read where it
47 would depict subsistence as people using primitive means to
48 harvest? Typically nowadays, subsistence, is interpreted by a
49 means of providing for yourself. That's the only question, I

50 don't want to put you on the spot.

00150

1 MR. SALLEE: In that respect, yes, I would say that
2 subsistence is a means for -- is people using whatever means
3 they have in providing for themselves. The difficulty that I
4 have is that it seems like we're getting this confusion between
5 what people did years ago and saying well, that's subsistence
6 because this is the way we've done it in the past. Our tools
7 we have available no longer allow us to do things as we did in
8 the past. We cannot go out there and take as many as we want
9 just because we have the tools to do them, and we do have those
10 tools and we can take far more than we need. And I guess I'm
11 just saying that, you know, in the past, people starved because
12 they didn't have a lot of the tools that they have now and
13 starving was one of the, you know, one of the ways that balance
14 was kept and now we don't have that balance anymore, we don't
15 have that check. And so now we have to pay a great deal more
16 attention to what we're doing when we're harvesting resources.
17 We have to recognize that we can make a tremendous impact. One
18 of the things that I've thought here and a previous speaker
19 mentioned all the deer in Pennsylvania, well, I guess one of
20 the thoughts that come to mind is that, yes, deer do seem to
21 prosper fairly well around people. On the other hand, this
22 isn't Pennsylvania, number one, and number two, we have other
23 -- other parts in the total ecosystem picture besides just
24 deer. And the first one that comes to my mind is wolves. Are
25 we going to take as many deer as we want and have them all go
26 to the major predator which is now man? And just wipe out the
27 wolves, and say well, we don't need them because they're just
28 competing with us anyway. So I have a real difficulty in just
29 managing solely for deer. I think that there is -- I think I
30 would rather see it managed in the big picture with everything
31 included, not only the deer, wolves, but the plants that the
32 deer eat and the whole picture.

33
34 One other concept that I tend to support is that the
35 wildlife and the resources have been going and getting along
36 just fine for a millennia before people ever showed up around
37 here in any great numbers.

38
39 MR. THOMAS: I was here.

40
41 MR. SALLEE: Okay. Well.....

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, we need to stick to the
44 Proposals 9 through 12 and not get too far from philosophy
45 here.

46
47 MR. SALLEE: In that case I've probably said enough.

48
49 MR. THOMAS: Okay, thank you, Mike.

00151

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And we do have four other people and I
2 would like to give them the opportunity to testify today if
3 they so choose. So we do need to move along. Thank you,
4 Mr. Sallee.

5
6 MR. THOMAS: You keep saying that but we never go
7 anywhere.

8
9 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, Matilda.

10
11 MR. THOMAS: Madame Chair, I'm talking to you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Matilda, are you ready to testify?

14
15 MS. KUSHNICK: Let Embert first.

16
17 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, well, he's -- if it's not you,
18 then the next person is Victor.

19
20 MS. KUSHNICK: Okay.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, Victor.

23
24 MR. BURGESS: Do I have to?

25
26 CHAIRMAN GARZA: You asked to I thought. So I have
27 Victor. Millie Stevens. Embert James. And then Tillie you
28 wanted to follow Embert?

29
30 MS. KUSHNICK: (Nods affirmatively)

31
32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

33
34 MR. BURGESS: Madame Chair, my name is Victor Burgess.
35 I'm going out on a limb, I've been on the Regional Council --
36 State Regional Council since the inception in 1978. And I
37 spoke for the community of Hydaburg and it's never been a
38 protest, I don't see anybody here from Hydaburg except one that
39 might protest in saying I'm representing the community of
40 Hydaburg, for the record.

41
42 And I really don't want to dwell too much on -- I had
43 some issues that seemed to tie into everything, you know. Now,
44 I want to apologize if I say anything that might -- I don't
45 want to embarrass anybody but I have a different understanding
46 of Hydaburg and I realize that this is a very political issue,
47 and most of these gentlemen who are here are honorable people,
48 so I don't want to cast any aspersions on them.

49

MR. THOMAS: Don't worry about their honor, give your

00152

1 testimony.

2

3 MR. BURGESS: Okay. But my idea of Hydaburg, I talked
4 around quite a bit about how's the -- I don't hunt anymore so
5 I've asked people in Craig and people that I know in Hydaburg,
6 how was the hunting this year and most of them or all of them
7 said, basically not too good, not as good as it was last year.
8 Now, to me that's excellent evidence. And I think it's
9 substantial evidence.

10

11 So speaking on deer I'll take the substantial evidence
12 and tell you how it's been misused by the Federal Subsistence
13 Board to overturn you last year because you were within the
14 meaning of the regulations to do what you did. And I'll read
15 directly from the Senate and the -- or the House Resources and
16 Energy Committee report on just what this issue is here about
17 what's substantial evidence. All right, it's under the heading
18 of conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife.
19 Now, the way it words it is it deals with specifically of
20 protection of the resource, nothing else, if I read this
21 correctly. Now, if I could Madame Chair, could I read right
22 from here?

