

00306

1 SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME III

7
8 February 27, 2003
9 Ketchikan Indian Corporation
10 Ketchikan, Alaska

11
12 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

13
14 John Littlefield, Chairman
15 Marilyn R. Wilson
16 Bert Adams
17 Floyd Kookesh
18 Donald Hernandez
19 Richard Stokes
20 Michael Douville
21 Harvey Kitka
22 Dolly Garza
23
24 Regional Coordinator, Robert Schroeder

00307

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
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Ketchikan, Alaska - 2/27/2003)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting is called back to order. At this point we were at Proposal 4 Council deliberations. Prior to that I'd like to go over the agenda a little bit and make some changes and adapt to people who have to leave this evening. If anybody requires an early out to make that plane, we could perhaps move them up on the schedule if needed. The way I see it, we are going to do Proposal 4, 5, 6, 7, we're going to go back to 2 and then take care of 10 and 11. We need to hopefully get those proposals done by noon and we can get everything done. If there's anybody that needs to be right after that on the schedule. I know Mr. Boyd and Mr. Rivard are leaving on that plane. If they would like to be moved up, as well as Doug McBride. We know you've got to catch that plane. We want to make sure you can make your presentation. Are there any requests to change the agenda? We'll proceed on that, but I want to remind you that we've got a lot of business to take care of.

Last night, when we recessed, I received a request from the State of Alaska to have some additional time prior to our Council deliberations to present some new harvest data as well as talk about the planning group. What is the Council's wishes? If there's no objection to that, I'd like to ask them to come forward and present that harvest data and planning group and understanding that we are on a time crunch here.

MS. SEE: Thank you and good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Council, members of the public. My name is Marianne See. I'm with the Department of Fish & Game. We did want to offer a couple things this morning very quickly. We realize you have a pressing agenda. There are some pieces of information that my colleague, Mike Turek, will present to try to clarify some of the harvest information from yesterday's testimony. We have two kinds of information that we've brought to this meeting to try and help in the context of these issues that you face with deer on Prince of Wales Island. The population data, which we're obviously going to continue working on, and the harvest data.

00309

1 that even if today there may not be compelling
2 information about where we are in the decline of deer,
3 eventually there will be a decline in deer. Our
4 population experts are quite certain of this. So this
5 really lends itself, I think, to the kind of planning
6 effort, and I use that term sort of loosely, it's the
7 stakeholder effort that's needed by all the participants
8 in the concerns about subsistence use in fish and
9 wildlife. Those folks need to be able to get to a place
10 where they can really work through these issues. The
11 kind of planning that was done in the Redoubt Lake issues
12 on the fisheries side, for example, has really engaged
13 people and I think that something like that really could
14 be very beneficial here.

15

16 This is not going to get solved
17 overnight. It's very complicated stuff and they're very
18 legitimate user concerns that are compelling for
19 subsistence. In order to allow both State and Federal
20 entities to provide for and protect subsistence, it's
21 going to take some time, so we would really urge your
22 consideration and support for the kind of planning that's
23 been discussed I think primarily the day before
24 yesterday. With that, I'd like to turn it over to Mike
25 Turek, who provides some clarification on harvest
26 information.

27

28 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chairman, Council. I'd
29 just like to clarify something from the harvest data that
30 we do have. Speaking yesterday, I didn't make it clear
31 about the 1999 harvest data that we have from Craig and
32 Klawock, the household harvest data of deer hunters.
33 What we did in Prince of Wales Island, we have three
34 communities -- excuse me, two communities that we've done
35 face-to-face household surveys three times, that's Craig
36 and Klawock, and that was in 1987 when we asked about all
37 resources, 1997, again we asked about all resources, and
38 then 2000 for the 1999 harvest year when we asked just
39 deer hunters just about deer.

40

41 What we have from those household harvest
42 surveys in 1987 in Craig, we have an estimation of 600
43 deer taken, in 1997, 963 deer, in 1999, 744 deer. For
44 Klawock in 1987, 445 deer, in 1997, 503 deer, and in
45 1999, 476 deer. So, in 1999 there was a decrease in deer
46 harvest in Craig and Klawock from our face-to-face
47 surveys. So those are the two communities that we have
48 the most face-to-face household harvest survey data for
49 Prince of Wales Island.

50

00310

1 For the Department of Wildlife
2 Conservation deer ticket surveys, which for most of the
3 communities we think is underreported on Prince of Wales
4 Island, but we think it gives us an idea of the trends of
5 harvests. Nothing from that data shows a serious decline
6 in harvest yet. So I think one thing that should be done
7 on Prince of Wales Island is work a bit more on trying to
8 improve our harvest data and that will take the
9 communities to really buy into helping us get better
10 harvest data, whether it's face-to-face surveys or trying
11 to improve the deer ticket returns or doing something
12 with the check stations. I think something, maybe a
13 combination of all three.

14
15 But a key on Prince of Wales Island, like
16 anywhere in rural Alaska, is you have to have the
17 communities buy into it. The hunters have to agree to do
18 it or you're not going to get good data. So I just
19 wanted to clarify there was indeed in 1999 from our
20 surveys a slight decline in harvest from Craig and
21 Klawock from our survey data. As was pointed out by
22 Patty, in the year 1997 there was a slight decline in
23 Hydaburg for deer harvest from the '87 data. So we have
24 some of that face-to-face data and a lot more of the deer
25 ticket data.

26
27 Now, with the check station, perhaps a
28 combination of doing something with all three of those we
29 can get some better harvest data. That may be the best
30 way to get an indication with data on paper showing a
31 decline of deer harvest and that may be what we really
32 need, at least to go to the Board of Game, to get
33 something done by the Board of Game. That's all I have
34 unless you have any questions.

35
36 MS. SEE: We'd be happy to answer any
37 questions.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: First, a comment.
40 We would like that in writing, too. If you could provide
41 that to us in writing so we have that for the record. We
42 have it on transcript, but I believe it's important that
43 we have that in writing to add to the additional data,
44 the '97 and 2000 surveys that we have. Also, was that a
45 per capita? What are those numbers? Are they per
46 capita?

47
48 MR. TUREK: Those are total numbers.
49 What we give you, what we write up, I can include the per
50 capita for those three survey years for those two

00311

1 communities.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. If you
4 could summarize that and get that to us in writing, we
5 would appreciate that. Any other questions from the
6 Council? Mr. Adams.

7

8 MR. ADAMS: Thank you for that report. I
9 think the State is way far ahead of the Feds as far as
10 gathering this data. Floyd and I, we've been talking off
11 and on about where does local knowledge come into this
12 and I think your household surveys accomplish that for
13 us. So my compliments to you for doing that. The last
14 survey I understand was done in 1999. Anything being
15 done since then to now?

16

17 MR. TUREK: Chair, Mr. Adams. No, the
18 survey was actually done in 2000 for the 1999 harvest
19 year and that's the last face-to-face surveys we've done
20 on Prince of Wales Island. At that time, in Klawock, we
21 were told that they really didn't want us to do any more
22 surveys. They'd been sort of surveyed out. We'd been
23 there a couple years for the household harvest surveys
24 and did a lot of work on deer while interviewing people.
25 So that's one of the keys. We have to get the
26 communities to say, yes, we do want you to do this work.
27 We have to do more work on Prince of Wales Island, in
28 particular in Klawock and Hydaburg, to get those
29 communities to really buy into this.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council?
32 Follow up. Go ahead.

33

34 MR. ADAMS: Yesterday, I can't remember
35 who it was, but I have it down here somewhere, made a
36 statement about the habitat and that the deer are kind of
37 harder to see when the growth is getting thicker and
38 thicker. I'm just wondering, you know, if that was taken
39 into consideration. That's about it. Thanks.

40

41 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Adams. When
42 we asked people -- we didn't ask them in particular what
43 the impacts of the second growth was having on their
44 finding deer. We asked them if it was easier to get deer
45 or if they were spending more time getting deer, more
46 difficult and if they were seeing fewer deer, and we
47 didn't get the details, an explanation of why they
48 weren't seeing more deer. But, in general, when we've
49 asked those questions on Prince of Wales Island, people
50 said it is more difficult to get more deer, they're not

00312

1 seeing as many deer as they did in the past five years
2 and spending more time to get the deer that they need.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

5

6 MR. KOOKESH: I'd like to see one of your
7 survey forms. Is it a standard form that you -- is it
8 like a document that's never changed? Like you mentioned
9 habitat. I'd like to see what your material looks like.

10

11 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Kookesh. When
12 we did the household harvest surveys for all resources,
13 it's a standard statewide survey, but we alter them for
14 particular communities for particular resources or if we
15 have extra questions that we're asking. In 2000, for the
16 deer survey, we came up with a deer survey form. I think
17 I have copies of the form we used in 2000 with me I can
18 share with you. I can get you a copy of the household
19 harvest survey that we used in '97 on Prince of Wales
20 Island. We try to use a pretty standardized form, but we
21 also can add extra questions or change it, modify it for
22 the particular community or the particular resource we're
23 trying to find out about.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
26 Floyd, go ahead and follow up and then Ms. Phillips.

27

28 MR. KOOKESH: I guess the reason I want
29 to see your data is because we always talk -- not your
30 data, but your document, because we always talk about not
31 having enough complete data to make decisions and that
32 some of the decisions we made don't have any bearing or
33 grounds to stand on because of apparently the way we go
34 after the information or based on the money. I'd like to
35 see the strength in the data process form for ourselves.

36

37 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Kookesh.
38 Yeah, I can give you a copy of the survey form. What we
39 do also is we work with the local communities. We show
40 them the survey form and we get some input from them
41 before we conduct the survey, especially when we hire
42 local people to help with the surveys and get their
43 input, what they might like to have added to the survey
44 or perhaps alter the format a bit. We try to get as much
45 local input as we can on that and we try to improve that
46 now, getting that input as early as possible helping with
47 the survey form. I can give you a copy of that probably
48 at this meeting. I'll check. I think I have that with
49 me.

50

00313

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Turek. I
4 have a comment and then a question. There used to be a
5 program called RAP, which is Rural Apprenticeship
6 Program, which is a high school student program, that
7 works through Federal agencies to give them part-time
8 jobs, sort of like mentorship programs. Possibly you
9 could get high school students to work with you to survey
10 community members on POW. My question is, in 1999, did
11 the survey ask if subsistence needs were being met?

12

13 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Ms. Phillips. I'd
14 have to check and see how we worded that, if it was
15 worded -- a needs question, how that was worded in '99.
16 I don't remember. I believe we did have some kind of a
17 wording in the question about needs. The problem we have
18 with needs is that managers on boards, State boards, they
19 want to see numbers and they want to see it backed by
20 something, harvest data, some kind of survey. They won't
21 just accept if you say, well, X community says they need
22 X amount of deer, so we have to come up with something
23 that they'll accept that they accept as scientific.
24 That's why we have to figure out a way to get at those
25 needs.

26

27 The best way for us and the data that we
28 can defend the best is through harvest surveys. If we
29 have a number of years showing how much people have
30 reported using, that's the best thing when we go to the
31 State Board of Fish or Game to say this is what people
32 need because this is what they've been harvesting.
33 That's just the way this system works with the State. So
34 they want to see those hard numbers when there's
35 questions of amount necessary the way we term it in the
36 State system.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
39 I'd like to address some of your comments, Ms. See. You
40 talked about the planning and you'd mentioned
41 specifically there was a priority in State law as well as
42 guaranteed that the deer were going down and also talked
43 about Redoubt as an example. I would suggest that the
44 State can implement this planning process quite rapidly
45 and take care of this because of the constraints that was
46 explained to us earlier that we operate under as a
47 Federal advisory committee.

48

49 What I would suggest is that you go ahead
50 and do this under the State auspices as soon as possible

00314

1 and what you're going to need, in my opinion, this is
2 just my opinion, is, number one, a good moderator, you
3 will need to have the realization that under Federal law
4 as well as State law subsistence is a priority in
5 preference, although they're talked about differently,
6 and then you'll need to get the stakeholders involved.
7 Let's call them consumptive users rather than
8 stakeholders. You'll need to determine who those people
9 are. And then you will have to have a short time frame.
10 You don't want to drag this out for two, three years.
11 You'll either come to some consensus or not and I would
12 suggest a series of rapid meetings over a month and you
13 will know by then whether you can come to some consensus
14 and I think at a future meeting that would be very
15 helpful. I think you can put this together not in years,
16 but in months. Certainly by the next meeting. That
17 would be my suggestion.

18

19 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, if I may respond to
20 that. We have actually been discussing this with the
21 Forest Service at great length and it's my understanding
22 that they mentioned something about this to you on
23 Tuesday. I was not here then. Our understanding is
24 that, because we do agree that it needs to happen soon or
25 get off the ground soon, that they are planning to get a
26 contract in place very quickly to start a person as a
27 facilitator to basically check in with these different
28 consumptive users, as you call them, that's a good term,
29 to see whether or not there's a degree of engagement that
30 we could mobilize and get something like this going. We
31 would do this -- the State would do this in a
32 collaborative mode with the Forest Service since they
33 have money allocated to start this already. We very much
34 want to work with them closely to make sure that this
35 happens.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree that that
38 approach should go forward. I'm just saying that under
39 State management this could proceed quite rapidly. There
40 are certain rules and regulations that the Federal
41 government has to follow and it might take a lot longer
42 and I'm thinking that under the State it could be done
43 speedily and that's why I recommend it. It also, as you
44 mentioned in Redoubt, worked quite well. Not everyone
45 was satisfied. In a consensus, generally no one is. It
46 could be either accomplished or not and you would know
47 that within a month I would think. So that was my
48 recommendation. You guys can get this taken care of much
49 quicker than we can. And not to discourage what we're
50 doing and I'm sure it's going to continue. Any other

00315

1 questions? Thank you very much for making this
2 presentation.

3

4 We are at Proposal 4 Council
5 deliberations, as well as 5. Council wishes. Ms. Garza.

6

7 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move to
8 support Proposal 4.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: On what page,
11 please? Is the suggestion language to your motion on
12 Page 105, is that correct?

13

14 MS. GARZA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on Page
15 105 is support the proposal, at the bottom of it. C&T
16 use determination. Residents of Unit 1(A) and residents
17 of Units 2 and 3. Four deer; however, no more than one
18 may be an antlerless deer. Antlerless deer may be taken
19 only during the period October 15 to December 31 by
20 Federal registration permit only. The season is July 24
21 through December 31. As a point of order, I'm not sure
22 if we adopt or support.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would make a
25 motion to adopt.

26

27 MR. STOKES: Second.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion
30 to adopt the language on Page 105 and it's been seconded.
31 It's before the Council. The maker of the motion, would
32 you like to speak first? Discussion on the motion. Are
33 you ready for the question?

34

35 MR. STOKES: Call for the question.

36

37 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Hernandez.

40

41 MR. HERNANDEZ: I do have some
42 reservations on this proposal I'd like to express and see
43 if any of the Council members agree.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Don, if you could
46 move forward so that everyone can hear you. Also, I'd
47 like the Council Members to remember that we need to use
48 the rationale for recommendation so that the record is
49 clear for the Federal Subsistence Board on why we made
50 this decision. Go ahead, Mr. Hernandez.

00316

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: I do see this as an
2 increase for subsistence opportunity. My reservation has
3 to do with whether or not it will benefit enough
4 subsistence users. I do see a bit of a problem with an
5 earlier opening. That is a very busy time of the year
6 for a lot of people engaged in commercial fishing. I'd
7 also point out that the third week in July is the peak
8 sockeye week for subsistence people who are going out
9 subsistence fishing for sockeye. I know in my area,
10 Salmon Bay, Red Bay, Shipley Bay systems where people
11 subsistence fish all peak in about that third week in
12 July and that's the time we're going to be harvesting
13 subsistence sockeye.

14

15 I have one other reservation. We've
16 heard a lot of substantial evidence in the last few days
17 that we do have a decline in the deer population. This
18 proposal may or may not -- I can't say for certain, but
19 it may or may not increase the harvest of deer. I'm not
20 sure I'm comfortable with a proposal that will increase
21 the harvest of deer in a time when we're talking about
22 shortages in deer.

23

24 My last reservation is that if we are in
25 a situation where we may have to be talking about more
26 conservation in the future and if one believes this has a
27 tendency to increase the take of deer, if we need to take
28 conservation measures in the future, this action we take
29 now would put more of the burden on the non-rural hunters
30 in any future decisions. We could not take this away as
31 a restriction to subsistence hunters. It would tend to
32 make us more inclined to restrict the non-rural hunters
33 in the future if we feel we are in a conservation
34 situation. However, it is not certain that this will
35 increase the take of deer and I would be interested in
36 hearing what some of the other Council Members think
37 about that. As I said, this may be our best solution to
38 the problem, but I would be interested in hearing some
39 opinions.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

44 Mr. Stokes.

45

46 MR. STOKES: The reason why I'm
47 supporting this proposal is that it would -- myself, I
48 take my grandkids out and they have an extra opportunity
49 while school is out and they're able to camp, I'm able to
50 show them how to catch the fish and I'm able to show them

00317

1 how to hunt. I don't believe this will hurt the
2 conservation at all. I just believe it's an added
3 opportunity for our youngsters to accompany us and learn
4 the ropes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

7

8 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. I support
9 this proposal. One of the reasons why we were put in
10 this position was for the purpose of creating
11 opportunities for the rural areas. Decisions we make we
12 know certainly affect non-rural areas, but I believe that
13 our actions are intended to benefit the rural areas. The
14 burden, well, that's something that's just considered, in
15 a sense, collateral damage and just have to learn how to
16 live with that because of this legislation. I think the
17 maker of the proposal understands that the one-week time
18 frame is small and that there's not going to be a huge
19 gain for them, but that the benefit, although small, will
20 certainly help. I think that this being a week, I don't
21 believe that we're asking for the moon. I think they're
22 just trying to take a little jump off the ground there.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

27 Mr. Douville.

28

29 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 I speak in favor of the motion for several reasons.
31 First, it was not designed to solve this problem. It's
32 more like trying to put a Band-Aid on a cut that really
33 needs stitches. However, our duty is to provide
34 continued access to the resource and this is following in
35 that manner.

36

37 There's some reasons for this proposal.
38 Some of the subsistence users are not getting what they
39 need because of competition and this is designed to help
40 alleviate that. Realizing that some subsistence users
41 are doing other things, well, we're not all going to go
42 hunting at the same time. But some of those that do need
43 meat more than others will be hunting at this time should
44 this go through the Federal Subsistence Board
45 successfully.