23

24 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Yes.

25

26 MR. BURGESS: Now, I'll make it short, there's much
27 more to it, you see, they have even a formula for when the
28 resource may be in jeopardy that you use. But I'll read right
29 here from the top. That a recommendation of a Regional Council
30 pursuant to Section 805, that's what you did last year, would
31 not be supported by substantial evidence if the recommendation
32 is inconsistent with the conservation of healthy populations of
33 fish and wildlife.

34

35 So what the Federal Subsistence Board, they turned it
36 completely around and used it against you, which is clearly not
37 consistent with the law. So I'm not going to go any further
38 than that, but what I will say is that for the first time in 20
39 years nearly the term subsistence needs came up in the survey.
40 But I've been saying this for years that there cannot be any
41 priority nor can there be a preference legally until there's
42 some identifiable community needs, that means in numbers, fish
43 and wildlife. And from that numbers you can extrapolate to the
44 next year whether the resource is going up or down. This is a
45 perfect scheme designed for perfect management. And that will
46 eliminate all these models and everything that don't really
47 mean anything. It's only the user that really knows whether
48 the particular resource is in jeopardy. And it's a perfect
49 scheme and here you're coming at the end of -- maybe the end of

50 the Regional Council because if this Constitutional Amendment

00153

1 passes, which I hope it doesn't, it's going to be the end of
2 you so now is your -- the only chance you'll ever have to come
3 out and identify just what subsistence is. It's a livelihood.
4 What kind of livelihood? Well, if you read 805 it says, quite
5 clearly, that you have enough regions necessary to take care of
6 the differences in subsistence uses. In other words, you can't
7 compare Southeast with some Interior region because it's a
8 complete difference. Yours is really the block because the
9 Federal government and the State can't get over this, they
10 don't come out with clear direction, they don't want to, it's a
11 political question.

12

13 That's enough for now, thank you, Madame Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

16

17 MR. BURGESS: I don't have anything else to offer.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thank you, Victor.

20

21 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

22

23 CHAIRMAN GARZA: John.

24

25 MR. VALE: Victor, if I understand your point correctly
26 on substantial evidence from what you read there, you're saying
27 that the Federal Board can't overturn a Regional Council
28 recommendation, unless there's not substantial evidence to
29 protect the resource? In other words -- what I mean -- let me
30 rephrase that, what you're saying is that the only reason the
31 Board can overturn a recommendation is if it is to conserve the
32 resource. And your point about what we did last year when we
33 recommended closing Prince of Wales to Ketchikan hunters, that
34 the Board wrongly applied that standard because we were not
35 conserving the resource in that.....

36

37 MR. BURGESS: You were protecting it.

38

39 MR. VALE: We were protecting it.

40

41 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

42

43 MR. VALE: And you're saying that standard of
44 substantial evidence is only to protect the resource -- I'm
45 trying to -- I think I got it but I don't know if I can
46 verbalize it correctly. You're saying the Board was improper
47 though and using that to overturn our recommendation?

48

49 MR. BURGESS: Yes. Because you don't need that. If

50 someone comes up here and says, if even one person comes and

00154

1 nobody contests it and says there's not much deer over there,
2 it's hard to get what we need, then you're within your rights
3 to say, well, let's lower it. Naturally, that's just a -- you
4 know, it's going to be different than that. But until you
5 identify the need you can't really tell whether there's a
6 shortage or not. You see, each community, basically either by
7 area or community, each community there would be so many of
8 population of whatever species, you know, this would be really
9 a standard, this is what you need for personal consumption.
10 And it may be when you identify the uses, it may be that barter
11 -- you need this many for barter, not deer specifically but
12 something else, well, maybe even deer. Maybe you want to
13 barter it for steak downtown or something. And also for the
14 term customary trade. Everything has been restrictive by the
15 State and Federal government. Customary trade is a legal term
16 that there's no way that they can change it. It means the same
17 to anybody, whether it's a subsistence user or not. It
18 wouldn't be in this if it wasn't a legal term, customary trade,
19 it would be something else.

20
21 So what I'm saying is, until you identify you'll never
22 know whether there's resources in jeopardy or not. You
23 identify your needs in each community. If you're not getting
24 them then the resource is in jeopardy. That's why you have to
25 report to the Secretary every year. Every year. In 805, you
26 know, John, I preached it for years to the State and nobody
27 listens. And now coming to the end of the line where this may
28 be your last meeting, I hope it's not too late for you to come
29 out with some kind of statement to the Federal Subsistence
30 Board.

31
32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: John, for your information in the
33 operations manual that was sent out to us under Section I, Page
34 5, it lists those three criteria that the Federal Subsistence
35 Board will use for rejecting a Council recommendation. So if
36 you want to look at it again, it's there.

37
38 MR. VALE: Okay.

39
40 MR. BURGESS: Madame Chair, if I may, I would advise
41 you to get both the House and the Senate Committee's report,
42 otherwise you could stumble through this ANILCA for years and
43 years and never understand it, and I'm not sure I do either. I
44 talk like I do, but I'm not sure I do because it's political.
45 It has nothing to do with anything but politics.

46
47 Thank you, Madame Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Victor.

00155

1 MR. ANDERSON: Madame Chair.

2
3 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Lonnie.

4
5 MR. ANDERSON: I'm going to sign off. What time is
6 check in tomorrow?

7
8 CHAIRMAN GARZA: The meeting starts at 9:00 and for
9 your proposals, we still need to go over Proposal 13.

10
11 MR. ANDERSON: Very good. I will study it tonight and
12 be able to comment on it tomorrow.

13
14 CHAIRMAN GARZA: We'll expect a verbal report.

15
16 MR. ANDERSON: Very good.

17
18 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, thanks Lonnie. Okay, Millie
19 Stevens. And we've added to the public comment, Joe Williams.

20
21 MS. STEVENS: Thank you, Madame Chair. In regards to
22 Proposal 9, the Craig Community Association which is our local
23 IRA is dead set against a doe season. We had quite a lengthy
24 discussion, although in years past when I was a youngster, not
25 too long ago -- all right, Joe, I heard you laugh -- that was
26 baby Joe -- my father and grandfather probably did get does,
27 but they were got only if they couldn't get a buck. I
28 personally, myself, am a hunter but I would never shoot a doe.

29
30 In regards to shortening the season, this was a very
31 controversial topic at our Council meeting. But in the end the
32 feeling was that we would like to see the season open up the
33 1st of September. Number one, most people that go hunting wait
34 until the weather cools down so that they can hang their deer.
35 And I was listening to the gentleman from Ketchikan that said
36 if we cut out the August opening, that his children or nieces
37 and nephews wouldn't be able to hunt. Growing up on POW, the
38 seasons weren't made around children and I'm not saying that
39 I'm not against children hunting because I didn't hunt until I
40 was older, but my father would take my younger brothers out.
41 And I have talked to parents that have young children that
42 would like to see it left it at the August 1st opening because
43 they would like to be able to take their children out to teach
44 them out to hunt before school starts. But yet, on the other
45 side of the token, in years past, if you had a youngster that
46 wanted to go hunting you can go after school, before school or
47 on the weekends.

48
49 For the past several years we've had an abundance of

50 people on the ferry, whether they all come from Ketchikan or

00156

1 from outlying areas, the first part of August you can't even
2 get a reservation on the ferry because there are so many
3 campers coming out to hunt. A lot of the local people in our
4 area won't even go hunting when the season first opens up,
5 August 1st, for fear of their lives because, I mean we're
6 bombarded with hunters opening day. And that was another
7 reason why the Council felt that the hunting should start in
8 September rather than August. Whether or not this will
9 alleviate that problem or not, I don't know.

10
11 I do have a comment to make in regards to I've heard
12 several reports today, in regards to tribes or tribal people.
13 And I just would like a clarification, what do you consider
14 tribal people? Do you feel that it's a Federally recognized
15 tribe or is it the local village corporation? In some of the
16 comments that were made today, to my knowledge, our local IRA
17 did not receive that type of information, so that's why I'm
18 asking. People may be confused with tribal organizations
19 versus village corporations because there is a difference.

20
21 Last year, to my knowledge, has been the first year
22 that there was a trophy type thing out on our island. We do
23 have concerns and I was -- I have to go along with what Herman
24 Kitka was saying about trophy hunting. I mean this sheds a
25 whole new light, you know, if you're going to trophy hunt or if
26 you're going to hunt for the meat. And when they come out with
27 really nice prizes, I think that a lot of people go out just
28 for, you know, to get the largest rack that they can. So far
29 there hasn't been any evidence that the people that were trophy
30 hunting just took the rack. Although on Prince of Wales
31 Island for the last, I would have to say, five years -- to be
32 on the safe side I'm going to say five years, since we've had
33 road hunting out on our island, a lot of the local people have
34 found that people only take the hindquarters. And to me that's
35 really sad, it's a waste. There are families that aren't
36 capable of going out and hunting and I think if people are
37 going to do that, I'm not sure how we can work this, maybe have
38 an ad in the paper, you know, for the trophy hunters if they
39 don't want the meat, that you know there are families on the
40 island that would be able to utilize the meat. But I would
41 like to see some type of regulation whenever there's a trophy
42 hunt in any of the areas.