46

47 There's many issues here that prompt me
48 to support it. One is that we have -- I agree with the
49 ADF&G that the decline in deer is slight. In some
50 places, I could tell you that it has crashed drastically

00318

1 on some of the islands and other places I see where it is
2 actually improving. That is not the real problem. The
3 real problem here is habitat that has been degraded
4 through clear-cut. Not all of Prince of Wales Island is
5 good terrain for hunting. Some of it is too steep, some
6 of it is full of blow-downs. There are many reasons why
7 select areas are more productive or more acceptable to
8 hunting. It has to do with those things. If you clear-
9 cut an area, you don't go back and hunt anymore. It's
10 ruined. So, while there is deer in those areas, you
11 don't use them. You never have used them for those
12 reasons. In any case, while this proposal would be a
13 small step, it is a step in the right direction and I
14 support it.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
17 Mr. Kitka.

18 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I,
19 too, support this proposal, maybe for different reasons.
20 I realize that the fisheries business has bottomed out
21 and dropped and there's no money coming in to these
22 communities and they need some help and some way to
23 survive through the year and they do need subsistence.
24 For these reasons I would support this motion.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
27 Ms. Phillips.

28

29 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.
30 There's been overwhelming evidence presented in public
31 testimony that individual's subsistence needs are not
32 being met. The Staff analysis shows that deer
33 populations are likely to decline over time due to
34 decreased habitat capability and without effective
35 thinning and second growth management, deer populations
36 will further decline. We've heard that there are empty
37 houses on Prince of Wales Island, that the population of
38 humans is declining, but with the depression in the
39 economy, I see that as their subsistence needs are going
40 to be increasing and that we should be managing the
41 resource to have an increased population of resource.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
44 Council. Mr. Adams.

45

46 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
47 think I'm going to direct this question to Mike Turek.
48 Thank you. On Page 101 of the book here it says under
49 data on deer numbers and harvest information, this
50 information was provided by the Department of Fish & Game

00319

1 and my question to you, Mike, is did this come as a
2 result of your household surveys for the previous years
3 or where did the State get this data from?

4

5 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Adams. Let me
6 get my book and take a look at 101. I think they're
7 referring to the deer harvest ticket data, which is
8 collected by the Department of Wildlife Conservation.
9 Yes, that's what they're referring to there.

10

11 MR. ADAMS: Let me just read that for
12 you. It says for the period of August 2001 to January
13 2002, the ADF&G reported that deer harvest was about
14 seven percent higher than the long-term average but lower
15 than those harvested in 2002. To me, it tells me that
16 there probably is a potential for a conservation issue
17 here, but I don't think it's that serious at this point.
18 Am I correct in that assumption?

19

20 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Adams. I
21 really couldn't say, but that's one way to look at it. I
22 wouldn't make a comment on that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would remind the
25 Council that at this time we have this proposal before
26 us, so it's probably not appropriate to ask others to
27 comment on it. We've had that time, so let's keep it
28 within the Council if we can. Are there other Council?
29 The Council has, I believe, adequately shown all of the
30 items that were in the rationale. I would just like to
31 note for the record that this is also supported on Page
32 104 by Staff as well as the State support, although it
33 was qualified to the doe harvest, it still supported the
34 proposal. If there are no more comments, are you ready
35 for the question?

36

37 MS. GARZA: Question.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would like to
40 ask if a Council Member will please summarize the four
41 points for the record. Ms. Garza, would you like to do
42 that?

43

44 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
45 four things we must consider are conservation. Under
46 conservation I have heard from Federal and State that the
47 population is fairly stable. There may be a slight
48 decline, but not a substantial decline. So I'm not
49 concerned as much about deer as I have been in the past
50 few years. Under the next point, subsistence

00320

1 opportunity.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Substantial

4 evidence.

5

6 MS. GARZA: You've got four different

7 points than I've got on my sheet. Substantial evidence.

8 I think that we have several very good reports in front

9 of us. Patricia brought her report from last year. We

10 have reams of reports on deer from Prince of Wales. From

11 the testimony we received yesterday, there is substantial

12 evidence in my opinion that the Prince of Wales residents

13 subsistence needs are not being met.

14

15 The next point, Mr. Chairman, is the

16 effect on subsistence users. Does it support customary

17 and traditional uses? Yes, it does. Mr. Chairman, I

18 have heard from several of the Council members the

19 concern about the earlier opening and conflicts with

20 fishing or it's a warmer season, but I think if it

21 provides opportunity for some subsistence residents, then

22 I'm happy.

23

24 Mr. Chairman, the last point, the effect

25 on other users, those are primarily the Ketchikan

26 residents. The reason this proposal was brought forward

27 by this Council was that it was an attempt to provide an

28 opportunity for Prince of Wales subsistence users without

29 taking away from Ketchikan users, so they still have

30 their August opening. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. That

33 summarizes it and I believe covers it. Are you ready for

34 the question?

35

36 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has

39 been called for and the vote before you is to adopt the

40 language on Page 105, effectively setting an earlier

41 date. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any opposed, same

46 sign.

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is

00321

1 carried. It is recommended to adopt the language on Page
2 105. We are on Proposal 5. We have heard all of the
3 previous information, so we are at Council deliberations
4 on Proposal 5. Please refer to the page that you're
5 talking about when you make a motion. Dr. Garza.

6

7 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Page 113. I
8 move that we adopt Proposal 5 as it is written on Page
9 113.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion
12 to adopt the language for the proposed regulation as
13 shown on Page 113. Is there a second?

14

15 MR. KOOKESH: Second.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
18 and seconded. The language on Page 113, proposed
19 regulation for Unit 2 deer is before the Council. Would
20 the maker of the motion like to go first? Other Council.

21

22 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

25

26 MS. GARZA: I seek to amend the proposal.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please proceed.

29

30 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. If you look at
31 the proposed Federal regulation Unit 2 deer, we have the
32 C&T determination, the August 1 to 31st for rural
33 residents, then we have separately non-Federally
34 qualified hunters on Federal land. Federal public lands
35 are closed to the taking of deer from August 1 to
36 September 1. Harvest limits for deer on Federal public
37 lands for hunters who are not Federally qualified
38 subsistence users is two bucks. Mr. Chairman, I would
39 move that we amend that Federal public lands are closed
40 to the taking of deer from August 1 to August 10.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a motion
43 to change the date. Substitute August 10 for September 1
44 in the first sentence. Is there a second?

45

46 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
49 and seconded. The amendment is before you to substitute
50 August 10th for September 1st in the first sentence of

00322

1 the bold language on Page 113. Maker.

2

3 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. As
4 a Ketchikan resident, I realize that the intent of this
5 Council is to ensure that we have subsistence
6 opportunities for rural residents. However, the Council
7 has always strove to represent all of Southeast and as a
8 non-rural resident I know that Ketchikan hunters use
9 Prince of Wales, they take their families over. August
10 is the best month. As Mr. Stokes has stated, this is
11 when they can take their kids up into the mountains and
12 hunt and teach them good skills, so this would remove a
13 substantial opportunity for families if it is September 1
14 because school will be starting. So I ask that we
15 support this amendment.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Is
20 there any other discussion on the amendment?

21

22 MR. KOOKESH: Call the question.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has
25 been called for. We'll stand down for a few minutes.
26 Please grab a cup of coffee. We'll be back in a couple
27 minutes only.

28

29 (Off record)

30

31 (On record)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're back in
34 session. We have before us an amendment to substitute
35 August 10th for September 1st on Page 113. Council, are
36 you ready for the question? Before the Council at this
37 time is an amendment to the main motion on Page 113. The
38 amendment would substitute August 10th for September 1st
39 in the first line of the last paragraph. Does everyone
40 understand that? Dr. Garza.

41

42 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. So it would
43 then read Federal public lands are closed to the taking
44 of deer from August 1 to August 10th and this is for non-
45 Federally qualified hunters.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Does everyone
48 understand the amendment before you? Are you ready for
49 the question? You will be voting on the amendment to
50 substitute August 10th for September 1st in the first

00323

1 sentence on Page 113. All in favor of the amendment,
2 please signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All opposed, same
7 sign.

8

9 (No opposing votes)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is
12 carried. August 10th is substituted for September 1st.
13 The main motion is before you. Ms. Phillips, Mr.
14 Douville, Ms. Garza.

15

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.

17 Title VIII of ANILCA, Section 801.5, says the
18 continuation of the opportunity for a subsistence way of
19 life by residents of rural Alaska requires enabling rural
20 residents who have personal knowledge of local conditions
21 and requirements to have a meaningful role in the
22 management of fish and wildlife and of subsistence uses
23 on public lands in Alaska.

24

25 Policy 1 says the use of the public lands
26 in Alaska is to cause the least adverse impact possible
27 on rural residents who depend upon subsistence uses of
28 the resources of such lands. Number 2, non-wasteful
29 subsistence uses of fish and wildlife shall be the
30 priority consumptive uses of all such resources. When it
31 is necessary to restrict taking to ensure the
32 continuation of subsistence uses of such taking, such
33 populations shall be given preference over other
34 consumptive uses.

35

36 Preference for subsistence use. Section
37 804 states the taking on public lands of fish and
38 wildlife for non-wasteful subsistence uses shall be
39 accorded priority over the taking on such lands of fish
40 and wildlife for other purposes. Whenever it is
41 necessary to restrict the taking of populations of fish
42 and wildlife for subsistence uses to continue such uses,
43 such priority shall be implemented through appropriate
44 limitations based on the application of the following
45 criteria. Customary and direct dependence upon the
46 populations, the mainstay of livelihood, local residency
47 and the availability of alternative resources. Whenever
48 it is necessary to restrict the taking of populations of
49 wildlife on public lands for subsistence uses to continue
50 such uses, such priority shall be implemented through

00324

1 appropriate limitations.

2

3

4 The SERAC, when reviewing and evaluating
5 proposals, has provided a forum for expressing opinions
6 and recommendations by interested persons. The SERAC has
7 encouraged local and regional participation in the
8 decision-making process affecting taking of fish and
9 wildlife for subsistence uses. Several tribes and
10 numerous individuals have testified that their current
11 and anticipated subsistence needs are not being met.

11

12

13 Household survey data, Page 128 of SERAC
14 February 2003 meeting booklet states, respondents in
15 Craig, Hydaburg and Klawock were asked in the 1998
16 surveys whether community needs for deer were met in the
17 previous year. In Craig, 62 percent said harvest was
18 somewhat lower or much lower than needed, 69 percent of
19 Hydaburg and 62 percent of Klawock thought harvests were
20 somewhat or much lower than needed. Hydaburg has said
21 500 deer will meet their subsistence needs. This is
22 their substantial evidence to continue the customary and
23 traditional way of life.

23

24

25 The SERAC is recommending to the Federal
26 Subsistence Board to exercise its authority to restrict
27 non-rural harvest of deer in Unit 2. Staff analysis
28 says, Page 96, that long-term habitat capability for deer
29 in Unit 2 is declining due to harvest of productive old
30 growth forest, reduced value of clear-cuts and further
31 reduction in habitat suitability of second growth stands.
32 It was further stated that clear-cuts reduced the
33 carrying capacity of deer winter range and results in
34 long-term reduction in deer population. The stem
35 exclusion stage creates a dense undergrowth with very
36 little deer forage for up to 200 years. Effective
37 commercial thinning, planting of red alder and second
38 growth management are needing immediate implementation to
39 enhance deer habitat to increase deer populations.

39

40

41 The Craig Community Association came up
42 with careful and responsible advice for management of
43 harvest for deer in Unit 2. The Craig Community
44 Association contacted several tribes on Prince of Wales
45 Island to identify common needs concerning deer harvest.
46 There is increased hunting pressure due to easier
47 accessibility to POW. The lack of an economy indicates
48 an increasing need for subsistence resources. Harvest
49 data does not reflect the actual harvest of rural
50 communities on Prince of Wales. Harvest data research by
51 tribes needs further funding. Overall, total numbers of

00325

1 deer needed per capita is increasing.

2

3

4 The data shows little or no harvest
5 decline because individuals have not been meeting their
6 subsistence needs in the first place. Most everyone has
7 testified that their subsistence needs are not being met.
8 That their subsistence needs are not being met is a
9 significant impact that has been occurring for years and
10 will continue to be a significant impact until management
11 tools are in place to recognize their subsistence
12 priority. The public testimony given is the substantial
13 evidence documenting subsistence needs are not being met.

13

14

15

16 Thank you for the multitude of comments.
17 This process works only as well as the dedicated effort
18 we put into it. I appreciate the depth of knowledge
19 shared with us. My charge as a Member of the SERAC is to
20 protect the subsistence priority of ANILCA for the health
21 of our communities and resource. Not to pit neighbor
22 against neighbor, but to protect the customary and
23 traditional uses by rural Alaska residents.

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

50

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you speaking
for the motion or against the motion?

MS. PHILLIPS: I am speaking in support
of the motion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would remind
Council, that was very good information, but please
indicate whether you're speaking for or against the
motion just for the record so we know. Other Council.
It would be Mr. Douville, followed by Ms. Garza.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I speak in favor of the motion. As I stated before in
some of my comments in speaking in favor, I was going to
say similar things as far as the habitat and subsistence
users have many obstacles. It's not like they can go out
and go shopping and get a deer. They're having a hard
time and they're telling you that, but there's a lot of
reasons why. I said before habitat is one of them. Some
of them are working. They only have weekends. The
window of opportunity is smaller. Some are also involved
in other subsistence activities or livelihoods, such as
fishing. So there's many things to consider when doing
this. Anything that enhances their opportunities, such

00326

1 as this proposal, is going to benefit subsistence, which
2 is what we're here for, to enhance opportunity to do
3 that.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Garza.

8

9 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
10 would like to support Proposal 5 as it has been amended.
11 I would like to go through the rationale. Under
12 conservation, as we have heard, the deer population is
13 stable and, if not, is only slightly declining. We
14 understand that there may potentially be larger declines
15 in the future as much of the logged land will move into
16 stage two, where it's exclusionary for deer passage.
17 However, I don't think that this proposal, as it is
18 written, will affect the conservation of the deer.

19

20 Under substantial evidence, Mr. Chair,
21 the main point that I am bringing forward on this is that
22 by providing an opportunity for rural residents only to
23 harvest in the days of August 1 to August 10, we are
24 meeting our obligation as a Council by providing an
25 opportunity to subsistence users. That is our obligation
26 under ANILCA. We have heard, as Ms. Phillips has
27 indicated, that the Prince of Wales residents are surely
28 not meeting their deer needs. They have continually
29 taken the same number, but as we have heard from Vickie
30 LeCornu, who was on this Council for several years, the
31 number that they are taking has never been enough and the
32 number that they needed was far higher than what we are
33 aware of.

34

35 In terms of the effect on subsistence
36 users, Mr. Chairman, this gives subsistence users an
37 opportunity to harvest with less competition in the area.
38 Generally speaking, subsistence users are on the lower
39 economic scale. They don't have the best boats, they
40 don't have the best cars, they don't have the best
41 anything, so this gives them a little bit of an edge.

42

43 The effect on other users, Mr. Chairman.
44 The data that we have been provided states that on the
45 average Ketchikan residents are taking somewhere around
46 1.2 deer. I think cutting back the permitted number from
47 four to two, if we follow that line of evidence that
48 we've been given, will not substantially decrease the
49 opportunity for Ketchikan residents. If the average is
50 1.2, there will be some who are taking four, there are

00327

1 others who are taking zero, so there will be some limited
2 cut-backs, but I think on the average it should not
3 affect Ketchikan residents.

4
5 My amendment, in terms of affecting other
6 users, by providing a 10-day closure as opposed to a one-
7 month closure ensures that Ketchikan residents can have
8 family hunting activities before school starts by going
9 over to Prince of Wales and hiking up with their
10 families. So, Mr. Chairman, I think that this proposal,
11 as amended, is a very good compromise. It works to
12 provide opportunities to rural residents while not
13 substantially having a negative effect on non-rural
14 residents.

15
16 Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
19 Mr. Douville.

20
21 MR. DOUVILLE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I
22 spoke in favor of the motion, but I also want to point
23 out one other thing. Unit 2 is not the only place to
24 hunt. Ketchikan has a wide area that has a four-deer
25 limit also, so it's not like we've deprived anybody of
26 hunting opportunity.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: To paraphrase what
31 you said, a reasonable opportunity will be provided for
32 -- is still available for those hunters to fulfill their
33 bag limit even if we were to adopt this motion?

34
35 MR. DOUVILLE: I believe so, Mr.
36 Chairman. We're only talking about Unit 2. I don't know
37 what the units are, 1(A), (B) and 3 are unaffected. This
38 only affects Unit 2.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
41 Council. Mr. Hernandez.

42
43 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 I also would like to speak in favor of the motion. With
45 this motion, we have placed a restriction on non-rural
46 hunters. I feel that a high level of evidence to support
47 that restriction is necessary. I feel, in the course of
48 our testimonies here this week from residents of Prince
49 of Wales Island, Staff, I felt we had a very substantial
50 amount of evidence that any reasonable person could draw

00328

1 conclusions. We are seeing some decline in the deer
2 population in Unit 2 and that subsistence users are not
3 having their needs met. One of the things that I wanted
4 to see from our actions was to not place too much of a
5 burden on non-rural residents. I felt that eliminating
6 all of the August hunting abilities for non-rural hunters
7 would be unfair to families who have always taken the
8 opportunity to go to Unit 2 and hunt deer together before
9 school starts. I didn't want to take that opportunity
10 away. I feel the August 10th date would have the least
11 adverse impacts on the non-subsistence users and I'm
12 happy with that.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
17 Prior to that, I'd like to add just a couple comments.
18 The State had opposed this proposal on Page 112 and, of
19 course, the very first sentence said that they did not
20 believe we had within the authority of SERAC to consider
21 this. We have evidence to the contrary; so, therefore,
22 we know that we can do this. This was also opposed by
23 Staff and I refer you to the language on Page 131 and
24 their justification of why they did not support it was
25 that there was no substantial evidence to indicate
26 subsistence users are unable to meet their subsistence
27 needs. Clearly, we heard evidence to the contrary that's
28 been presented. Any other discussion? Are you ready for
29 the question?

30

31 MS. GARZA: Question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
34 before you is on the main motion as amended on Page 113.
35 The amendment added the language August 10 to September
36 1st. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
41 same sign.

42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I haven't stated
46 the call yet. You have the floor. Go ahead. The motion
47 has passed. The amended motion has passed and has been
48 adopted by SERAC. Please go ahead.

49

50 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would like

00329

1 to thank the Council for accepting my amendment for
2 allowing part of August to be open for Ketchikan
3 residents. It is very important for Ketchikan residents
4 who are working to establish rural status. If you look
5 outside, live in Ketchikan, despite the fact that we have
6 180 inches of rain because we love this area, we live
7 here because we use this land, we use these fisheries and
8 we need this opportunity, so thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
11 comments before we proceed? The next item on the agenda
12 would be Proposal 6. Before I do that, are there any
13 requests from Staff to make an early presentation? Ms.
14 Wilson.

15

16 MS. WILSON: Did we vote on the main
17 motion yet? We voted on the amendment.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We voted on the
20 amendment. The amendment was passed for the substitute
21 language of August 10th. Subsequent to that, our last
22 vote was on the amended motion and the motion was
23 carried. Is that clear? Does anybody else have any
24 question about that? This is done. We're going to
25 proceed with Proposal No. 6. Staff. Please come to
26 order. Mr. Brainard, please proceed.

27

28 MR. BRAINARD: Good morning. My name is
29 Jim Brainard. I'm a wildlife biologist for the Forest
30 Service stationed in Petersburg. Unit 3 has quite a
31 history. In the late '60s, early '70s, deer populations
32 crashed throughout the entire unit. It was so bad at
33 times when people walking in the woods would walk up and
34 find a deer track and everybody would come look at it.
35 It was that unusual. It took about 20 years for the deer
36 population to come back to a huntable level. Parts of
37 Unit 3 have had severe restrictions on the take of deer
38 since then.

39

40 With this proposal, portions of Unit 3 on
41 Kupreanof Island would be brought in line with most of
42 the rest of the unit with the exception of Mitkof,
43 Woewodski and Butterworth Islands. This proposal mirrors
44 what would bring the Federal hunting opportunities in
45 line with the State with what the Board of Game has done
46 and it would move it back to 1 August to 30 November with
47 two bucks on the entire island of Kupreanof.

48

49 Here's more of the discussion I started
50 with earlier. Petersburg, the community of Petersburg

00331

1 Do we have any public testimony on Proposal 6? I have no
2 cards before me. Is there anybody in the audience that
3 wishes to testify? We are at Regional Council
4 deliberation. What are the Council's wishes on Proposal
5 6? Mr. Stokes.

6
7 MR. STOKES: I just want to say that I
8 speak in favor.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You need to make
11 the motion first, please. Also, please show the page.
12 Would you please tell what page so that everyone can
13 refer to the same page. I believe it is Page 145 that
14 you're talking about.

15
16 MR. STOKES: I make a motion to adopt
17 Proposal 6.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion
20 to adopt Proposal No. 6 and I believe the correct
21 language is on Page 145. Do we have a second.

22
23 MS. GARZA: Second.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
26 and seconded to adopt the language on Page 145. Is there
27 any Council discussion? Are you ready for the question?

28
29 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

32
33 MS. GARZA: I speak in favor of the
34 motion. It's my understanding there is no conservation
35 issue. We have a good report from Federal Staff. The
36 effect on subsistence users is to increase opportunities.
37 I don't see that there's an effect on other users, so I
38 support.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. That
41 was a good summary. Any other Council? Mr. Adams.

42
43 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I also speak in
44 favor of the motion. I see a good demonstration here of
45 the Feds and the State working together. If we can get
46 that working relationship with all of our proposals, I'm
47 sure that we would breeze right through these in no time
48 at all. So I speak in favor of the motion.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. Any

00332

1 other Council comments before we proceed to the vote?
2 Are you ready for the question?

3

4 MR. ADAMS: Question.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has
7 been called. The motion before you is to adopt the
8 language of Proposal No. 6 as shown on Page 145. All
9 those in favor say aye.

10

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
14 same sign.

15

16 (No opposing votes)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing none, the
19 proposal is adopted on Page 145. Proposal No. 7 is next
20 on the agenda. We're ready for Staff.

21

22 MS. REECK: Mr. Chair, can we have just a
23 couple minutes, please.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes. (Pause) The
26 meeting will please come back to order. We are on
27 Proposal 7. Staff presentation. Jill, please proceed.

28

29 MS. REECK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
30 Council. My name is
31 Jill Reeck. I'm lead Forest Service biologist for this
32 proposal. I'd like to refer the Council, please, to page
33 number 149, which is the beginning of this proposal.
34 This proposal was submitted by Alaska Department of Fish
35 & Game on mountain goats. We'd like to request closure
36 of all harvest on Cleveland Peninsula and for reasons of
37 consistency and conservation, we'd also like to reduce
38 the harvest limits elsewhere from two goats to one goat.

39

40 Existing regulation. Revillagigedo
41 Island no open season. Unit 1(B) north of LeConte Bay,
42 one goat by State registration permit. Unit 1(B) between
43 LeConte Bay and the North Fork of Bradfield River is
44 currently two goats. The first one by State registration
45 permit, the second goat is by Federal permit. The
46 remainders of Unit 1(A) and 1(B) is currently two goats
47 by State registration permit.

48

49 I'd also like to refer the Council to the
50 map on Page 155. This may help explain where some of

00333

1 these different areas are. The proposed regulation.
2 Revillagigedo Island would remain at no open season.
3 Portions of Units 1(A) and 1(B) on the Cleveland
4 Peninsula south of Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet would be
5 closed. Then the remainder of Units 1(A) and 1(B) would
6 be reduced from two goats to one goat by State
7 registration permit.

8

9 What I'd like to do for the Council is
10 kind of break this discussion up by these different
11 areas, starting with Cleveland Peninsula. We have a
12 picture of Cleveland here kind of showing all the
13 different sub-population areas of Cleveland Peninsula
14 mountain goats. They occur in very small isolated
15 sub-populations. I believe back in the 1980s some of
16 those sub-populations were as small as five goats. Also
17 back in the late '60s through the '80s fairly
18 consistently seeing probably roughly 50 to 80 goats. All
19 the current year surveys have been consistently going
20 down. The last few years survey numbers have been down
21 to approximately 10 goats. Data definitely suggests we
22 probably have a conservation concern for the Cleveland
23 populations.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Jill, I have one
26 question. Could you go back to that previous slide. The
27 numbers that were circled, those are the -- refer to the
28 amount of goats in the herd or what does that refer to?

29

30 MS. REECK: I would have to ask Mr.
31 Porter that question. It's actually his slide.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Porter, go
34 ahead.

35

36 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, Members of the
37 Board. These are estimates of what occurs in these
38 small, fragmented groups of goats. They're our best
39 counts during the last five years or so.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So these are your
42 estimates of the number of goats in those sub-
43 populations?

44

45 MR. PORTER: Yes. I might note that
46 there's not a whole lot of movement between those groups.
47 The viability of those groups of goats that remain
48 isolated is dependant on the billies moving between the
49 groups of nannies and kids. That occurs in October when
50 the season is open, so it makes them quite vulnerable to

00334

1 hunting pressure. If those billies were taken out, there
2 wouldn't be pregnant females, obviously, in the spring.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. That's
5 enough. I just wanted to know what the circles meant.
6 That's fine. You'll be given a chance. Thank you very
7 much.

8

9 MS. REECK: I'd like to move next to the
10 portion of 1(B) between the Bradfield River and LeConte
11 Bay. This area has currently been two goats, one goat by
12 State registration permit, one goat by Federal permit
13 for, I believe, at least the last 10 years. I believe
14 longer than that actually. Within this area there have
15 only been 11 Federal permits issued for that second goat
16 since 1991 and there's actually only been four goats
17 harvested during that period. In fact, there have been
18 no permits issued since 1997. This, to me, suggests that
19 subsistence users are not having a big impact on this
20 population and suggests to me, at least, that it would
21 unnecessarily be restricting subsistence users to have
22 this reduction within this area. We do not have a lot of
23 early survey data, so I was not able to compare just what
24 that population has done historically to now. I believe
25 the current information, the State survey has put it
26 roughly at about 100 animals. Like I say, there have
27 been very few second permits issued for subsistence use
28 within the last 10 to 11 years.

29

30 Moving on to the portion that would
31 actually be the remainder of Units 1(A), 1(B), this has
32 also been a two goat harvest limit. Both of these have
33 currently been by State registration permit. From what I
34 was able to tell from the census data, goat survey
35 numbers have fluctuated over the years since about the
36 late 1960s, but appeared to me to be pretty comparable
37 with what they were then. Some of the early data was
38 shown kind of a range between 500 and 700 animals and
39 that's kind of what I've gotten out of the survey data
40 for the last couple years. It goes up and down by
41 individual sub-area within this remainder but overall it
42 seems like a fairly stable population.
43 Rural users within this area have only accounted for 21
44 percent of the harvest and they've only accounted for --
45 about 18 percent of that was female harvest, which one of
46 the other concerns was the number of females being taken
47 out of these areas.

48

49 Overall, I believe there's been
50 approximately 30 to 40 second goat permits issued within

00335

1 this remainder of Units 1(A) and 1(B). The data, to me,
2 looking at just strictly mailing addresses on the hunter
3 harvest report indicated that the majority of those
4 second goat permits within this area were to non-rural
5 users. Therefore, to me, the data suggests that
6 subsistence users are not having a big impact also on
7 this area under a second goat permit.

8

9 Therefore, it was Staff's recommendation
10 to agree to close the portion on Cleveland Peninsula.
11 This would be a slight restriction for current
12 subsistence users, but we agreed that the population data
13 indicates there is a conservation concern and that any
14 additional harvest within this area right now could
15 threaten the long-term viability of those sub-
16 populations.

17

18 Just for a little bit more information, I
19 believe there's only been one to nine subsistence users
20 that have taken goats out on the second permit on this
21 area. Generally, it's been more one to three. A lot of
22 years zero. So we're not talking a large restriction,
23 but we do feel it's a conservation concern and should be
24 closed.

25

26 In light of the fact it didn't really
27 appear from the data that there was a need to restrict
28 subsistence users, we recommended the following
29 modification you'll find in your book on Page 167. It
30 would leave Revillagigedo Island the same as it is now,
31 closed. It would leave the portion north of LeConte Bay
32 as it currently is, one goat by State registration
33 permit. It would close the Cleveland Peninsula south of
34 Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet. And then it would leave
35 the remainder of Units 1(A) open for two goats for
36 Federal subsistence users. The first would be under
37 State registration permit, the second by a Federal
38 registration permit. This will be a separate, not
39 aligned with the current State regulations, but I just
40 did not feel the data supported restricting subsistence
41 users for these other areas. I guess, with that, I'll
42 take any questions the Council has.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions from the
45 Council. Mr. Hernandez.

46

47 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
48 Jill, I'm just trying to remember. On Revilla Island,
49 were goats planted there originally or are they native?

50

00336

1 MS. REECK: I know there was a
2 transplant. I believe it occurred approximately 1983.
3 I'm not positive whether that was a supplemental
4 transplant or a full-fledged initial transplant.

5
6 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm just wondering if you
7 can attribute the declines on Cleveland Peninsula to
8 anything in particular. Is it predation or is it hunters
9 that are causing the declines? What is your best guess
10 there as to why we've got a problem on Cleveland
11 Peninsula?

12
13 MS. REECK: I believe it's a combination
14 of factors. There's actually data under some of the
15 research papers that were done in the early 1980s on
16 Cleveland that talked about the potential threats to
17 viability of that population due to the number of small
18 isolated sub-herds and the inbreeding and, as Mr. Porter
19 was talking about, the movement of the billies having to
20 move between those small sub-populations of females.
21 Predation is definitely one factor that comes into play.
22 Hunting pressure has probably contributed to that. Like
23 I say, a lot of these areas have had a fairly high
24 portion of female harvest some years. So I think it's
25 probably just a whole combination of factors, plus the
26 way this Cleveland population is so spread out and
27 isolated into little sub-populations is finally coming
28 into play.

29
30 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm kind of disappointed
31 to hear that. I've hunted goats on Cleveland Peninsula
32 in area 1(B) and both north and south of LeConte Bay,
33 hunted all those areas. It's been a while. I was a
34 younger guy when I used to go up and do that kind of
35 stuff, but there seemed to be a fair number of goats up
36 there. I'm sorry to hear they're having problems there.
37 How about in the 1(B) districts there, do you have any
38 information as to what the breakdown is between
39 subsistence hunters and non-subsistence hunters?

40
41 MS. REECK: Actually, yes. If you will
42 turn to your proposal book on Page 163. Table 2b breaks
43 down the number of rural hunters and number of goats
44 harvested versus the non-rural hunters and goats
45 harvested for that particular area.

46
47 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. One other
48 question. Could you inform us as to what the regulations
49 are regarding the use of harvested goats. Is all the
50 goat required to be used? There's not a trophy hunt in

00337

1 other words. I know a lot of the non-subsistence use is
2 not for meat, it's for the horn and the trophy. So what
3 are the regulations there?

4
5 MS. REECK: I do believe under Federal
6 subsistence regulations you are required for almost all
7 species, and definitely including goat, to utilize all
8 usable parts.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
11 Thank you. You may want to stay there. We're in State
12 presentation. Hold on one second. Mr. Douville.

13
14 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 You did state what the reasons for this decline was.
16 Would you restate those?

17
18 MS. REECK: You're talking about the
19 Cleveland population?

20
21 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

22
23 MS. REECK: Yes, sir. I believe that
24 it's a combination of a lot of factors. Predominantly
25 the fact that the Cleveland population does occur in a
26 lot of very small, isolated sub-populations where
27 inbreeding is a problem. Plus a lot of the females are
28 bred by billies that move between the different
29 sub-populations. Predation is also a factor and also
30 hunting, I believe, has contributed in some way to the
31 decline of the population. I think it's all these
32 factors coming together. Like I say, in light of the
33 small, isolated sub-populations, it's really having an
34 impact.

35
36 MR. DOUVILLE: Is there any hard data
37 that would suggest whether it's wolf predation or actual
38 hunting? I do know that when you have inbreeding on
39 islands on deer, it really doesn't deplete them or
40 anything, but it makes them get smaller. I don't know if
41 goats are similar.

42
43 MS. REECK: I believe it can be a factor
44 and I can also believe that there may actually be nannies
45 that are not being bred every year just because of the
46 vulnerability of those billies moving between the
47 populations during hunting season. I guess I'd like to
48 also refer that question to the State, who's probably got
49 a better idea on goat biology than I do.

50

00338

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You state here
2 that Staff supports this proposal and it was a
3 conservation concern that's listed in your justification
4 and then referring also to the data. Was that
5 conservation concern mainly driven by rural hunters
6 taking too many or non-rural hunters?

7
8 MS. REECK: For the Cleveland Peninsula,
9 yes, we did support closing it for conservation concern.
10 The State has actually closed the State season this year
11 by Board of Game action for the last two years by special
12 emergency order. The concern by the Staff analysis was
13 additional harvest by rural residents. Like I say, we've
14 had a high some years of nine rural hunters. We figure
15 if that many hunters or even some number less than that
16 continued to take goats from this very isolated, small
17 population right now that it could jeopardize long-term
18 viability.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm referring to
21 Table 2a on Page 162. I believe this talks about the
22 Cleveland Peninsula and, to me, maybe you can correct me
23 there, but it looks like the total rural hunter take or
24 number of hunters was 24 and there were 100 non-rural
25 hunters. Rural hunters took seven, non-rural hunters
26 took 43. This appears to me to be that the conservation
27 concern that you have has been caused by the non-rural
28 hunters and you're asking the rural hunters that utilize
29 the Cleveland Peninsula to also sacrifice. Is that what
30 you're saying?

31
32 MS. REECK: I'd like to reiterate that
33 the State season has now been officially closed down
34 through Board of Game action. Yes, it is my biological
35 opinion that any further harvest, regardless whether it's
36 rural hunters, non-rural hunters, could put that
37 population in jeopardy.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any
40 other questions? Mr. Douville.

41
42 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 The reason I ask these questions, if you address one part
44 of the problem, which may be hunters, and there is
45 predation, you still have only taken care of part of the
46 problem. I guess if you close it to hunters, you're
47 still just making more goats for predators.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
50 questions for Staff? I'd like to ask you to stay there.

00339

1 Before we go to ADF&G, I have an introduction. Mr.
2 Adams, would you make the introduction, please.

3

4 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 Would the real Clarence Summers please stand. Ladies and
6 gentlemen, Mr. Clarence Summers. Mr. Summers, what is
7 your title?

8

9 MR. SUMMERS: Subsistence coordinator.

10

11 MR. ADAMS: For who?

12

13 MR. SUMMERS: National Park Service.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: State ADF&G.

16

17 MR. TITUS: Good morning. For the
18 record, this is Kim Titus speaking. A couple points I'd
19 like to clarify, especially as related to the Cleveland
20 Peninsula goat population. We took this issue before the
21 Board of Game and one of the issues that may be relevant
22 to this body is the fact that also within the State
23 system we have to provide opportunity in a subsistence
24 type context and when that came up when we proposed
25 closing this season and Mr. Porter can answer much of the
26 details about our emergency orders and the history of
27 this, along with some other clarifying points, one of the
28 issues for this board to recognize in our desire to see
29 Cleveland Peninsula closed for conservation reasons is
30 the alternative areas to hunt goats in southeast Alaska
31 and within the Ketchikan area here and up through
32 Petersburg and Wrangell. In general, goat herds are very
33 healthy. There's hundreds of goats here. So, the
34 closure of the Cleveland Peninsula relative to goat
35 hunting does not preclude other State or Federal
36 subsistence users, in our opinion, from alternative
37 locations to go hunt goats. There are many healthy goat
38 herds right behind town here, so there are lots of
39 alternatives. It isn't like this is the only goat herd.
40 This is a goat herd that's in trouble.

41

42 So I'd just like to bring that to your
43 attention because that was a standard we also had to deal
44 with relative to the State system and I think, to some
45 extent, it's a similar type of standard that you may have
46 to meet here. Are there alternative places for
47 Federally-qualified users to hunt goats and, in our
48 opinion, yes, there are, nearby, where there are very
49 healthy goat herds.

50

00340

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: One quick comment
2 on that. There is a different State standard and Federal
3 standard on that. Under State standards, if you provide
4 a reasonable opportunity in other areas as well as time
5 limits, that's fine, but under our standard, what we have
6 to talk about, is the continued opportunity for rural
7 users who have been using that Cleveland Peninsula. So
8 there are two different standards. They're similar, but
9 they are different. Mr. Porter.