43
44 And other than that, I don't have anything more. I do
45 thank you for the time.

46
47 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, and Millie, for the record you
48 are the president of the Craig IRA.

49

MS. STEVENS: Yes, I am.

00157

1 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Are there questions of Millie?
2 John.

3
4 MR. VALE: Once again, Millie, did I hear you correct
5 when you said you supported Proposal 9, which would eliminate
6 the doe season?

7
8 MS. STEVENS: Yes.

9
10 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And I guess in comment to the tribe.
11 I think Division of Subsistence inadvertently did not contact
12 you and apologize profusely; is that correct, Bob.

13
14 MR. THOMAS: No, it was intentional.

15
16 MR. TUREK: We attended your Council meeting in late
17 October.

18
19 MS. STEVENS: Right.

20 MR. TUREK: And it felt (indiscernible - away from mic)
21 informed the Council we thought quite extensively.

22
23 MS. STEVENS: Okay, probably Fred.

24
25 CHAIRMAN GARZA: but they know not to -- I mean they
26 don't consider the village corporations the tribal reps.

27
28 MS. STEVENS: Okay.

29
30 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Millie.

31
32 MS. STEVENS: Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So the next on the list is Embert
35 James. And for the record please identify yourself.

36
37 MR. JAMES: My name is Embert James, Madame Chair, Mr.
38 Chair and Honorable members of the Southeast Regional Council.
39 You guys all look real serious here. I haven't seen anybody
40 smiling too much. Could I take up 30 seconds and tell a joke
41 against the Fish and Game?

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Sure.

44
45 MR. JAMES: Well, I'm going to.

46
47 MR. THOMAS: I got one, too, when you're through.

48
49 MR. JAMES: I have an uncle -- you know, before we

50 started signing to get a permit to go hunting and stuff, one of

00158

1 my uncles here, he was really dead set against it. But he
2 finally decided he'd go get a permit, Fish and Game knew he
3 never ever did get them. My dad never ever did get a permit.
4 But my uncle decided to get a permit this one time and they
5 didn't know it. And they're always trying to catch him or my
6 dad. And my uncle was way up on top of the mountain and he
7 shot a great big buck and what better for the Fish and Game to
8 do but to trail a couple of Natives. So after he shot that big
9 buck, a real big five-point one side, six-point the other side,
10 dressed out at about 200 pounds, and geez, he was thinking of
11 the long pack down and here comes this Fish and Game guy out of
12 the woods. Do you have a license? He knew he had a license,
13 but geez he started looking around for it and he couldn't find
14 it. Geez, I can't find my license, I know I have one. Well,
15 we finally got you. Carry your deer down that's evidence
16 against you. My uncle said, no, if you want to have that for
17 evidence you carry it down yourself. So while they were
18 carrying it down, boy, this guy was muddy from head to foot,
19 stumbling down, all the hunters know what I'm talking about.
20 Finally they got down to the beach, and my uncle was still
21 puzzled where he left his license and he took off his hat and
22 doggone it, it fell right off from his hat. He showed the
23 license to the Fish and Game and said, thank you for carrying
24 my deer for me.

25
26 Proposal 9, deer, to eliminate the doe season.
27 Everybody said it and I'll say it too, we do need to eliminate
28 it. A long time ago before the population was so big with non-
29 Native people and it was all Native people, our Native people
30 went out and got does when they wanted it because they were
31 such a small population it wasn't going to hurt it at all. But
32 right now the population is so big and mostly non-Native people
33 and with it being open like that believe me they will do their
34 damage to the does, and I really respect the report from the
35 one gentleman there that says that those does -- you know, I
36 mean, I've seen does with two fawns, you know, we do an awful
37 lot of hunting so I see a lot of does with two fawns, and we'd
38 hate to see those future deer eliminated.

39
40 Now, Proposal 11 is to shorten that buck season. Boy,
41 you know, it would be nice to shorten that buck season.
42 Especially during the rutting season. Those things, you know,
43 before rutting, they really -- those deer about come to almost
44 anything, any kind of noise, they'll come to it, you know, you
45 even bang antlers and stuff like that or you snort like a buck
46 and those bucks coming running like the dickens to fight for
47 their territory. So I would really be strongly in support of,
48 you know, eliminating the buck season just by the time the
49 rutting season starts. And you know, a long time ago people --

50 I don't believe that the deer were at a decline, I will never

00159

1 buy that from anybody, a long time ago, because nobody hunted
2 as much territory as the Native people did. And we hunted in a
3 lot of mountains and everything. And right now the logging
4 roads are right into the heart of the mating grounds. He knows
5 what I'm talking about, he's from Prince of Wales. I hardly
6 ever hunted Prince of Wales, there's a lot of deer here. But
7 those logging roads go right into the heart of the mating
8 grounds of the buck and the does. And those guys that hunt in
9 cars and stuff, they're not hunters, they're just road drivers
10 and they just shoot deer, you know, from their cars, that's not
11 a hunter. So the logging roads are really, you know, right in
12 there, and that's where a lot of the deer are getting killed
13 from.