10

11 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, Members of the
12 Board. I could address the question from Mr. Hernandez
13 earlier. He asked two questions. One was about the
14 translocation of goats to Revilla Island. There have
15 been two of those in the recent past. One in 1983 to an
16 area north of Carol Inlet on Revilla and another in 1987
17 to near Ketchikan here on Deer Mountain, both of which
18 are doing quite well. The one north of Carol Inlet is
19 currently being hunted. There is a season on that one.
20 The one right above town here in Ketchikan is not yet,
21 but we expect to open that on a limited basis in the near
22 future.

23

24 I could say, again, the numbers that you
25 had looked at on that map and the circles were our best
26 estimate and those are based on on-ground observations
27 and aerial surveys that we try to do every year. Those,
28 we feel, are fairly accurate, but the Cleveland is very
29 unique. Probably some of the most unique goat habitat in
30 the state. I'm not so familiar with habitat in B.C., but
31 the alpine is very distinct on the Cleveland and,
32 consequently, the scrub timber almost comes up into the
33 alpine, so you don't really have an open alpine habitat
34 and it makes it very difficult to survey, so those
35 numbers are our best extrapolation given our highest
36 counts and on-the-ground best estimate.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Again, I refer you
39 to the table on 162 where the rural hunters averaged 1.4
40 goats per year. Nobody gets .4 of a goat. But given
41 that that was the number, whether it was one or two, and
42 the chart that you presented earlier had 36 goats by my
43 count as the estimate there, could a rural hunt, this is
44 rural hunters we're talking about, be safely conducted
45 without conservation concerns if they were to take no
46 more than two goats from the estimated populations that
47 you have here?

48

49 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair. The standard
50 that we try to approach goat populations is around 100

00341

1 goats as a viable population or sub-population. With the
2 Cleveland Peninsula at the level, given our best
3 estimates, and the current level of harvest, we felt that
4 any harvest of this population could potentially endanger
5 it. That's not to say if it were open under Federal
6 regulation that maybe some of those groups couldn't
7 sustain a small harvest, but you wouldn't be able to
8 direct people in to where on the Cleveland Peninsula that
9 they were hunting necessarily. So they could impact one
10 of those very small, fragile groups of goats.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.
13 Council questions for ADF&G Staff. Dr. Titus.

14

15 MR. TITUS: Thank you. There was a
16 comment before about meat salvage requirements and
17 essentially they're the same under State and Federal law
18 for all big game. You have to remove all of the meat
19 before you remove the hide and the skull and the horns.
20 So, the State regs and the Federal regs are very similar
21 in that vein for all big game, that the meat must all be
22 removed.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions?
25 Thank you for your presentation. Thank you, Jill, for
26 staying with the. We're now to other agency comments.
27 Any other agency comments? Tribal governments. Are
28 there any tribal representatives presentations on
29 Proposal 7. Fish & Game Advisory Committee comments.
30 Any Fish & Game Advisory Committee? Summary of written
31 public comments.

32

33 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we have no
34 written public comments on this proposal.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Public testimony.
37 I do not have any cards on this Proposal 7. Is there any
38 member of the public that would like to testify on
39 Proposal 7? We are at Regional Council deliberations.
40 What is the Council's wishes and please address, again,
41 the page. I believe the page is 167. Go ahead,
42 Mr. Douville.

43

44 MR. DOUVILLE: Before we make the motion,
45 I still may have some questions here. It reduces the
46 number of goats from two to one. Is there a provision
47 there for a rural user to get that second goat?

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Maybe Jill could
50 come forward. I believe the language on 167 does allow a

00342

1 Federal registration permit. Could you please clarify
2 that for the second goat? Any other Council questions
3 concerning the possible motion? Mr. Douville, go ahead.

4

5 MR. DOUVILLE: A Federal registration is
6 required for the second one, but it is not for the first
7 one? You have to go through the State to get that?

8

9 MS. REECK: That is correct. It seems
10 like it's been kind of a long-term history to utilize
11 State registration permits where possible since this
12 would be a departure from existing State regulations.
13 That's why the second goat would be by Federal permit.
14 This adopts the language that is currently in the
15 existing regulations for that portion between LeConte Bay
16 and North Fork of the Bradfield. Just extending it to
17 the other areas to take in the second goat.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead and
20 continue, Mike.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. I move to
23 adopt the proposal on 167.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion
26 to adopt the language on Page 167, Proposal 7. Is there
27 a second?

28

29 MR. STOKES: Second.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion has
32 been seconded. Before the Council is the adoption of the
33 language as shown on Page 167 for Proposal 7. Council.
34 Maker of the motion, would you like to go first? Is
35 there any discussion on the motion? I want to remind the
36 Council that we still have to go through the rationale
37 for why we're going to make this recommendation. We
38 can't just simply adopt it. We do need to address the
39 four points. Ms. Phillips.

40

41 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield,
42 thank you. I support the Proposal 7. Staff analysis has
43 shown closing the season on the Cleveland would have a
44 minor impact on subsistence hunters and the goat
45 populations may not sustain a yearly harvest of greater
46 than two to four percent of the population. Recovery of
47 the goat population would have a long-term positive
48 effect by providing subsistence use into the future.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other

00343

1 Council. Mr. Stokes.

2

3 MR. STOKES: I support this. In the
4 past, I've hunted most of these areas and I know this
5 will be good for it.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council on
8 other rationale. Mr. Douville.

9

10 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 I believe that it meets the conservation criteria in
12 Title VIII and I believe there is substantial evidence
13 presented by Staff to support this proposal and I believe
14 that it has minimal effect on subsistence users and there
15 are other areas to help support their needs. I don't
16 believe it will have an effect, very little if any, on
17 other users.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
20 Douville. Mr. Adams.

21

22 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 Again, I see evidence here of the State and the Feds
24 working together and, for that purpose, I think that's
25 sufficient enough for me to support this motion.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
30 other Council speaking to support or oppose? I believe
31 we have addressed all the points. Is that correct? Any
32 other discussion?

33

34 MS. GARZA: Question.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has
37 been called. The motion before you is to adopt the
38 language on Page 167 on Proposal 7. All those in favor
39 signify by saying aye.

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
44 same sign.

45

46 (No opposing votes)

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing none, the
49 motion is adopted for the language on 167. We have a
50 tabled motion. If someone would like to bring it off the

00344

1 floor. We did table No. 2. The correct motion would
2 have been postpone it to this time, but it is tabled, so
3 if someone would like to take it off the table, this
4 might be the time.

5

6 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would move
7 that we take Proposal 2 off the table.

8

9 MR. ADAMS: Second.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
12 objection? Proposal 2 is before you at this time.
13 What's the page?

14

15 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. The executive
16 summary for Proposal No. 2 is on Page 59.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Page
19 59. Council's wishes. Meredith, I would like to ask you
20 to review the minutes, if you could, or the transcript
21 and bring us up to date on exactly where we were on this
22 proposal if you would, please. Oh, you can't do that?
23 Dr. Schroeder can do that.

24

25 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. Where I
26 think the Council was at on this proposal, we had gone
27 through and Council had heard a briefing on this
28 proposal. This proposal concerns the designated hunter
29 program and whether or not this proposal would extend
30 designated hunter provisions across all ungulate species
31 around the state. For our region, I'd refer you to Page
32 70 of your Council book. The ungulate hunt sorted by
33 regions and species for the 68 hunts and regulations. Of
34 66 hunts and regulations, 21 at the present time provide
35 for designated hunters.

36

37 In our region, we have a designated
38 hunter program, which has been implemented very
39 successfully for deer in all units. We have no
40 designated hunter program for goats in any units and we
41 have a designated hunter program for moose in Game
42 Management Unit 5. The way the existing designated
43 hunter systems in southeast have come up have been by
44 proposal acted by the Regional Council and then passed by
45 the Federal Subsistence Board.

46

47 What the proposal before you would do
48 would establish a standardized way of doing designated
49 hunter permits. It would also, if passed as written,
50 establish designated hunter provisions for moose hunting

00345

1 in Units 1 and 3 and for goat hunting in Units 1, 4 and 5
2 in our region. When we gave the presentation yesterday,
3 we noted that there was some concern about whether or not
4 ungulate populations that are small should have
5 designated hunter provisions applied to them. These
6 would mainly be goat and muskox and sheep populations
7 around the state.

8

9 There's some discussion that is not
10 reflected in the printed materials that perhaps the
11 blanket designated hunter program around the state should
12 apply to deer, moose and caribou only. The Council
13 wanted to do our goat proposal before we acted on this
14 and, for that reason, you postponed action on this
15 proposal. I think that brings us up to date, Mr.
16 Chairman.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr.
19 Schroeder. By my notes, I have that we adopt -- there
20 was a motion and a second to adopt the language as shown
21 on Page 72. Subsequent to that we tabled the motion,
22 postponed. Is that correct? Okay. So the motion before
23 you at this time is to adopt the language on Page 72 and
24 it's open for discussion.

25

26 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Mass
27 confusion. Mr. Chairman. While I understand that the
28 intent of this proposal is to make the regulations a
29 little bit more in line with each other, I will speak
30 against the motion. I think there are too many
31 exceptions we would have to make for Southeast; the goats
32 in Unit 1, the moose in the Unik River area. We heard
33 yesterday that that is a small population, a small number
34 of take. And in regards to deer, we heard that in some
35 units where there are smaller seasonal takes, if there is
36 a year where there's only two deer that you can take,
37 then someone may want to have more than two designated
38 permits in order to provide for additional families. So I
39 think we could spend half the day providing exceptions to
40 this proposal and it would be easier just not to support
41 it.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
46 Council. Mr. Adams.

47

48 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We
49 addressed this same proposal in our Subsistence Resource
50 Commission meeting last week. One of the concerns that I

00346

1 brought up at that meeting and I'm going to bring it
2 forth here is that this proposal was submitted by the
3 Office of Subsistence Management. Again, you know, I
4 think that we -- I have a problem with proposals coming
5 from the top down. I really believe, you know, that they
6 should begin at the grass roots and I think we talked
7 about that the other day. It should come through the
8 process. If it's begun with an individual even. If they
9 get an organization of some sort to support it, that
10 proves to me that it has gone through the process of
11 public hearings and comments and so forth. When it
12 reaches our level, we know that it has been adequately
13 researched so that we can make an intelligent decision on
14 it. I remember asking the question in Tazalina last week
15 about this, did it go through public comment and so
16 forth, and I think the answer was, yes, it did. Again,
17 you know, I have this problem with proposals coming from
18 the top down.

19

20 What we did with this proposal, and I
21 might open it up for discussion, is that we went ahead
22 and supported it with a modification. That modification
23 was that it would align with State regulations. Other
24 than the fact that I think there was a provision in the
25 State regs where it says something about the elderly, 65
26 years or older, or 70 percent disabled of some sort. We
27 crossed that out and said must demonstrate a need. Thank
28 you, Mr. Chairman.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
31 Council. This is somewhat different than our rationale
32 for why we're making our recommendation on this. It's
33 different than proposals on the effects on the users.
34 Also, I'd remind you that we have almost virtually all of
35 this language in unit-specific regulations right now for
36 Unit 1 through 5. Other Council. Ms. Wilson.

37

38 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chair. You mentioned
39 that there's other regulations in our units down here in
40 Southeast. Is that for deer and moose and all the
41 ungulates? I also have a question if we could change
42 this proposal to just name the deer.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder,
45 could you please answer that.

46

47 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Wilson.
48 The Regional Council in Southeast did excellent work in
49 establishing designated hunter programs in previous
50 meetings. You'll see on Page 53 of your Board book the

00347

1 existing regulations for Southeast for deer in 1, 2, 3, 4
2 and 5. There also is a regulation in here that covers
3 moose in Unit 5. So these were specific regulations
4 brought forth through the Regional Council system to
5 address our needs. These regulations would disappear if
6 there was an adoption of statewide regulation. The
7 statewide regulation would then permit our existing
8 designated hunts to continue under a slightly different
9 wording of new regulation.

10

11 I did point out to you that there was
12 what I considered to be a minor change in wording in the
13 new regulation that's shown on Page 50. In the second
14 paragraph on Page 50, the wording of our regulation at
15 the present time says the taking does not violate
16 recognized principals of wildlife conservation. The four
17 lines after that are added in in the proposed regulation.
18 I'm not sure that these are substantive changes. I think
19 they're there basically to mirror action that was taken
20 on other proposals, so we want to have proposal
21 consistency.

22

23 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please go ahead,
26 Mr. Douville.

27

28 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
29 I believe we're dealing with Proposal 2 here and I think
30 50 is Proposal 1, so we've got some confusion.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza, we are
33 on Proposal 2. Let's just make sure everybody knows
34 we're on Proposal 2 on Page 72 and the question asked by
35 Ms. Wilson was unit-specific regulations that are
36 referred to in that language. Dr. Garza.

37

38 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. As
39 Bill alluded to yesterday, I may be dumb as a piece of
40 kelp, but I'm awfully confused here. Mr. Schroeder
41 didn't help it any for a short span there. I understand
42 we're looking at Proposal 2 as a more statewide
43 designated hunter definition and we're trying to look at
44 Page 70 and try to get a feel for Southeast. There's
45 deer, goat, moose, units all hunts, units designated
46 hunting. In the right column where it says units
47 designated hunting on Page 70, is that currently where we
48 have designated hunting opportunities, Mr. Schroeder?

49

50 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Garza, I must be

00348

1 getting a little dizzy after three days of meetings. I
2 meant to point you to Page 74, which talks about the
3 existing designated hunter provisions. We do have
4 designated hunts for deer in 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. For
5 moose, in Unit 5. We do not have designated hunts for
6 goat at the present time. We also do not have designated
7 hunts for moose in Units 1 and 3.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Wilson, did
10 that address your questions on what the unit specific
11 ones that we'd already adopted were?

12

13 MS. WILSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any other
16 discussion on this? Dr. Garza.

17

18 MS. GARZA: We're still confused over
19 here. So, I'm back-pedaling here, changing with the
20 tide, so to speak, this dumb piece of kelp here. So, if
21 we supported this proposal as is and there would be
22 designated hunting for moose in all units in Southeast,
23 goats in all units in Southeast and, as it currently
24 stands, deer in all units in Southeast. Is that correct?

25

26 MR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Garza, that's
27 correct.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you like to
30 follow up, Dr. Garza? Other Council. We'll stand down
31 for a few minutes.

32

33 (Off record)

34

35 (On record)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting is
38 back to order. I'd like to remind the Council where we
39 are and the public. We are considering the language as
40 shown on Page 72. That's the motion before you. Is
41 there any discussion? Mr. Kitka.

42

43 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
44 have just one portion of this that I'd like to bring up
45 and discuss and that is the number of permits that the
46 designated hunter is allowed to use and the instances
47 around some of the communities like Sitka where I know
48 the distance to travel during the subsistence hunt is
49 considerable. Two permits doesn't really make sense to
50 these people because they need more than that to be able

00349

1 to hunt for four and five families at a time.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I believe the
6 language would cover that. Not at this time. This would
7 be the default State two harvest permits and then under
8 unit-specific regulations that are in the remainder of
9 the text, Units 1 through 5, could then apply for more
10 than two. Other Council. Are you ready for the
11 question?

12

13 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. This dumb
14 piece of kelp has shifted with the tide and is now going
15 the other way. So I will speak in favor of this motion.
16 It's my understanding that it will increase the
17 opportunity for subsistence use. I need a clarification
18 on procedure if we support this motion. Once we pass it,
19 would we amend it or would we amend it now for the
20 specific unit criteria?

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I will refer that
23 to Dr. Schroeder. I do not believe the unit-specific
24 regulations are on the table at this time, but I will ask
25 for a clarification.

26

27 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. My reading
28 of this is that this proposal is dealing with the kind of
29 omnibus designated hunter proposal. I'm not sure whether
30 we're set to pass a proposal that would deal with unit-
31 specific regulations at this time. I would like to refer
32 that to Mr. Rivard. Perhaps he could help us a little
33 bit.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Unless there is no
36 objection, I would like to ask Mr. Rivard as well as Mr.
37 Boyd to come forward and answer the questions. This is a
38 proposal from OSM and the Council would like some
39 clarifications. Please proceed.

40

41 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. So I can
42 understand again, I would like to have the question
43 repeated, please.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I believe the
46 question by Mr. Kitka was whether the unit-specific
47 regulations could be -- did not fit his needs as well as
48 Dr. Garza's comment was unit-specific regulations on the
49 table at this time. In other words, could we specify
50 those unit regulations. Is that correct?

00350

1 MR. BOYD: If I could take just a moment
2 to look at this and then turn back and look at the
3 appendix, Mr. Chair.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Now you know why
6 we're going both ways with the tide as well as a piece of
7 kelp. Dr. Garza.

8
9 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I guess the
10 intent is if we support this proposal and we have
11 concerns about either increasing or decreasing an
12 opportunity in a unit in a specific ungulate, can we make
13 the amendment to the motion before or after the motion
14 has passed?

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Boyd and Mr.
17 Rivard.

18
19 MR. BOYD: Well, I'm struggling with
20 this, Mr. Chair, probably for the same reasons you're
21 struggling with it. I think the intent of the proposal,
22 as Mr. Schroeder said, it was a blanket proposal to try
23 to standardize the approach we're dealing with with
24 designated hunter permits. I don't think we evaluated it
25 within the context of specific situations that this may
26 apply where you may want to modify pieces of this. That
27 was the original intent. So we haven't evaluated the
28 proposal with other situations in mind where you may want
29 to deviate from this blanket approach. However, I think
30 I'd be remiss in saying you shouldn't think about that,
31 nor should you bring those issues up and make those
32 recommendations if you want to do that. I would suggest
33 that you consider those if you have some specific changes
34 in mind.

35
36 Saying that, I'm not exactly sure where
37 that's going to end up in the overall process going to
38 the Federal Subsistence Board. That's something we're
39 going to have to think about more specifically with
40 regard to what I don't know right now and that is what
41 you're going to recommend with regard to specific changes
42 and what the implications are with regard to other
43 things, like the conservation issues associated with a
44 particular population that you're dealing with and maybe
45 there are many other factors. But I think it would be
46 appropriate for you to go ahead and make those
47 recommendations at this time and then we can sort that
48 out as we go.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: As I understand

00351

1 that, you believe it is appropriate at this time to go
2 ahead and offer an amendment to this that addresses unit-
3 specific requirements?

4

5 MR. BOYD: Yes, Mr. Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Rivard, do you
8 have anything to add?

9

10 MR. RIVARD: Well, if I understand Dr.
11 Garza's question as well, I think procedurally you'd
12 probably want to offer these as amendments or your
13 modified language to the proposal before voting overall.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Could
16 you please stay with us on this. Council. Mr.
17 Hernandez.

18

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. It is my
20 understanding during testimony that should we approve
21 this proposal as proposed in the case of unit-specific
22 concerns or conservation concerns, there was opportunity
23 for emergency regulation dealing with those so that we
24 may not necessarily have to address those types of
25 concerns in an amended form at this time. Such concerns
26 could be dealt with as they arise by emergency action.
27 Is that correct or am I mistaken?

28

29 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. That's really
30 difficult to discuss this in the abstract. It would be
31 more helpful if you had a particular case in hand that
32 you were looking at. I'd say generally you can apply
33 emergency actions or special actions to deal with
34 conservation issues, but it may not be appropriate in
35 every case.

36

37 MR. HERNANDEZ: To be specific, we have a
38 conservation concern with the goat population in some
39 areas. If one of those areas were to become a
40 conservation concern and it had a designated hunter
41 option there due to this proposal, would there be the
42 means for Staff to eliminate that designated hunter
43 opportunity for goat hunting as an emergency order or
44 would we have to make an amendment to the proposal now to
45 disqualify goats for designated hunters?

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder.

48

49 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hernandez.
50 My understanding is the designated hunter program is not

00352

1 really seen as a management tool such that it could be
2 used for raising or lowering harvest in that way. If it
3 is a bona fide subsistence activity, before it would be
4 restricted we'd need to consider restricting other hunts
5 on a particular population. So I'm probably back to what
6 Mr. Boyd was saying, you really have to look at all the
7 factors there. Designated hunters is specifically not a
8 management tool to raise or lower subsistence hunts and
9 probably shouldn't be used that way if other hunting
10 opportunities are being provided to other people.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Did that address
13 your question? Next is Ms. Wilson followed by Dr. Garza.

14

15 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I tend not to
16 support this proposal unless we can make amendments to
17 it. I keep thinking of the Hydaburg people wanting more
18 than two designated hunter permits in their possession.
19 I think Marty mentioned too that sometimes when you go
20 hunting for deer -- I'm thinking of deer specifically, I
21 think. If you go a long ways and you have to spend all
22 that gas, you need to have more than two permits on you
23 if you're going to hunt for the people. And I wanted to
24 know what the unit-specific regulations in Section .26.
25 I don't know what that is.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder,
28 would you please clarify the unit-specific regulations?
29 I believe they're on Page 74.

30

31 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 I'll try not to go back to Page 50. Unit-specific
33 regulations are listed there. These would be existing
34 unit-specific regulations. For example, in Unit 9(D),
35 the last sentence there, the designated hunter may hunt
36 for any number of participant recipients but may have no
37 more than four harvest limits in his possession at one
38 time. This existing unit specification would trump the
39 wording of the regulation we're talking about passing.
40 There may be other examples of that nature. I'll leave
41 it at that.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

44

45 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr.
46 Schroeder, you've once again confused me. On Page 74,
47 under deer Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8, I see it's two, not
48 four, so are you reading for a different region?

49

50 MR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Garza, I was pulling

00353

1 out an example where the existing unit specification
2 provides something different from what the new regulation
3 provides. That's the case for Unit 9(D) and it may be
4 the case for a number of other units. At the present
5 time, our existing regulations allow two bag limits.

6

7 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, if I can follow
8 up. I am speaking in favor of the motion. I think I
9 understood the point that Mr. Hernandez was making and
10 the response to that. My initial concern was what about
11 regions where there are conservation concerns. However,
12 even in those events, we still have elderly people and
13 other people who still need whatever it is they need.
14 Even under conservation concerns we still have those
15 subsistence needs.

16

17 In terms of the ungulates, thinking of
18 goats, we still have elder people who have to have their
19 goat meat. We have elder weavers who need those goat
20 hides for beautiful ravens tail garments. That's a very
21 important customary and traditional use and those women
22 are not women that can go hiking up these mountains and
23 need designated hunters to do this type of work. So I'm
24 speaking for the motion as it is and the only concern
25 that I had was for Unik River moose. I'm not sure what
26 to do with that, if we would deal with an amendment here
27 or what.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: As advised, I
30 would suggest that we deal with that amendment at this
31 time. Any other Council. Mr. Kitka.

32

33 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
34 feel that in the Sitka area the subsistence hunting
35 period they set aside from January 1st, I'm not sure how
36 long the period is open, but during this period it is
37 open for subsistence I believe the carrying of permits
38 for a designated hunter should be more than two and only
39 during that period.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it your wish to
42 amend the two harvest limit to a higher number?

43

44 MR. KITKA: Yes, it is.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second
47 to that amendment to change two harvest limit to --
48 excuse me. First you need to specify in the motion how
49 many harvest limits you recommend.

50

00354

1 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
2 would recommend four to six designated permits.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Five?

5
6 MR. KITKA: Five would be a reasonable
7 number, I believe.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a motion
10 to amend to change the language two harvest limits to
11 read five harvest limits. Is there a second?

12
13 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
16 and seconded to amend the motion to substitute five for
17 the word two under the number of harvest limits.
18 Discussion. Mr. Kitka, I would like to ask you to
19 clarify, is the five harvest limits in your amendment
20 meant to include only the deer in Unit 4 or is it meant
21 to include all of the ungulates that are talked about in
22 the main motion?

23
24 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To
25 clarify, I was speaking to the special set aside season
26 for subsistence within Unit 4. The distance that we have
27 to travel to get the ungulates in that time is a
28 considerable distance and it doesn't make sense to spend
29 the whole day running back and forth to get more permits
30 when we have to travel a distance of half a day to get to
31 this area of subsistence.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just for clarity,
34 the way I understand this, is that you are desiring to
35 substitute five for two in the unit-specific regulation
36 Unit 4 deer only.

37
38 MR. KITKA: That is correct.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Does that meet
41 with the second? Who seconded? Mike, does that meet
42 with your recollection what you seconded, that it was
43 specific to Unit 4, that it raised the deer harvest
44 limits from two to five? Designated harvest permit.
45 Changing the words from five to two. You seconded it.
46 We clarified that. I want to make sure you're satisfied
47 that that meets your approval to second it.

48
49 What we should do is we should look on
50 the screen and make sure that that was the intent of the

00355

1 maker of the motion as well as the second before we
2 discuss it. Mr. Kitka, is that your amendment?

3

4 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Yes, it is.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And the second
8 concurs?

9

10 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Before the Council
13 at this time is an amendment to the main motion. The
14 amendment to the motion is as shown on the screen, which
15 reads the designated hunter in Unit 4 in the January 1st
16 - 31st portion of the hunting season for deer may hunt
17 for any number of recipients but may have no more than
18 five harvest limits in his or her possession at any one
19 time. This is unit specific under discussion. Council.
20 Ms. Wilson.

21

22 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I just need
23 to know where Unit 4 is and what areas does it include.
24 I don't have my map.

25

26 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Wilson.
27 Unit 4 is the ABC Islands and I believe Ms. Phillips is
28 showing you this boundary at this time.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is everyone clear
31 what Unit 4 encompasses? Is it available to have a map
32 of that? Make sure the book goes around so we know what
33 Unit 4 is and note this was proposed by a resident of
34 Unit 4 who has that information and maybe he could
35 elaborate on that if you have any further questions. Any
36 other Council? Mr. Hernandez.

37

38 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman, I think I
39 want to speak against the amendment. It seems to me that
40 the issue stated for the reason for this amendment is to
41 align State and Federal regulations statewide. I guess I
42 feel uncomfortable in making unit-specific amendments at
43 this time. It would have to possibly send this proposal
44 back through the whole process again. Things would not
45 be in align necessarily throughout the state if we make
46 amendments. I think I'd rather vote the original
47 amendment up or down.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just so it's clear
50 in my mind what we are doing, the language that's on Page

00356

1 72 says the designated hunter may hunt for any number of
2 recipients but may have no more than two harvest limits
3 in his or her possession at any one time, unless
4 otherwise specified in unit-specific regulations in
5 Section 26. This is what I believe we are trying to
6 address, is a unit-specific regulation. The default
7 limit for the state of Alaska would be two harvest
8 limits. We are trying to address the differing
9 requirements that each unit may require. So we are not
10 affecting the default limit, only the unit-specific
11 regulations with this amendment. Further discussion on
12 the amendment. Ms. Phillips.

13

14 MS. PHILLIPS: I, too, will not support
15 the amendment. I believe that sort of a change should go
16 through the public process with the public being able to
17 testify on the increase of a harvest limit.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
20 comments. Mr. Douville.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 I seconded this motion to get it on the floor for
24 discussion. I do not support it and I'll tell you why.
25 You now currently can take two harvest limits. I don't
26 see one person going out and collecting six limits in any
27 unit. I don't care which one it is. You simply couldn't
28 handle that many. On the other hand, you could take two
29 or three hunters that can have two harvest limits in
30 their possession. If you have three hunters, you could
31 take six. Let's redo this. Three hunters could have six
32 possession limits, which is quite a number of deer. So I
33 speak against the amendment.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
36 Council. First we'll go to Mr. Stokes and then to Mr.
37 Kitka.

38

39 MR. STOKES: I speak against this
40 amendment. When we go out, there's normally three or
41 four guys going any length from town. If it's anything
42 like Wrangell, we've got a couple three predators there
43 that you could go out and shoot and shoot and shoot, so
44 I'm afraid this might happen.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Mr.
47 Kitka.

48

49 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
50 Maybe I didn't make myself clear. It isn't like we can

00357

1 get the deer back in one day. Most of the time we only
2 have to go hunt for the subsistence things. It might
3 take a day of travel. If you limit us to just two
4 permits a day, maybe we need to make it in possession per
5 day. I don't know how I can make it back from a trip
6 that might take overall two days to do.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
11 Dr. Schroeder, if you would please put the amendment back
12 on the screen. Is Council ready for action? If there's
13 no further discussion, the amendment is before you.
14 You'll be voting on the language as shown on the screen.
15 The amendment is the designated hunter in Unit 4 in the
16 January 1st to 31st portion of the hunting season for
17 deer may hunt for any number of recipients but may have
18 no more than five harvest limits in his or her possession
19 at any one time. All those in favor please signify by
20 saying aye.

21

22 IN UNISON: Aye.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
25 same sign.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is
30 defeated. We are back to the main motion as shown on
31 Page 72. Council action. Mr. Adams.

32

33 MR. ADAMS: Call for the question, Mr.
34 Chairman.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
37 further discussion? Ms. Phillips.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield. I'm
40 inclined to vote against this proposal. I think it
41 should be on a case-by-case basis. The moose populations
42 in some areas are difficult to get to. To have two
43 harvests of a moose, it's hard enough to take care of one
44 moose. To put another one on top of it for some areas is
45 not good conservation to me.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
48 Ms. Wilson.

49

50 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I was for the

00358

1 more than two designated hunter permits in your hands,
2 but I thought maybe we could do that with the process of
3 public input also, but we voted it down. The other thing
4 is I think we need to be unit specific in this and what
5 we do have on hand now is unit specific, so I want to
6 vote this down also because Patricia just mentioned about
7 the moose and then there's a question about the goats. I
8 really think it needs to be unit specific and so forth.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

11

12 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
13 will be voting in favor of this motion as it is to
14 provide the opportunity to have two designated or
15 yourself and one designated hunt permits in your hand for
16 all of the ungulates in Southeast. I think we are
17 confusing the issue of regulation with the opportunity
18 for subsistence users. If we provide that opportunity
19 and someone has the opportunity to go get two goats and
20 one of those goats will be given to a weaver, I don't
21 think we should deny the weaver that opportunity because
22 that population is low if the hunt will take place
23 anyway. The same with moose. If there are conservation
24 concerns and that will be dealt with with the total
25 number of moose that are taken without denying the
26 opportunity for subsistence uses and for the recipient of
27 those resources by elderly and people who cannot
28 otherwise go out and get those resources. So I speak in
29 favor of the motion as it currently stands.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Stokes
32 followed by Ms. Wilson.

33

34 MR. STOKES: I speak in favor of this.
35 My reason is that there are only -- the hunters that go
36 out, they're after their own meat and they're not going
37 to have an extra ticket with them as far as moose is
38 concerned in the Wrangell area. I hunted goat in my
39 younger years and one is sufficient to pack out because
40 you can't leave anything on the mountain. I know we've
41 had to make two or three trips just to get the goat and
42 the head. So I speak against the motion.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Wilson.

45

46 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I change my
47 vote. After listening to Dolly's rationale, okay.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council?
50 I would support this motion and urge you to adopt it for

00359

1 the same reasons that Dr. Garza talked. It does increase
2 the opportunity to subsistence users. The word unguates
3 is an improvement over the word deer. It can be
4 addressed. The two harvest limits that are talked about
5 at this time are no different than the unit-specific
6 regulations that we have in effect right now. There are
7 two. I would expect and fully encourage others to bring
8 forward a higher number if they want to in a proposal
9 form. Are you ready for the question?

10

11 MS. WILSON: Question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The language
14 before you is on Page 72. The amendment had failed, so
15 the language that's shown on that page is before you at
16 this time. I'm going to call for the vote on this. All
17 those in favor of Proposal No. 2.

18

19 MS. GARZA: Do we have to do the
20 rationale?

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't know if we
23 have to or not. This is different than a proposal that
24 has to do with users. Is that correct, Mr. Boyd?

25

26 MR. BOYD: You're not changing harvest
27 limits or anything like that, so I would agree that the
28 rationale statement does not have to be as extensive as
29 the four points that you were using previously.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion before
32 you is on Page 72. All in favor of adopting Proposal No.
33 2 please signify by saying aye.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
38 same sign.

39

40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion has
43 carried. The language on Page 72, Proposal No. 2 has
44 been adopted. We are now on Proposal 10. Thank you for
45 your help, gentlemen. Proposal No. 10. Staff
46 presentation. This will take us a couple minutes. You
47 have a few minutes to grab a quick cup of coffee. We're
48 doing pretty good, folks, but we want to get these done
49 before noon.

50

00360

1 (Off record - Ms. Wilson leaves for rest
2 of session)

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Proposal No. 10,
6 opening the Federal wolf hunting season six weeks
7 earlier. We are at Staff presentation.

8

9 MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
10 Council. My name is Kurt Aluzas. I'm a wildlife
11 biologist with the U.S. Forest Service out of Wrangell
12 and I'm here to discuss Proposal No. 10, which would look
13 at opening the unit to wolf hunting season six weeks
14 earlier for Federally-qualified subsistence users. This
15 proposal was submitted by the Southeast Regional Advisory
16 Council and the general gist of the intention was to
17 increase the opportunity for rural wolf hunters, allow
18 for wolf hunting during the peak in wolf hunting
19 activities, with the idea that most of these animals are
20 taken by hunting opportunistically while people are out
21 deer hunting and there's not necessarily a concerted
22 effort to go out solely in search of wolves during
23 hunting activities, so it's something that happens during
24 the deer hunting activity. It's an opportunity they're
25 given and overall just allow a greater use of this
26 subsistence resource by hunters.

27

28 The proposed Federal regulation for Unit
29 2 wolf hunting, basically all it's doing is allowing for
30 an earlier opening beginning October 1 instead of
31 November 15. Let me back up real quick and just say that
32 this is starting on Page 183 in your workbook there. The
33 bag limit stays the same, five wolves, and the ending day
34 of March 15 stays the same. This is the Unit 2 map,
35 which you're well familiar with by now.

36

37 The wolf conservation issues that we're
38 dealing with here are predominantly, at least for this
39 particular proposal, I'm going to focus on the human-
40 caused aspects. In Southeast Alaska, the vast majority
41 of wolf mortality is human-caused, so the initial concern
42 would be that if you lengthen the season, that would
43 increase the mortality to perhaps unsustainable levels,
44 but the ADF&G database shows that, just on its own,
45 hunting contributes to a much smaller proportion of wolf
46 mortality and trapping and snaring. It's anywhere from
47 15 to 20 percent of the total mortality or total harvest
48 that comes from hunting, so it's relatively small. It
49 does tend to occur earlier in the season, especially when
50 you look at times past where the season opened earlier
and you can look at your regulatory history, Page 189,

00361

1 and that will show you in some years past it did open
2 much earlier, the wolf hunting.

3

4 The State currently has regulations that
5 provide for closure of the hunting and trapping seasons
6 on wolves in Unit 2 when 30 percent of the estimated
7 population has been harvested in order to avoid
8 overharvest. This proposal could certainly recommend
9 adopting that code of Federal regulations regarding wolf
10 hunting as well and that's kind of been an implied part
11 of this proposal from the start. By adopting a combined
12 Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota, what you'd be
13 doing is keeping the harvest level of wolves at or below
14 30 percent of the estimated population. Thirty percent
15 is the current harvest quota. That would be irrespective
16 of the season during which the wolves are harvested. In
17 that sense, it doesn't really matter when the wolves are
18 harvested, if they're harvested early in the season or
19 later from a conservation perspective if you have that
20 cap.

21

22 The State currently has in-season
23 monitoring of wolf pelts in order to monitor whether
24 they're approaching the quota. So, in a sense, there
25 would be no need to tie that in with the State, focusing
26 with the Federal so that a closure could be coordinated.
27 This is just a table that you have on Page 191 that shows
28 the annual legal wolf harvest from hunting and trapping
29 in Unit 2 during the last 10 years and it kind of breaks
30 it down by method of take. Shooting contributes to a
31 smaller proportion than trapping and snaring.

32

33 As far as the subsistence issues, the
34 subsistence value of early season wolves is something
35 that's come up in Staff discussions. What I've gotten
36 from discussions with individuals who are trappers and
37 other folks is that while there is some debate about the
38 exact time in which these pelts are prime, there's a
39 general feeling by the people that are using these
40 animals that animals harvested during that -- you know,
41 beginning October 1 would have a value, would have
42 subsistence value, you know, in terms of tanned hides and
43 rugs and so forth. And there's also other uses of wolf
44 parts, such as the claws and teeth and so forth that have
45 been used traditionally in regalia and other ceremonial
46 functions that would not be effected by the primeness of
47 the pelt or the season during which they were taken.

48

49 As far as the actual opportunities that
50 this would create, this would likely increase

00362

1 opportunities for federally qualified subsistence
2 hunters. There would be less competition with the
3 nonrural hunters for a period. There would also be the
4 opportunity basically to take an animal, or take a wolf
5 during the peak in deer hunting activities when most
6 people are out there in the woods. Again, the feeling I
7 got from folks is that subsistence hunters don't
8 necessarily go out on their own to harvest these animals
9 by hunting just for that sole purpose, but it's something
10 that given the opportunity to do that during deer hunting
11 season when they're out there, that they would take that
12 and be able to use that resource.