14
15 Seiners, I would like to see the season start in
16 September. Why? Because I've been a fisherman all my life. I
17 have a lot of seiner friends that are from Puget Sound. These
18 guys don't have licenses to hunt. But these guys would tell us
19 that they would have 15/20 deer in their hatch, in their
20 refrigerator -- in their refrigeration heading south. And
21 instead of going into town a close of a fishing season, they
22 would stay out and anchor up and go hunting. And, hey, they
23 would take a lot of deer down south, so this is one way to
24 eliminate and I know they don't care what they shoot because
25 they're heading south. A lot of them just head south right
26 there from out there on the grounds when they're done. So I'm
27 really strongly in favor of that hunting season to start in
28 September. I know people don't give their correct report on
29 the amount of deer they get because I have friends out in
30 Prince of Wales and one non-Native guy was over here, he came
31 over here with his buddy and they were visiting my nephew and
32 they were talking and he says, yeah, we got 36 buck already,
33 you know, from out on Prince of Wales and they don't use tags
34 or anything. They only keep the tags when they know they're
35 probably going to get checked. So there's no accurate report.
36 And I know these gentlemen here do the best they could on it,
37 but they're far from getting the accurate reports.

38
39 One of the good points that I'll backup my thing on
40 stopping the buck hunting right before rutting. We're out
41 hunting a lot and so many times we'll come up to a buck and a
42 doe, it's not a five-point buck, it's not a six-point buck on
43 side and five on the other, it's a little spiked buck or three-
44 point buck because all those big bucks were already killed off
45 and those little bucks are taking over their spot. So that's
46 not preserving the strength for, you know, for those big bucks
47 there to continue their chain of life. I know what this
48 gentleman was talking about from Ketchikan, when he says he
49 takes his kids out hunting. I raised my kids hunting, my three

50 boys get an awful lot of hunting time in. They get their

00160

1 bucks. But we don't have to go over to POW, there's a lot of
2 deer around here. They could go out on a skiff just like we
3 do. There's a lot of good hunting areas around here to get our
4 deer.

5
6 I strongly believe that tags should be given --
7 shortened to four tags instead of six like a lot of places have
8 six tags. I think the four tags would help us an awful lot to
9 shorten the amount of deer that a person would get. I'm just
10 about done with those proposals.

11
12 One thing that really struck me was the gentleman that
13 was talking about all that produce and saying that the Natives
14 went and bought that stuff and that our diet is no different
15 than theirs. That's very sticky ground when a person starts
16 talking like that. We're talking about our Native way of life.
17 And I wouldn't be talking about this had that person not said
18 that but that sort of put a spine in me and it just hit a sore
19 spot. Definitely they do not have our way of lifestyle. A few
20 years ago, because a few years ago the non-Native would laugh
21 at us and make fun of us on the type of food we would put up
22 and the type of food we'd eat. Now, that same person is giving
23 out permits to non-Native people to sell our Native food and
24 taking away our food from us. So I wouldn't have even brought
25 that up had this gentleman not said that our diet is the same
26 as theirs.

27
28 And I appreciate your guys' time and we do need a lot
29 of things solved, and for our gentlemen that swear to uphold
30 the Constitution of the United States, please do so, you're
31 supposed to protect the Native lifestyle. That's it.

32
33 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Question's to Embert. John.

34
35 MR. VALE: Yeah, when's the rutting season?

36
37 CHAIRMAN GARZA: He's from Yakutat.

38
39 MR. JAMES: That really -- you know, it really varies.
40 It goes from probably the middle to the end of October up until
41 about the middle of December, it just depends on the type of
42 weather. This year was the worst I've ever seen, you know.
43 Bucks were coming to the call real late, you know, maybe it was
44 because of the weather. They knew it was going to be sort of
45 warm weather so they didn't want to -- they know their nature.
46 But everybody knows -- every hunter knows when the rutting is
47 going to start, those bucks will come to any kind of call, even
48 if you make a deer call that don't even sound like a deer call,
49 they're going to come to it. So it'd be so good -- a good

50 hunter will already have all his deer by then. And I strongly

00161

1 feel that, you know, we should eliminate that, even if it's to
2 take it out for two or three weeks, you know, and then after
3 rutting season is over with -- you know, during the rut the
4 deer are so stink, you know. They should wait -- they have to
5 wait two or three weeks for those bucks to have a decent smell
6 again. So I think they should -- that would be a good idea to
7 close it and then open it up; field announcement.