13

14 Something else that would need to be at
15 least discussed is the potential for an impact of an
16 emergency closure on federally qualified subsistence
17 trappers. By having a harvest quota, imply that once
18 that quota is reached, that you would be closing down the
19 trapping season as well, or perhaps through other
20 measures.

21

22 The information that I have suggests
23 again, because the hunting portion of the harvest is
24 relatively small, the potential for this to impact, to
25 have a substantial impact on the trapping, you know, user
26 group would be also relatively small. Probably looking
27 at, you know, 15, 20 animals, you know, that might
28 additionally be taken by hunters by opening it up
29 earlier. And the way that I arrived at that number is
30 just by kind of looking at some of the harvest numbers of
31 animals that were taken prior to the current dates. It's
32 a real ballpark number, but you're looking at a small
33 number of animals, so again the idea is that it probably
34 have much of an effect. And I talked to several trappers
35 as well who agreed, and they were not very concerned
36 about any potential effects on their user group there.
37 And some of them are -- would take the opportunity as
38 hunters then, so it kind of works out.

39

40 As far as nonrural folks, they've always
41 been a relatively small proportion of the annual take,
42 around seven percent or so, so it's not -- wouldn't be
43 expected to have any early closure brought about by
44 having a harvest quota would not be expected to have any
45 significant effect on them as well.

46

47 The effect of the proposal again, staff
48 analysis seemed to indicate it would provide for an
49 increased opportunity for subsistence hunters, kind of
50 evening out the proportion of the use of this resource a

00363

1 little bit between the different user groups, with
2 minimal impacts to the other user groups such as the
3 trappers.

4
5 Again, adopting a 30 percent harvest
6 quota would minimize potential for over-harvest of Unit 2
7 wolf populations and address conservation concerns.

8
9 So the preliminary conclusion by Staff
10 then would be to support the proposal with modification.
11 And this would be -- let's see, 193, the language, that
12 the Forest Supervisor has the authority to close the
13 season, close the Federal hunting and trapping season in
14 consultation with ADF&G when a combined Federal/State 30
15 percent harvest quota is reached.

16
17 And with that I would gladly take any
18 Council questions.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council questions
21 for Staff. Dr. Garza.

22
23 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
24 This must be my morning to be confused. So the proposed
25 language on Page 193 is different than the language that
26 was submitted on Page 183 in that it addresses the Forest
27 Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting
28 and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G when a
29 combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is
30 reached. So that means that currently there is a 30 --
31 if 30 percent of the wolves are taken, an estimated, then
32 the season closes?

33
34 MR. ALUZAS: That's correct.

35
36 MS. GARZA: And does the season close for
37 everyone?

38
39 MR. ALUZAS: That would be the intention
40 of this.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
43 Mr. Hernandez.

44
45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Kurt,
46 I wanted to ask a little bit more about this 30 percent
47 harvest cap, and I have some questions dealing with that.
48 I know I have some strong suspicions, I wouldn't say I
49 could say for sure, but strong suspicions that there is a
50 number of wolves that are harvested by hunting that are

00364

1 never reported. And I was wondering if you would agree
2 with that. And have you accounted for that in your 30
3 percent harvest cap?

4

5 MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hernandez. I
6 would ask that the State also be given the opportunity to
7 answer that, because ultimately they have the best answer
8 for that, but I will do my best. Mr. Person is not going
9 to be back until after lunch, and he's certainly the
10 person that has the best knowledge of that.

11

12 To answer your first quest -- or at least
13 one of your questions, the 30 percent harvest quota does
14 not take into account the unreported mortality. The
15 second part of that with respect to reported mortality
16 is, yes, there is pretty good information based on radio
17 telemetry data collected by Mr. Person that suggests that
18 there is wolf harvest that goes unreported. And again he
19 would be the best one to answer that, but perhaps other
20 members of the State might be able to talk about that as
21 well.

22

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. One other question
24 on the 30 percent harvest cap. I'm a fisherman, and I
25 know in, you know, managing things, when you start
26 talking about percentages of the total populations, and
27 it seems like we don't deal with that very often in
28 wildlife, but this particular issue does. It seems like
29 it's usually a good idea to index those harvests to the
30 abundance. And my question is, this is theoretical, but
31 I'm just kind of wondering about your, you know, opinion
32 on it, seeing as how we're dealing with a harvest, a
33 percentage quota. Have you -- can you give me some idea
34 if you've considered if the abundance of the wolves
35 should start to decline rapidly, would you alter the
36 percentage harvest to deal with declines like that, or
37 should the abundance rise unexpected, or, you know, at
38 some point, would you consider raising that 30 percent
39 harvest cap, or is 30 percent good under all
40 circumstances?

41

42 MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hernandez,
43 the 30 percent, or having that harvest quota, that
44 percent of the estimated population, allows the percent
45 of the population harvested to track the level of the
46 population. So if you had 100 animals as your estimated
47 population, you would be able to take, you know, 30 of
48 those. And then if it went all the way up to 200,
49 hypothetically, you take 60, assuming I'm doing my math
50 right in my head, and I think I am. so in that sense,

00365

1 the quota itself allows for tracking of the population as
2 it grows.

3

4 As far as the ability to change the --
5 what we believe or the State believes is a sustainable
6 percentage, that actually -- there is -- that is
7 something that I guess, and again the State might be able
8 to speak to this better, but the -- when it was first
9 implemented I believe in '97, the harvest quota the State
10 used was 25 percent. And this is based on -- the quota
11 itself is based on the idea of mortality studies from
12 Southeast Alaska, other areas of Alaska, and other areas
13 of the Lower 48 and so forth where deer are the primary
14 prey of wolves, and they're based on what's the maximum
15 amount of mortality that a wolf population can sustain
16 and still be viable, you know, without depressing that
17 population, sending them into a tailspin. And the number
18 that they roughly came up was -- came up with that as far
19 as a pretty good estimate was 35 percent of overall
20 mortality.

21

22 And so what they were attempting to do in
23 this case is set a level. The 25 percent originally
24 allowed for 25 percent human-caused mortality plus 10
25 percent natural mortality. So you still ended up with 35
26 percent total. And so in that sense they're allowing for
27 some natural mortality.

28

29 What happened in the intervening years
30 since that what that they -- you know, Mr. Person came up
31 with some new information through his research that
32 showed that the natural mortality rate was lower so that
33 therefore we could increase the amount of human harvest
34 that was permissible and still keep us below that
35 threshold, total threshold of wolf mortality. So in that
36 sense there is -- as information becomes available, the
37 ability to, you know, and the State has shown this, that
38 they have changed that quota slightly in terms of what
39 they learn about the different factors of mortality and
40 the effects on the population. Does that answer your
41 question in a long-winded way?

42

43 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, it does. Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

46

47 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
48 think you've answered part of my question, but I have one
49 remaining. Is -- so the 30 percent, given the studies
50 that have been done in the Prince of Wales or Southeast

00366

1 area, does that reflect the general harvest level for
2 wolf populations, or in other areas? Is it conservative
3 compared to other areas, or areas so specific based on
4 the habitat that you can't really compare across regions?

5

6 MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza, I'm
7 afraid I don't the answer to that one. I would defer
8 that to the State.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. I
11 have a question for Staff, and this has to do on Page 193
12 with your preliminary conclusion and the language. I'm
13 looking at the first part there where it says the Forest
14 Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting
15 and trapping season. If that was a period there, isn't
16 that within their authority right now?

17

18 MR. ALUZAS: In terms of such as through
19 emergency type of venues? I would probably defer to
20 other members of Staff, but I believe that is something
21 that's an avenue. Bob?

22

23 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, I believe the
24 intention of putting this wording in here was to allow
25 the Forest Service, the Forest Supervisor to do this
26 closure and not require going through the Federal
27 Subsistence Board process with emergency order or a
28 special action request. Since this action would be in
29 accord with a long-term plan for managing wolves on
30 Prince of Wales and a successful working relationship
31 with Fish and Game on wolves for this area.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. That's all
34 I've got. Mr. Douville? You're okay? Any other
35 Council? Dr. Garza.

36

37 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So one
38 final question on that, this language, when a combined
39 Federal/ State 30 percent harvest quota is reached. What
40 do we do if the State under this new administration
41 increases it? Do we also increase?

42

43 MR. ALUZAS: I'm not sure if I
44 understand. If the State increased their harvest quota?
45 Then I would guess that we would consider, you know,
46 certainly it would be -- at this time we're relying on
47 their information, so it would be something, you know,
48 that we could change as well.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza, go

00367

1 ahead.

2

3

MS. GARZA: So I guess I'm thinking specifically through the Board of Game process, if someone submitted a proposal and said we should be able to take 35 or 40, because there's too dang many wolves on Prince of Wales, they're killing all our dear, and the Board of Game, which has certainly changed. They have a different view of wolves than the previous Board. They support it, then there's a 40 percent for the State and a 30 percent for Feds.

12

13

MR. ALUZAS: I think the idea, Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza, would be to keep them aligned. Some of that would certainly depend on the rationale for that, what the State's reasoning was. And we've been relying on their information, you know, them having the best wolf research information, so my guess that those would stay aligned.

20

21

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Rivard, please go ahead.

23

24

MR. RIVARD: Yes. Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management. Dr. Garza, there would have to be a separate Federal proposal come forward to align back with the State if that were the case. You couldn't automatically do it, unless this was part of this proposal, which it's not.

29

30

31

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

32

33

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. So then can we just change this -- take out 30 percent, when a combined Federal/State -- when the combined Federal/State harvest quota is reached.

37

38

MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza, yes, you could propose that as a modified language to this proposal if you so chose.

41

42

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Rivard, I have a question. If the language was to end with a period after ADF&G, in other words, not referencing a quota at all, in other words the language would be the Forest Supervisor has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with the ADF&G, would that give the ability to the Forest Service to go upwards with the State as needed? In other words, if the words from when a combined Federal/ State 30 percent harvest

00368

1 quota is reached, were not in this language, would that
2 still give the tool available to the Forest Supervisor to
3 raise or lower the quota as needed?

4

5 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, by deleting that
6 language that you said, that would give the Forest
7 Supervisor more flexibility to do just that. Right now,
8 the way it's worded, it would have to reach that 30
9 percent. So it could even be a lower harvest quota if
10 that were for conservation concerns, maybe they could
11 only harvest 25 percent in any given year. And that might
12 get at Mr. Hernandez's question, is if your population
13 got really low, you might want to only allow 10 percent
14 of that population to be harvested in a given year. So
15 the answer to your question is yes.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you.
18 Other Council questions for staff? Okay. That's all I
19 -- ADF&G, please.

20

21 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, members of the
22 Board, this is Boyd Porter. I'd like to read in the
23 ADF&G comments with a slight modification.

24

25 If the 30 percent cap is maintained,
26 adding six weeks to the start of the wolf hunting season
27 in Unit 2 could redistribute the harvest from trappers to
28 hunters. Trappers currently take about 85 percent of the
29 wolves harvested in Unit 2, and trappers would be
30 impacted if an increase in the wolf harvest by hunters
31 resulted in the 30 percent cap being reached earlier in
32 the year before the trapping season was closed. Wolves
33 taken by trappers later in the season will more often
34 yield pelts suitable for sale or home use, whereas wolves
35 taken in October and early November, and I would like to
36 change that to may not have prime pelts. Wolves
37 harvested under the Federal subsistence regulations
38 should provide additional opportunity for subsistence
39 users of these animals. Subsistence uses of these
40 animals.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: For clarification,
43 that is the language that's shown on Page 185, and I
44 thought I heard you add something after -- in the middle
45 of the paragraph, 30 percent cap being reached earlier in
46 the year, and then you said before. Was there some other
47 language there you wanted to add?

48

49 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, prior to the
50 close of the trapping season.

00369

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you like to
2 continue, or is that it? Dr. Titus.

3

4 MR. TITUS: Thank you, and good morning
5 again. One of comments I'd like to just reference is the
6 idea of stripping out of the regulation the harvest cap
7 that's currently in the Federal book, and also is in the
8 State regulation. You know, I guess there's pros and
9 cons to that issue. And in terms of granting flexibility
10 out there. You know, currently I would suggest that the
11 fact that they're the same and it's one of the
12 regulations that's the same in the book has some merits
13 in terms of everyone understanding what sort of the
14 ground rules are. And effectively all the hunters and
15 all the trappers are federally qualified users, so having
16 the regulations be the same is useful.

17

18 If in fact the State Board raised that
19 limit, and it took a while for the Federal system to
20 catch up with it, then in fact those Prince of Wales
21 trappers could in fact then effectively trap to that
22 higher limit under the State regulations. And that just
23 continues to add confusion.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
26 comments. Mr. Porter.

27

28 MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, I'd like to add
29 that the counts of wolves on the island, the estimated
30 population of wolves on -- in Unit 2 is based on work
31 that's been done during the last nine years on about a
32 third of the northern portion of the island, and then
33 extrapolated to the rest of the island, and those are
34 from radio-tagged animals and then visual sightings of
35 pack size.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Prior to
38 questions, a lunch announcement, please.

39

40 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, Saxman camp
41 ANS/ANB, Camp 15, are ready for us to eat. It's a
42 Chinese luncheon, \$7. So whenever we want to break
43 there.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We will recess for
46 lunch. One-hour lunch. We will come back at 1:00
47 o'clock, and if you gentlemen will join us at the table
48 again, we'll continue. 1:00 p.m.

49

50 (Off record)

00370

1 (On record)

2

3

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're going to
4 continue with ADF&G presentations. Okay. Please come to
5 order, the meeting is back in order. We are on Proposal
6 10. Wade Porter and Dr. Titus are doing the ADF&G
7 presentations. Questions from the council Excuse me,
8 did you have something that you wanted to add first?

9

10 MR. TITUS: No, I just spoke with Dave
11 Person. He's on his way here.

12

13

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Council
14 members. No other questions from Council. Dr. Titus,
15 would you like to have Dave Person come back later and
16 made an additional presentation? Excuse me, Dave, could
17 you please come forward. You are on the hot seat. For
18 clarification, we've gone through the Federal Staff
19 analysis and presentation. We're nearing the end of the
20 State proposal. We were just ready to go, so if you have
21 additional information, I know you don't know what they
22 presented, but go ahead and make a presentation on wolf.

23

24

Dr. Garza.

25

26

MS. GARZA: While Dave's catching up
27 there, I just wanted to announce the Alaska Native
28 Sisterhood and Brotherhood, Camp 15 made \$320 today, and
29 they're very appreciative of the opportunity to be able
30 to fund raise here. So they give us a big thanks.

31

32

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If you're ready,
33 go ahead.

34

35

MR. PERSON: Thank you, Chairman
36 Littlefield. Actually I guess I really don't have much
37 to say. We don't oppose this proposal at all.

38

39

The only concern, or I should say the
40 only comment I would like to make is that we don't oppose
41 it primarily because if the 30 percent cap that we have
42 on the harvest guideline that is in place now works, this
43 shouldn't matter, you know. And as long as we're allowed
44 to do our job in terms of deciding when and if it's
45 necessary to close the season, then it really doesn't
46 matter who takes those wolves, and at what time they take
47 them, because they guideline is in place to prevent any
48 risk of over-harvest.

49

50

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

00371

1 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Then, Mr.
2 Person, you may not like the amendments we're about to
3 make, because it is our intent, or at least mine to amend
4 it to take out the 30 percent so that it is just in
5 consultation with ADF&G, realizing we're going for good
6 management, but we have found in fisheries that we put a
7 cap in that matches the State and then the State
8 increases it or decreases it, then we're stuck with an
9 out-of-date cap, and so it would just say that Forest
10 Service has the authority to close Federal hunting and
11 trapping season in consultation with ADF&G.

12
13 MR. PERSON: Yeah, Ms. Garza, that's
14 fine.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The State would
17 support that?

18
19 MR. PERSON: Yes, I believe.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Titus.

22
23 MR. TITUS: Yes. This is Kim Titus.
24 Yeah, the State really has no feeling about that one way
25 or the other, because we have our harvest guideline.
26 It's in effect and it's in statute, so it is there.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
29 questions? Mr. Douville.

30
31
32 MR. DOUVILLE: I just have a question,
33 like when you feel that the harvest guideline has been
34 met, you're doing do it off the top of your head, that
35 you are using some sort of hard data to verify that that
36 is the case, and then you will make your judgement then,
37 is that correct?

38
39 MR. PERSON: Yes. And it's based on both
40 my research work in the center part of the island, and
41 also complimented by some computer modeling.

42
43 MR. DOUVILLE: I would be more inclined
44 to think that you would use probably -- well, to use the
45 sealing data, since we are obligated to seal those, so
46 you know the exact number and it's not an arbitrary
47 number, it is a fixed hard number.

48
49 MR. PERSON: Yes, Mike, that's true. I
50 mean, we're looking at the harvest data as representing

00372

1 what's being taken, absolutely. Of the mortality.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions
4 for ADF&G? Ms. Phillips.

5

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
7 Littlefield. On Page 191, table 2, it shows 19 deer, or
8 I mean 19 wolves. Why is it so low in comparison to the
9 other years?

10

11 MR. PERSON: I'm not sure. Let me just
12 see if this list is actually correct. I don't think it's
13 all the data. I think that's an incomplete -- that's not
14 the correct value. 2001 I believe was 74 wolves
15 harvested in that year.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
18 other in the table besides that year that's inaccurate?
19 Mr. Douville.

20

21 MR. DOUVILLE: The State has recently
22 changed the bag limits and/or seasons for Units 1 through
23 5. I don't believe they took any action on Unit 2. Can
24 you explain that procedure, and why they did it in other
25 units and why they did not in Unit 2?

26

27 MR. PERSON: Okay. First let me mention
28 that the State of Alaska Fish and Game was opposed to
29 those changes. However, the Board of Game did make
30 changes in Units 1, 3, 4 and 5 to eliminate the month of
31 August for hunting wolves, and also the month of April in
32 the trapping seasons. So in other words, they shortened
33 the total seasons.

34

35 The rationale for doing that was, first,
36 they felt that the seasons were liberal as they are.
37 There's no bag limit during the trapping season, and
38 secondly they felt that taking wolves in April and taking
39 wolves in August would potentially cause problems with
40 pups. In other words you might be orphaning pups because
41 you're removing the adults, or removing the breeding
42 pair. And that there were concerns dealing with
43 orphaning pups.

44

45 MR. DOUVILLE: In the first part you said
46 what was ADF&G's stance on the Board of Game action?

47

48 MR. PERSON: We were opposed to that
49 measure, those changes. That's what you're asking?

50

00373

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah.

2

3 MR. PERSON: Yeah. We didn't think that
4 the seasons needed to be changed. We also basically
5 didn't think that the changes that were made will matter
6 much in terms of the changes in harvest, because most of
7 the harvest doesn't occur in those months anyway.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza. Other
10 Council. Mr. Hernandez.

11

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: dave, in the briefing
13 book it says that in 1997 the hunting season was
14 shortened to December 1st through March 31st due to
15 conservation concerns regarding harvest levels, and that
16 was only five years ago, six years ago now maybe. What's
17 changed since then?

18

19 MR. PERSON: Really nothing has changed
20 since then. We still have concerns about harvesting
21 wolves on Prince of Wales Island in Unit 2, and concerns
22 about over-harvesting, primarily because of the road
23 access. It's very easy to trap wolves on Prince of Wales
24 and gain access to most of the island, with the exception
25 of the very south end, by the road system. You know,
26 traditionally trapping was mostly done along the beaches.
27 The interiors of islands were relatively more or less a
28 refuge from hunting and trapping. With all the
29 development that occurred on Prince of Wales Island,
30 there was concerns about over-harvesting wolves because
31 of not only the numbers of trappers active, but also the
32 accessibility.

33

34 The action taken by the Board of Game at
35 that time was also a reaction largely because of a
36 petition that was filed in 1994 I think by a group, the
37 Bio Diversity Legal Defense Fund or whatever, to list
38 wolves in Southeast Alaska as threatened under the
39 Endangered Species Act. And the Board of Game at that
40 time felt that they could off that listing or at least
41 have an influence on the decision by the Fish and
42 Wildlife Service to list wolves by showing that they were
43 reacting to some of those mortality concerns or harvest
44 concerns in at least Unit 2. And Unit 2 was special
45 simply because of the road system, because of the
46 accessibility. That's why it's not as much of an issue
47 anywhere else in Southeast.

48

49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm just trying to
50 make sure we're covering this rationale dealing with

00374

1 conservation concerns. Are you saying there is or is not
2 a conservation concern?

3

4 MR. PERSON: Yeah, I am concerned about
5 over-harvesting wolves in Unit 2. And that's why I
6 personally and professionally support the harvest
7 guideline. I do have concerns, because it is very
8 accessible and there are a fair number of people
9 involved. There's eight or nine trappers on Prince of
10 Wales Island at least that are capable of harvesting
11 between 10 and 15 wolves. At least. And when you're
12 looking at a population that we're estimating between
13 three and 350 wolves, it can be -- the harvest can reach
14 over 100 animals, and that's about a third of the
15 population, and that's getting to maximum sustained
16 yield. 1996, 136 wolves were taken on Prince of Wales
17 Island. We believe that that was beyond maximum
18 sustained yield.

19

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: So you're saying that as
21 long as the 30 percent cap is adhered to, there is no
22 conservation concern?

23

24 MR. PERSON: That's correct.

25

26 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. I
29 just have one comment, and that is on your comment on
30 Page 185, the last sentence.

31

32 MS. GARZA: 193?

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: 185. ADF&G
35 comments. Wolves harvested under the Federal subsistence
36 regulations should provide additional opportunity for
37 subsistence uses of animals. I do not know how that got
38 in the State comments, but I commend you for putting it
39 in there.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 If that's it, thank you very much.

44

45 Tribal governments. Any tribal
46 governments, would you like to comment on this proposal?
47 No tribal governments? Oh, there's a tribal government.
48 Dr. Garza.

49

50 MS. GARZA: Dr. Person. I had another

00375

1 question for you. I'm slow and confused just like a --
2 yeah, just like what was?

3

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A chunk of kelp.

5

6 MS. GARZA: Just like a chunk of -- dumb
7 as a chunk of kelp, that's what I am today.

8

9 So when Mike was asking you about the
10 Board of Game looked at changing the wolf regs from --
11 did you say it was from July to -- no, from August to
12 September, and that was done for Units 1, 3, 4 and 5. So
13 with Unit 2 then, the State regs still have an August 1
14 opening?

15

16 MR. PERSON: No, the State regs on Unit
17 2, there is no hunting season early hunting season. It's
18 starts with the same date as the trapping season, which
19 is December. There is none. So in other words, the
20 season in Unit 2 is still shorter than the seasons in 1,
21 3, 4, and 5. Is that still confusing, Dolly?

22

23 MS. GARZA: No, but can you give me the
24 rationale for that, from the management perspective?

25

26 MR. PERSON: Of why Unit 2 is different?
27 Okay. Remember Unit 2 was changed at a different session
28 of the Board of Game, what, four years ago, 1996.
29 Secondly we don't have, as a Division, we don't have
30 harvest concerns currently about wolf mortality or wolf
31 harvest in those other units. We do with Unit 2, because
32 of the potential at the over-harvest. So we still
33 consider Unit 2 to be different than Units 1, 3, 4 and 5.
34 Well, actually 1, 3, and 5.

35

36 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chair, so the major
37 concern with Unit 2 is human take?

38

39 MR. PERSON: Yes. And my radio collared
40 wolves, 85 percent of the mortality is from human causes.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr.
43 Person for coming back.

44

45 Other agency comments. Any other
46 agencies? Fish and game advisory committees. Any
47 comments from fish and game advisory committees? Summary
48 of written public comments.

49

50 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we've

00376

1 received one public comment from Paul Joselyn of the
2 Alaska Wildlife Alliance. Mr. Joselyn does not support
3 Proposal 10. He believes that making the season earlier
4 would increase the amount of wanton waste. Wolves aren't
5 eaten. They're not -- he believes that wolves taken at
6 this time are not marketed for their trophy value. He
7 shows that -- he refers to ADF&G records that show that
8 almost all wolves taken by trappers occur in December
9 onward. Except in those circumstances where control
10 programs have been authorized, hunting of wolves at a
11 time of year when the pelt has little or no value only
12 serves -- serves no purpose. It contributes to lost
13 opportunity for those who do not value the resource.

14

15 That's the only public comments we've
16 received. Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Public testimony.
19 I don't have any white cards. Do you have any white
20 cards?

21

22 MR. SCHROEDER: No, I don't.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
25 member of the public that would like to testify on
26 Proposal 10? Last call, Proposal 10.

27

28 Okay. We're at Regional Council
29 deliberations, Proposal 10. Dr. Garza.

30

31 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
32 would move that we adopt Proposal 10 as stated on Page
33 193 of our document, at the bottom of Page 193, Unit 2
34 wolf hunting. Is it five wolves?

35

36 We need a two-second at-ease.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: At east, two
39 seconds. Was there a second?

40

41 MR. STOKES: I'll second.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead, take a
44 minute.

45

46 (Pause)

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready?
49 Please proceed.

50

00377

1 MS. GARZA: Apparently I'm serving as
2 someone's secretary, so I just had to clarify what I was
3 doing. He just doesn't know how expensive I am.

4
5 Mr. Chairman, for Unit 2 wolf, hunting,
6 not trapping, five wolves. The Forest Service has the
7 authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping
8 season in consultation with ADF&G, when a combined
9 Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached, with a
10 season of October 1 to March 15th. That is the proposal.
11 It's my understanding there will be several amendments.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second?
14 Mr. Stokes, did you second?

15
16 MR. STOKES: I seconded it.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
19 language before you is as written on Page 193, Proposal
20 10. Any discussion or amendments.

21
22 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend
23 Proposal 10 to strike the words following the ADF&G,
24 comma. So it would read The Forest Service has the
25 authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping
26 season in consultation with ADF&G, period.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second
29 to that amendment?

30
31 MR. STOKES: I'll second it.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
34 and seconded. The amendment is to strike when a combined
35 Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached on Page
36 193. Does everyone understand that? That is the
37 amendment before you at this time. Council.

38
39 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

42
43 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 It's the intent of the motion to still stay within the
45 guidelines of working with the State, but with the
46 thought that this 30 percent could go up or down, and
47 this just allows for that variation without sticking the
48 federal management with a particular number. And it's my
49 understanding there's no objection from the State with
50 this.

00378

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any other
2 discussion on the amendment, or are you ready for the
3 question?

4
5 (No discussion)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing no
8 objection, all those in favor of the amended motion to
9 strike when a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest
10 quota is reached, and the correct language should be
11 shown on the screen in front of you. All those in favor,
12 please vote aye.

13
14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
17 same sign.

18
19 (No opposing votes.)

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is
22 carried. You have the main motion before you as amended.

23
24
25 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

28
29 MR. DOUVILLE: I move to further amend
30 the proposal striking October and adding September.

31
32 MS. GARZA: Second.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please clarify
35 that for me and make sure that we've got it right on the
36 board.

37
38 MR. DOUVILLE: October 1 would change to
39 September 1. March 15 would remain the same.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm not -- yeah.
42 It's been moved and seconded to change the words October
43 1st to September 1, and the language should be before you
44 on the screen. Is that language correct, maker of the
45 motion? Is there any discussion on this amendment? Mr.
46 Adams.

47
48 MR. ADAMS: I just would like to as Mr.
49 Douville his rationale for the change. I don't have any
50 problem with it, but I think that needs to be brought

00379

1 out.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

4

5

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 The rationale being that Unit 2 guideline harvest is 30

7 percent, and it really does not matter when the 30

8 percent is harvested. It doesn't change anything else,

9 only the window of opportunity is moved up a little bit,

10 so.....

11

12

MS. GARZA: And September 1 is in.....

13

14

MR. DOUVILLE: It's in line with State

15 regulation for State users on the other -- or Units 1

16 through 5 State regulation.

17

18

Also is it appropriate at this time to

19 tell you why -- the wolf hides are better quality earlier

20 than they are later from personal experience, so it's

21 preferred to get them earlier than later.

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

50

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council on

24 the amendment. Mr. Hernandez.

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

50

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. If, Mike, one of
the reasons for your amendment is aligning with State
regulation, I see that under current State regulation for
Unit 2 the season runs until March 31st, and the season
that we are proposing runs through March 15th. Would you
see any reason to change the closing date on this
proposal to match State regulation?

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville?

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. DOUVILLE: Repeat the last sentence?

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. HERNANDEZ: I was just wondering if
you see any reason to change your amendment so that it
aligns with the State regulation for District 2, which is
two weeks later than the Federal regulation as of right
now.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. DOUVILLE: I think it's desirable to
align with the first part, but the last part like I said,
it's more desirable the beginning of the season than it
is later, so to me it's not an issue, but.....

47

48

49

50

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

49

50

00380

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it something
2 that would be objectionable, that would align them? Is
3 it something maybe we should add? If it's not bad for
4 us, should we go ahead and do it to make sure that we are
5 aligned?

6
7 MR. DOUVILLE: If there's no objection, I
8 have no problem with it.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If the maker and
11 the second have no objection, it would be to go from
12 September 1st to March 31st. Is that correct? Is the
13 language correct, the amendment there? No, it's not.

14
15 MR. SCHROEDER: Now? Did we have a
16 friendly amendment?

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, the maker was
19 allowed to change that, he suggested September 1st in his
20 original, September 1st to March 15th, and the maker and
21 the second approved to change that to March 31st.
22 Counsel. Are you ready for the question?

23
24 MS. GARZA: Question.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment --
27 you will be voting on the amendment, and the amendment is
28 to change the dates from September 1st to March 31st as
29 shown before you. All those in favor of the amendment
30 signify by saying aye.

31
32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
35 same sign.

36
37 (No opposing votes.)

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is
40 carried. You have the main motion as amended before you.
41 Council? Dr. Garza?

42
43 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I speak in
44 favor of the motion as it has been amended. In terms of
45 conservation, which seems to be one of the issues, the
46 majority of the take is not by hunting, but rather by
47 trapping, and there is a limit on five wolves per person,
48 so I don't see that this will substantially increase the
49 hunt.

50

00381

1 In terms of substantial evidence, I think
2 the reports we've received here are very nice. I'm very
3 comfortable with the evidence in front of me.

4
5 The effect on subsistence users. The
6 intent of moving up 'til September 1 is to align that
7 September so that it's the same as the other four units
8 in Southeast for wolf hunting, so that it's an
9 improvement.

10
11 The effect on other users, I don't see
12 any. Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Just the
15 effect on other users, I believe the testimony was seven
16 percent of those were nonrural, and that was minimal.

17
18 Are you ready for the question? You have
19 a motion before you that's been amended twice as shown on
20 the board, and the language reads, Dr. Garza?

21
22 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 10
23 would read, Unit 2 wolf hunting, five wolves, September 1
24 through March 31st. The Forest Service has the authority
25 to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in
26 consultation with ADF&G.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Everyone is
29 clear on that? All those in favor of supporting the
30 amended motion, please signify by saying aye.

31
32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
35 same sign.

36
37 (No opposing votes.)

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amended motion
40 has carried. Proposal 10 is adopted with the two
41 amendments as shown on Page 193, and also as shown on the
42 screen.

43
44 Proposal 11 is before us. We're going to
45 go to staff comments.

46
47 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, Dr. Garza.

50

00382

1 MS. GARZA: We've got to get our clump of
2 kelp to be flowing one way here. When I read that there,
3 this whole proposal deals with hunting. Yeah, I'm just
4 going up and down. Deals with hunting, and yet the
5 language in there deals with hunting and trapping. And
6 so we're not dealing with trapping, Mr. Schroeder.

7
8 MR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Garza, the trigger
9 for closing the season is a 30 percent cap no matter how
10 the wolves are taken, so both would close simultaneously,
11 both hunting and trapping in my understanding.

12
13 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

16
17 MR. DOUVILLE: It is not the intent to
18 change the trapping season in any way. However, the
19 intent of this proposal was to increase the window of
20 opportunity for hunting. So we're not moving the
21 trapping season up. We're not doing anything with the
22 trapping in my opinion. We are only changing the window
23 of opportunity for hunting.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just a
26 clarification. We've already adopted this motion. Is it
27 the wish of the Council to reconsider? Dr. Garza.

28
29 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I guess that's
30 what we're trying to clarify, is whether or not we need
31 to reconsider, whether or not we have inadvertently
32 affected trapping by supporting this language. So maybe
33 we need somebody from the Feds to come up and tell us, or
34 someone from the State or something.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Prior to that, I
37 would suggest that you reconsider and we put it back on
38 the table. We'll be back right where we were before with
39 the language as shown there, except there will be no
40 motion and it's open for discussion.

41
42 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move -- quit
43 cutting me off. Mr. Chairman, I move to reconsider
44 Proposal 10.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a motion
47 to reconsider made by one who voted in the affirmative.
48 Is there a second?

49
50 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

00383

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
2 objection to the reconsideration of this motion? The
3 proposed language that was on the board before you back
4 as if nothing had happened, and we are talking about the
5 language that is up here. So discussion. Mr. Adams.

6
7 MR. ADAMS: My last day here and I
8 finally figured out how to work that. Mr. Chairman, on
9 Page 185 under ADF&G comments, it says here that if the
10 30 -- season in Unit 2 could redistribute the harvest
11 from trappers to hunters, and I think that's the issue
12 that we have before us. Is that the question we're
13 trying to resolve at this point?

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I would
16 like to call the State ADF&G. Dr. Person, is he still
17 available? Would you please -- Kurt, would you also come
18 forward, please so we can get these discussions. Do we
19 need a lawyer, too? You could start it off, Mr. Titus,
20 and maybe the three of you can give us your
21 interpretation of what we're doing here, and I think you
22 know where the council wants to go on this.

23
24 MR. TITUS: This is Kim Titus. I think
25 Mike Douville was correct. You haven't done anything to
26 tinker with the trapping regulations. What you've done
27 was increase the opportunity for hunting regulations.

28
29 And Mr. Schroeder was also correct in
30 asserting that the trigger mechanism with regard to the
31 harvest guideline cap is a combination of all the
32 human-caused mortality of wolves. So what you've done
33 from my perspective and our agency's perspective, and I
34 think Mr. Douville's perspective, is quite logical, in
35 which case you haven't done anything to tinker with the
36 trapping regulations, and you've provided significantly
37 more opportunity for the hunters. And fact, just so you
38 understand this, in both the Federal and the State side
39 of things, hunting regulations for wolves and trapping
40 regulations for wolves are sort of two separate issues,
41 and so in some cases they get combined, and in some cases
42 they're separate. But from my agencies perspective what
43 you've done is very logical and it makes sense.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Kurt.

46
47 MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chairman, this is Kurt
48 Aluzas again. This gets into some policy stuff that's
49 not necessarily my forte, but my understanding of the
50 issue would be to agree with what Dr. Titus is saying in

00384

1 terms of, you know, looking at having increased the
2 opportunity for hunting opportunities without affecting
3 the trapping opportunities, but in the same -- but
4 recognizing that that trigger is a combination of hunting
5 and trapping mortality. And I think the desire to keep
6 that explicit, that that trigger is combined.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Person?

9

10 MR. PERSON: For once I have nothing to
11 say.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council questions?
14 Mr. Douville.

15

16 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 I believe that when we submitted this proposal, it did
18 not include trapping. It was only a hunting issue at
19 that time, and I don't know how trapping got into it. Do
20 you understand what I'm saying?

21

22 And the reason for changing this is
23 because the hunting season opens the same as the trapping
24 season, and the hunters are at a distinct disadvantage.
25 It's just a means just to give hunters more opportunity.
26 It's not changing anything else, just the hunting.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville,
29 you're correct. The original proposal did not include
30 any of the language in bold, starting at the Forest
31 Supervisor. That was added by Staff, and that was to
32 give the Forest Supervisor the authority to close. Would
33 you feel more comfortable if that said Federal hunting
34 and deleted and trapping? Dr. Garza.

35

36 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, perhaps if we
37 just had it read the Forest Service has the authority to
38 close the Federal season in consultation with ADF&G.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would that meet
41 with Staff? Comments, please.

42

43 MR. ALUZAS: Yes, I think, or at least
44 the Forest Service, I think that would be adequate.

45

46 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Person, Dr.
49 Person.

50

00385

1 MR. PERSON: I'll let Dr. Titus deal with
2 that one.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder.

5
6 MR. SCHROEDER: Just through the Chair,
7 Dr. Garza, just to clarify the way this would work. The
8 reason for the wording in there is so that the Federal
9 Subsistence Board would not have to take up emergency
10 closure or special action requests if in the what's been
11 the unlikely event that the all harvest quota is met. Is
12 it your intent that the Forest Supervisor would continue
13 to have -- would have that authority under the regulation
14 that you passed, knowing that the quota combines as Dr.
15 Titus and Kurt Aluzas said, it combines the wolves taken
16 by both trapping and hunting.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

19
20 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
21 Yes, you know, if you look at the regulation on the
22 bottom of 193, it says, Unit 2, wolf hunting, five
23 wolves, date, September 1 to March 30th. The Forest
24 Service has the authority to close the Federal season in
25 consultation with ADF&G. It's that simple. I mean, if
26 it's under wolf hunting then that's what it's under.