8
9 MR. THOMAS: Bucks will be bucks.

10
11 MR. VALE: Do you care to demonstrate a deer call for
12 us?

13
14 MR. JAMES: No.

15
16 MR. VALE: I'm a moose hunter, not a deer hunter, I
17 know how to call moose.

18
19 CHAIRMAN GARZA: You can corner him after the meeting,
20 John. Okay, we do have two more people who have requested to
21 testify. I would like to get both of those people up here so
22 we would finish public testimony and not make them have to come
23 back tomorrow, if that's okay, even if we do go over a little.
24 And then tomorrow we would start with the written comments read
25 into the record and then we would go on to Council
26 deliberation. Does that sound okay? Okay, Tillie, and then
27 Joe. And if someone shows up here tomorrow that needs to
28 testify we certainly will allow that, I don't mean to cut it
29 off. I just want to make sure they have that opportunity
30 today.

31
32 MR. ABEL: Can I have the morning?

33
34 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, 10 minutes.

35
36 MS. KUSHNICK: Madame Chairman and Regional Board of
37 Directors, I have so much to say, talking for our Native
38 lifestyle or subsistence lifestyle.

39
40 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Millie, she needs to know your name
41 and where you're from.

42
43 MS. KUSHNICK: Matilda Kushnick, also known as Tillie
44 from Saxman, originally from Prince of Wales, and
45 representative from the Tlingit-Haida local chapter of Saxman.

46
47 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Tillie.

48
49 MR. KUSHNICK: Yeah, the young fellow here that spoke

50 that he's been here since the pulp mill, that's about how long

00162

1 I've been here, too, but that don't give me a right to take
2 over this side of the country. You know, all our lives, our
3 young people were making a living that was going to Wrangell
4 Institute, hunting and fishing, and then they brought in the
5 child labor law. Now, I'm just wondering about these people
6 here that's taking their kids out that's not of our culture
7 here, isn't that child labor law, too? I thought it was only
8 just for Indians.

9
10 When speaking of subsistence, permit me to put things
11 into prospective. The Southeast population is set at 74,118.
12 Out of that number 14,481 are Alaska Natives. The urban
13 population of the Southeast, Juneau/Ketchikan is set at 44,252
14 total. There are 5,628 Alaska Natives that live in the urban
15 Southeast, in the rural Southeast. There are 29,876 people the
16 rural Southeast is comprised of. Non-Natives - 23,031, Natives
17 - 8,851. That means that rural Natives in Southeast are
18 outnumbered by non-Natives close to three to one. So when the
19 Alaska populations reported the news report also by people in
20 responsible position, they make it sound as if only Alaska
21 Natives live in rural Alaska. On a statewide basis, the rural
22 Native is outnumbered by non-Natives at a ratio of about five
23 to one. So when you hear a rural subsistence preference, it is
24 not a Native preference, therefore, it is not a racial issue.
25 On a statewide basis, subsistence users take less than four
26 percent of the wild renewable resource. Here now are the
27 Southeast harvest of -- oh, I'm going into salmon, oh, well,
28 that's subsistence, too, which is being taken away from us.

29
30 I'm speaking on Proposal 9. I'm against the doe
31 hunting and I'm in favor of shortening the season from
32 September to December for one reason. Beginning the end of
33 this month, there's going to be a fleet of boat coming here,
34 you should see it out here, it looks like summertime, a whole
35 bunch of boats coming for our herring harvest -- herring roe
36 harvest. There's a bunch of them. And then in the -- the next
37 bunch of boats coming up here is gillnetters. They also
38 harvest from the beach, everything they could get their hands
39 on, depleting our areas here of where all our non-Natives and
40 Natives, alike, eat from. This is going too far. We should
41 have more people taking charge of this.

42
43 You know, by restricting our people from this and that
44 are putting our people on welfare and food stamps. The Indians
45 didn't start welfare and food stamps. We survived and put up
46 our own food and lived, never knew about it. When I was a kid
47 when we'd watch the movies in Klawock Theater, we'd see people
48 lined up, bread line, never knew that was going to happen in
49 Alaska. It's happening right here in Ketchikan. And then our

50 people are being criminalized. They're hungry, they go out and

00163

1 get something to eat right now they're in jail. So we have to
2 think and do everything to help our people. I like to hunt. I
3 like to fish. And I've never been on welfare or food stamps
4 all my life or raised on it. I have 15 children, I just lost a
5 daughter not long ago. There's about two of them on welfare
6 and foods stamps, and as much as I raised them and had a hard
7 time raising them. And we have to think about our people. It
8 hurts me on this wanton waste, like going up with a packsack,
9 you don't know if that person is bringing down a doe or a buck,
10 there's probably a lot of does in those bags. So I disapprove
11 of that, I think it's already passed but I just wanted to let
12 you know that I'm aware of it. And make sure that we protect
13 our subsistence survival on our hunting because you all know
14 that these people from out of state come up here, clean up our
15 shores and our woods with our deer. They get sea store stuff
16 that they buy groceries cheap, that's all cans and stuff, when
17 they come up here all they buy is eggs and probably lettuce if
18 they're hungry for greens. Their meat, they got it from our
19 forests along the way. By the time we are out to hunt, those
20 deers are spooked and you can't come near them. That's why
21 people think there's no deer, they're spooked, they've been
22 already hunted. Those of you that hunt and know what hunting
23 is know what I'm talking about, too many people are there they
24 get spooky, you can't get them.

25
26 I have a lot more to say, but I'll leave it at that.

27
28 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay.

29
30 MS. KUSHNICK: Any questions.

31
32 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Millie.

33
34 MR. THOMAS: Matilda.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Matilda. Sorry, Millie. Okay, Joe
37 Williams, were you going to testify on these proposals? Okay.

38
39 MR. THOMAS: Okay, let's go Joe.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GARZA: So long ago when you were young.

42
43 MR. THOMAS: No jokes.

44
45 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Joe Williams. My Indian name
46 is (Native). And I just want to say thank you for the
47 opportunity to speak before you this afternoon for such a
48 prestigious group.

49

I'm here because I believe that you folks are charged

00164

1 with one requirement and that's to protect the subsistence
2 lifestyle of what we are so looking forward to annually. I can
3 only mirror in reference -- Proposition 9, only mirror and say
4 what has been said before by the Federally recognized tribe of
5 Craig, no does. Have your season. I can only support what Mr.
6 James and what
7 Mrs. Kushnick is saying is that your season begins September 1
8 and ends December 31st.

9
10 Kind of addressing the ways it's given is there should
11 be local people within the communities of Craig, Klawock,
12 Hydaburg and Kasaan. We should not eliminate Kasaan as a
13 community because they are truly a community, they have a
14 Federally recognized tribe there. And there are people in
15 those communities who are leaders. We all know who they are.
16 They can be contacted and they know where and who needs the
17 meats that are left behind by those who don't desire them.

18
19 Addressing the information that was given today, a long
20 tremendous amount of information. I can only surmise that it
21 took a tremendous amount of time to gather and I'm very
22 impressed by that. So for those who went through that problem
23 of gathering that information and presenting it today, I am
24 very impressed by that. However, Saxman was left out as far as
25 the count is concerned. And I can only surmise that Saxman was
26 left out because we are the step-brother of Ketchikan. We, in
27 Saxman have a Federally recognized tribe. And for those who
28 are gathering that information, I strongly encourage you to
29 recognize that factor. I no longer want to be overlooked. We
30 have been overlooked for many, many years. And as a Saxman
31 resident, as a past Saxman leader of the Saxman IRA, Federally
32 recognized tribe, I will be here to state that. I don't wish
33 to come to another one of these things and see that Saxman is
34 left out of being counted. That's like leaving Craig being
35 left out and not being counted. We are a community of Alaska,
36 we are a Native community of all Alaska. And I just resent the
37 fact that we are left out intentionally or unintentionally.

38
39 So Madame Chair, I want to thank you again for the
40 opportunity to address you, and certainly welcome any
41 questions.

42
43 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you, Joe. Bill.

44
45 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, well, what do you mean Saxman's left
46 out? Left out of what?

47
48 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, with all the information that was
49 gathered, there was never once mentioned that any of our people

50 in Saxman were interviewed, any of our people in Saxman were

00165

1 ever even contacted, and I resent that. Because we do have
2 subsistence users. You had one here just before me that spoke.
3

4 MR. THOMAS: Okay, well, the only one doing that survey
5 is the State. The Feds are not doing that survey. This is a
6 Federal management proceeding.
7

8 MR. WILLIAMS: I recognize that. But if you are using
9 State information, we as Saxman should be included in that or
10 don't use any of the State's information whatsoever, gather
11 your own.

12 MR. THOMAS: The Feds are the only ones that recognize
13 you as a rural community, the State doesn't.
14

15 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm keenly aware of that.
16

17 MR. THOMAS: Okay.
18

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Keenly aware.
20

21 MR. THOMAS: Well, I'm just reminding you. The reason
22 we're here and meeting now is because you are an eligible user
23 community. We target those communities to bring these meetings
24 to to give the population of those communities an opportunity
25 to interact, to listen to what's going on so they won't feel
26 left out.
27

28 MR. WILLIAMS: I believe that's what I'm doing now.
29

30 MR. THOMAS: Well, I think there's a bigger population
31 than one, you know, I mean there's three people here from
32 Saxman.
33

34 MR. WILLIAMS: What I'm referring to, Mr. Chairman, is
35 the information that was gathered by the State. According to
36 the State, until they passed the law that Saxman is not
37 recognized as a rural community, we are still recognized as a
38 rural community. That law has not been passed yet.
39

40 MR. THOMAS: You're right.
41

42 MR. WILLIAMS: And so with that, with the State's
43 gathering of information, I strongly encourage the people who
44 gathered this information to include Saxman because we
45 participate in this and will participate in this long after all
46 this is done.
47

48 MR. THOMAS: One thing I can add to that. There was a
49 time when Saxman wouldn't participate, but they might have

50 changed now.

00166

1 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

2

3 MR. THOMAS: There was a time when Saxman wouldn't
4 participate in those surveys because they felt like they were
5 compromising their means and methods of harvesting. And that
6 the more information they shared with the information being
7 gathered would down the road somewhere jeopardize their
8 opportunity to continue using.

9

10 MR. WILLIAMS: The information -- as I understand the
11 reason the information was not shared was because of lack of
12 trust in what the State of Alaska's doing.

13

14 MR. THOMAS: Exactly.

15

16 MR. WILLIAMS: And that lack of trust is continuing
17 today. What is the State of Alaska doing to the Native people
18 of Alaska?

19

20 MR. THOMAS: Good question.

21

22 CHAIRMAN GARZA: And that certainly happened to more
23 than just Saxman. There are many residents throughout
24 Southeast who, for a long time, and possibly even today are
25 very skeptical of how information is used. Gabriel.

26

27 MR. GABRIEL: Yeah, I'd like to just mention for those
28 people that have testified and said, no doe season, that if --
29 I hope you recognize that, you know, we're sitting here as a
30 Council to protect the subsistence rights of rural Alaskans.
31 And that if there is a use of the doe and you've seen
32 documentation that there is does taken, not very many mind you,
33 but there are some does taken, and that if we close the doe
34 season on those people, it would be like leaving you out. It
35 would be like a lack of trust on -- at least in my own personal
36 opinion on me for those people that depend upon that resource
37 for subsistence use. So that's where, you know, I stand on
38 this Council, to protect all subsistence users and that I
39 recognize that people have opinions, but we're bound to
40 recognize subsistence use. So don't feel slighted if we don't
41 take your recommendation on no doe season, and same with season
42 -- or same with length of season, that we have to recognize
43 that people take it at certain times and that we can't
44 accommodate other things -- other factors unless something else
45 is happening so that we have a procedure. And we are trying to
46 establish, you know, within the Council a trusting relationship
47 to all subsistence users. And I think that's where I stand.

48

49 Thank you.

00167

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Madame Chairman, the only comment I do
2 have on that is that the Federally recognized tribe of Craig
3 met at length and came up with their decision. And that should
4 be weighed very heavily, more heavily than my personal
5 presentation today. That's all I have, Madame Chairman.

6
7 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So we will come back to order
8 tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. We will look at written
9 comments and then we will go into Council deliberations. I
10 know that there has been numerous comments about what we can do
11 legally and there are different responses or different
12 interpretations of that. What I would like you to think about
13 tonight is what you think you need to do is right. I don't
14 think that we should base our votes on what we think is legally
15 responsible, but what we think is right for our communities.

16
17 MS. LeCORNU: We have a mandate to protect subsistence
18 users, just like Gabe said. We don't do what's right for us,
19 me, we do it for the subsistence users.

20
21 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Well, that's what I mean by what is
22 right.

23
24 MS. LeCORNU: Thanks.

25
26 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mim.

27
28 MS. McCONNELL: Is there going to be a subcommittee
29 meeting tonight to deal with the annual report?

30
31 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Are there Council members who would
32 like to meet tonight to work on a draft or topics for the
33 annual report?

34
35 MS. McCONNELL: I'd be willing to do that.

36
37 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay, Mim. John.

38
39 MS. LeCORNU: I will.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Vicki.

42
43 MS. LeCORNU: Yeah.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Do you guys want to work
46 something out for Cape Fox?

47
48 MS. McCONNELL: Yes.

49

CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Do you want to come up with a

00168

1 time so if other people want to join they can?

2

3 MS. McCONNELL: How about 7:00 o'clock in the lobby,
4 we'll be there.

5

6 CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. 7:00 o'clock in the lobby over
7 at Cape Fox if you're interested in working on the annual
8 report. So we're at recess until tomorrow morning.

9

10 (Hearing recessed)

00169

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter and Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 46 through 168 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Southeast Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, Volume II, meeting taken electronically by Salena Hile on the 10th day of March, 1998, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at the Saxman Community Hall, Saxman, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed under my direction and reduced to print by employees to the best of their knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 22nd day of March, 1998.

JOSEPH P. KOLASINSKI
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 04/17/00