27
28 My concern with keeping trapping in there
29 is that somewhere down the line we could separate those
30 two so that there's some difference in when you would
31 close one or the other. Don't shake your head at me,
32 because that has happened with fish when we set a cap and
33 then reset a cap to align with State and then the State
34 Board of Fish turned around and increased their cap, and
35 then all of a sudden we're with a lower cap and we have
36 to go through a whole another season, and then we have to
37 remember to change it, and then we have to change it.
38 And so this just leaves it open enough so that the Forest
39 Service knows they have that regulatory authority. But
40 it doesn't force something that may change in the future.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do any of the
43 doctors wish to respond to the Doctor's question? Dr.
44 Douville. Okay. Apparently there's no problem with
45 taking the words hunting and trapping out as far as you
46 see, so is there any other questions for Staff? Are
47 there any other questions for the Staff? Okay. Thank
48 you, gentlemen.

49
50 The motion before you right now is before

00386

1 you on the board as previously adopted but it is as if we
2 had not voted on it. Are there any amendments?

3

4 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have
5 a point of clarification. It's critical to the Council.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any objection?
8 Please come forward. State your name.

9

10 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
11 Council. Everything up there is really good with the
12 exception that the Forest Supervisor should be scratched
13 and replaced with the RAC. That's how the law reads.
14 The RAC makes these decisions, and then in the past
15 that's how it's worked before. If the Department had a
16 problem that they recognized, they'd contact the RAC, the
17 RAC would concur and then they would issue the
18 announcement regarding particular closures. The Forest
19 Supervisor has never been part of this language in the
20 past.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Thomas, if the
23 language, we understand it, has not been amended yet, but
24 if it was to read the Forest Supervisor, because that's
25 the land manager in the area, has the authority to close
26 the Federal season in consultation with the ADF&G and
27 SERAC, would that be acceptable? Because that has been
28 the process at least in my case in Sitka. I've been
29 called by -- the Federal biologists call me as well as
30 the State, and ask my opinion. Would that language be
31 acceptable?

32

33 MR. THOMAS: Well, in your case you were
34 talking about Sitka Tribe business. Sitka Tribe
35 necessarily. And normally I've had -- have been in
36 consultation with Sitka also on occasion where Mr.
37 Suminski would contact me with regard -- if he recognized
38 something, and then in turn would get ahold of the
39 Department. And then that three-way triangle is what
40 worked before.

41

42 The thing that is possibly -- I'm getting
43 like the State now, that could lead into a longer list of
44 people in the loop of authorization, and it might not be
45 as positive as it has been. So now I'm speaking in
46 hypotheticals.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you.
49 But I don't -- with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I do
50 not know how SERAC is going to issue an emergency closure

00387

1 of the season at this time. That's a function of the
2 land manager. Mr. Casipit.

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, thank you, Mr.
5 Chairman. Calvin Casipit, Subsistence Staff fisheries
6 biologist, Forest Service.

7

8 Maybe I can clarify how we do things on
9 the fisheries side as far as the in-season management,
10 the special actions that are issued to manage fisheries
11 in-season, but in the delegated authority that goes to,
12 in this case, the in-season managers, the various rangers
13 that have the in-season authority, they have the
14 responsibility before they undertake a special action to
15 consult with Fish and Game, the Chairman of the Southeast
16 Regional Advisory Council and affected Council members in
17 the area that have a knowledge of what's going on in
18 their local area. That's the standard for Federal
19 fisheries in-season management. I'm sure that would be
20 similar to what would happen with wildlife.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If I understand
23 you correctly, perhaps that could be worded, the Forest
24 Supervisor has the authority to close the Federal season,
25 period as being good enough and understanding that the
26 Federal land managers would consult with ADF&G as well as
27 the SERAC members and other affected users.

28

29 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
30 not sure what's in the Federal regulations as far as the
31 wildlife special actions. I was just saying what is
32 expected of us in fisheries in-season action. You know,
33 you may want to have that in your proposed language to
34 ensure that that carries through into the regulation.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'd like to let
37 the other Council address questions. Dr. Garza first.

38

39 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
40 kind of wish we didn't reconsider this now. In what I
41 remember in being called, and I've been called I think
42 more on the game issues, the Yakutat moose and those were
43 some years back for emergency closure, that this language
44 would actually not -- would allow Forest Service to make
45 that decision as not an emergency closure, but as a
46 closure with ADF&G based on guideline harvest or whatever
47 it's based on. And that that would be done without
48 consultation of SERAC, because we make recommendations on
49 seasons, bag limits, blah-blah-blah, but we're not into
50 in-season management, and I think that's where it would

00388

1 put us, although I think it would be important that we
2 are notified if such activity takes place.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
5 Mr. Kookesh.

6

7 MR. KOOKESH: It's my understanding from
8 reading the letters that I got from the Federal
9 Subsistence Board that the -- for example, the Admiralty
10 District, the monument manager had in-season regulatory
11 authority which only allows the closure to occur for a
12 period of only 60 days. Am I correct? I'd like to know
13 though.....

14

15 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

16

17 MR. KOOKESH:what you're saying and
18 what he's saying, I'd like to know who's right, because
19 it sounds like you're making a decision for us
20 without.....

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't mean to do
23 that at all. Mr. Boyd, would you come forward and please
24 answer Mr. Kookesh's question.

25

26 MR. BOYD: Well, when you're dealing with
27 regulatory language, I think what we're trying to do here
28 in this phrase, the Forest Supervisor has the authority,
29 is for the decision-making authority to be delegated from
30 the Board to the Forest Service or to the Forest
31 Supervisor in this case. Currently, without that
32 language, that authority resides only with the Federal
33 Subsistence Board. So this is more of a convenient way
34 of annotating in the regulations that that authority has
35 been delegated for this specific purpose.

36

37 And I think as, you know, Mr. Casipit
38 tried to allude to sort of the parallel of what currently
39 happens under the delegated authority with in-season
40 managers for fisheries. That's more of a blanket or a
41 broader delegation by the Federal Subsistence Board
42 that's made by letter from the Board to the in-season
43 managers. In that case, the guidelines to the in-season
44 managers are that they consult with Alaska Department of
45 Fish and Game, and other affected users, and the Regional
46 Advisory Council representatives for that region.

47

48 The Council itself does not have the
49 authority to make the decision on the regs as you've
50 pointed out, Mr. Littlefield. So in my view it would be

00389

1 inappropriate to put that kind of language in the
2 regulations. However, consultation is appropriate and
3 can be directed by the Board. Consultation with the
4 Regional Advisory Council.

5
6 In a nutshell, I think the language that
7 you have up there is sufficient.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Could you please
10 comment on the 60-day emergency closure?

11
12 MR. BOYD: This is where I need to
13 consult my regulations.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I was correct, we
16 did need our lawyer up here.

17
18 MR. THOMAS: He's sitting right here.

19
20 MR. BOYD: Okay. Mr. Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please proceed.

23
24 MR. BOYD: Excuse me. Let me read from
25 the -- if I may, Mr. Chair, let me read from the Federal
26 regulations under the heading special actions. There are
27 two kinds of special actions. There are emergency
28 situations or emergency actions, and there are temporary
29 actions. Under the emergency situation, which I think
30 this would parallel, because we're dealing with an
31 immediate conservation need, i.e., we've reached the
32 threshold where harvest limits have dictated a need to
33 close. It -- let me just read. The Board may
34 immediately open, close or liberalize or restrict
35 subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on the public
36 lands, or close or restrict nonsubsistence uses if
37 necessary to assure the continued viability of a fish and
38 wildlife population. So that's this situation. Prior to
39 implementing an emergency action, the Board shall consult
40 with the State. The emergency action shall be effective
41 when directed by the Board, may not exceed 60 days, and
42 may not be extended unless it is determined by the Board
43 after a notice and public hearing that such action should
44 be extended.

45
46 So what that entails is an immediate
47 action to close for 60 days and then a follow up action
48 which would then require public notice and public
49 hearing, the opportunity to be heard to extend such an
50 action. That's the way our regulations currently read.

00390

1 I presume that that sort of or possibly confounds the
2 language that we're dealing with up here now.

3

4 And it's something I think we're going to
5 have to think about as to how we might implement these
6 emergency closures for longer than 60 days without going
7 to a notice and public hearing. Or we may have to do
8 that. So I'm sitting here thinking out loud how we might
9 proceed given the constraints in our regulations. I'm
10 wondering if it would be more of a temporary reg.

11

12 It's possible that we, and this is
13 something that I'm going to have to consult on. I
14 certainly didn't come into this meeting prepared to
15 answer the question, but since it's come up, I think I
16 would like the opportunity to do a bit of research on
17 this obviously before this goes to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board to determine whether or not this can be
19 determined to be a temporary regulation under our
20 regulations, which then the closure would be in place for
21 the duration of the existing season, or the current
22 season, and I just simply don't have the answer for you
23 right now.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions from the
26 Council. Dr. Garza.

27

28 MS. GARZA: No question. Just a comment,
29 Mr. Chair. So perhaps it's better if we stick with the
30 original proposal which is just to change the dates, and
31 when we figure out how we can do it properly so that
32 we're properly align, blah-blah-blah, then it can be done
33 later. So, Mr. Chairman, if we're ready for action?

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: At the present
36 time you have the language -- thank you. At the present
37 time you have the language on Page 193 as amended twice
38 before you. Go ahead, Dr. Garza.

39

40 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, if I might
41 interject, you went all the way around the mulberry bush
42 without it touching me, who was the person at the podium.
43 And there was a reason for me being here. You guys are
44 getting too complacent in what you're doing. These
45 regulations wouldn't be on the books if it wasn't for
46 your action. You have the responsibility of representing
47 that action at all times. And I saw that disappearing
48 just now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.

00391

1 Thomas. Council action. The motion is before you as
2 amended twice. Are you ready for the question. The
3 motion is before you at this time. When we reconsidered,
4 we brought it back as if it had not been voted on. The
5 motion is before you as you previously passed, which was
6 changing the date from September 1st to March 31st, as
7 well as dropping the last sentence. That is still before
8 you as if it had not been voted on.

9

10 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

13

14 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend
15 the Proposal 10 to strike all of the language below five
16 wolves, September 1 to March 31st.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There is a motion
19 to strike all the bold language added by -- from the
20 Forest Supervisor on. Is there a second?

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You have an
25 amendment to strike the bold language. It's been
26 seconded. Discussion on the amendment. Dr. Garza.

27

28 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. The
29 intent of the motion is that it would just change the
30 season and when we can figure out how to align the State
31 and Federal in terms of closures, then we'll gladly look
32 at the language when it's correct.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
37 discussion on the amendment. Mr. Hernandez?

38

39 MR. HERNANDEZ: I just have a question.
40 You know, I'm new here, but prior to this meeting, was
41 the Forest Supervisor language included in regulation?
42 That's been added new since we started discussing this?
43 Okay.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would Staff like
48 to come forward and answer that? I'm not going to give
49 any more comments.

50

00392

1 MR. JOHNSON: Dave Johnson, Forest
2 Service. That is correct. The concern was raised that
3 with an in-season management decision that would need to
4 be made based on a harvest cap, that potentially by
5 having to go through the Federal Subsistence Board and
6 the time that it would take, additional wolves would be
7 harvested and would exceed that harvest cap. By putting
8 in the Forest Service language that you see, or the
9 Forest Supervisor language you see currently before you,
10 in consultation with ADF&G, that would take care of it.

11
12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. So the proposers
13 of this proposal, they did not include that language.
14 That language was added afterwards, correct?

15
16 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct. The
17 proposal was submitted by the Regional Advisory Council,
18 and it was added later for clarification and to minimize
19 a potential over-harvest of wolves.

20
21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

24
25 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr.
26 Hernandez, if you look on Page 183, that was the initial
27 proposal submitted by SERAC, so it just changed the date.
28 And then Patricia who seems to have the only wildlife
29 regulation pamphlet here, we did go over that several
30 times to make sure that that language is not already in
31 there. So it was added by Staff.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment.
34 Further discussion on the amendment to strike all the
35 bold language?

36
37 (No discussion)

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready for
40 the question?

41
42 MS. GARZA: Question.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's
45 been called on the amendment, and the amendment is to
46 strike all of the bold language on Page 193 starting at
47 the Forest Supervisor. All those in favor signify by
48 saying aye.

49
50 IN UNISON: Aye.

00393

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
2 same sign.

3
4 (No opposing votes.)

5
6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The bold lettering
7 has disappeared, and we are at Unit 2, wolf hunting, five
8 wolves, September 1st to March 31st as amended is still
9 before you. Any discussion on the motion.

10
11 (No discussion)

12
13 MS. GARZA: Call for the question.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's
16 been called for, and all those in favor of the motion as
17 amended, please signify by saying aye.

18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
22 same sign.

23
24 (No opposing votes.)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion,
27 amended language is carried. Unit 2, wolf hunting, five
28 wolves, September 1st to March 31st. Five minute break,
29 and we've got lots of stuff to do. We'll come back with
30 Staff on 11.

31
32 (Off record)

33
34 (On record)

35
36 MR. PARSLEY: My name is Chuck Parsley,
37 I'm a biologist for the Forest Service on the Hoonah
38 Ranger District.

39
40 WP-03-11 is a simple proposal that would
41 allow for the use of motorized land vehicles for trapping
42 activities. This analysis addresses Proposal WP-02-15
43 from the 2001-2002 proposal cycle concerning trapping
44 regulations in Unit 4.

45
46 The Federal Subsistence Board deferred
47 this proposal at the recommendation of the Southeast
48 Regional Advisory Council until a meeting could be
49 arranged with Federal Staff, trappers, and State of
50 Alaska managers.

00394

1 The Hoonah Indian Association submitted
2 WP-03-11. They request the current regulatory ban on the
3 use of motorized vehicles for the taking of martin, mink
4 and weasel on Chichagof Island to be lifted to allow for
5 the use of any motorized land vehicle.

6
7 State regulations do not limit motorized
8 access on Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area. The
9 differing regulations governing the season length and
10 access have caused much confusion for the local trappers.
11 It is legal for a trapper to use motorized vehicles as
12 long as they are trapping under State regulations. But
13 if they declare they are operating under Federal
14 regulations, they can be cited.

15
16 The Southeast Regional Advisory Council
17 discussed Proposal WP-02-15 during their spring of 2002
18 meeting in Juneau. The Council's recommendation was to
19 defer the proposal. At the suggestion of ADF&G, Division
20 of Wildlife Conservation Manager, the Council requested
21 Federal Staff meet with trappers and State of Alaska
22 managers in Hoonah to see if a consensus solution to
23 questions concerning trapping, trapping seasons, and the
24 use of motorized land vehicles for trapping in the Hoonah
25 area could be reached. The Federal Subsistence Board
26 concurred with the Regional Council and deferred this
27 position.

28
29 October 11th, 2002, a meeting with the
30 State of Alaska, myself, Dave Belton, HIA, Hoonah Indian
31 Association, and several -- excuse me, and several local
32 trappers along with Dave Johnson was held to discuss
33 issues associated with martin trapping in Hoonah area. A
34 compromise was agreed upon that would maintain the
35 current Federal season, and allow for the use of
36 motorized vehicles in Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use
37 area and the remainder of northeast -- or Chichagof
38 Island.

39
40 Jack Witman stated that there currently
41 is not a conservation concern with the martin population
42 on Chichagof Island. ADF&G and Forest Service biologists
43 will monitor the harvest to ensure over-harvest does not
44 occur and conservation of the resources is provided.

45
46 Currently Federal regulations are more
47 restrictive than the State regulation regarding access to
48 trapping sites in the northeast part of the unit. Under
49 the existing Federal regulation, a large part of the area
50 is not accessible to subsistence users because of vehicle

00395

1 restriction. Removing this restriction would allow
2 motorized vehicles to be used, and as a result increased
3 access would be provided. The change would also allow
4 access for hunters -- for trappers, excuse me, under both
5 Federal and State regulations. The subsistence trapper
6 would be able to trap for two and an half months using
7 motorized land vehicles, while trappers operating under
8 the State regulations would be limited to a one-month
9 long season.

10

11 With requested change in regulations,
12 subsistence users will be able to use a motorized vehicle
13 for trapping. The existing season, December 1st through
14 February 15 will remain in effect. This action will
15 allow the use of motorized land vehicles for the taking
16 of mink, martin and weasel during the entire season
17 similar to what is currently allowed by State trapping
18 regulations in the State's shorter trapping season.

19

20 Preliminary conclusion. Support proposal
21 with modification. The modification is to add the
22 requirement that the Forest Service and ADF&G will
23 provide the in-season management by examining sex and age
24 ratios. And there also is the same wording the Forest
25 Supervisor authority. Any questions.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: In other words,
28 the proposal's been modified to add the bold language we
29 just talked about in similar form?

30

31 REPORTER: Your microphone.

32

33 MR. PARSLEY: I apologize. You're
34 correct. Also the sex and age ratio requirements were
35 added in there as well.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council,
38 questions. Mr. Rivard, did you have anything? I almost
39 made you a doctor. Did you have anything to add on that?

40

41

42 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Don Rivard
43 with the Office of Subsistence Management. I was just
44 looking at the proposed regulation on Page 209, and in
45 the bold language. Because the proposed regulation is
46 talking about marten, mink and weasel, I was just asking
47 Chuck here whether it ought to be made very explicit that
48 the bold language is just talking about martens.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any

00396

1 questions for Federal Staff. ADF&G.

2

3

4 MR. TITUS: Thank you very much. The
5 Department comments are that we support this proposal
6 with some amendments. First of all, we recommend closing
7 the Federal trapping seasons for marten, mink and weasel
8 on December 31st to match the State season, closing roads
9 in old growth reserves and fully implementing all the
10 standards and guidelines for martens as described in the
11 Tongass Land Management Plan.

11

12

13 We do have some reservations about the
14 in-season management scheme described in the proposal,
15 and believe that a shorter two to four-week trapping
16 season would be a more responsible way to manage marten
17 populations on northern Chichagof Island.

17

18

19 Although differences between State and
20 Federal trapping season in the regulations on northern
21 Chichagof Island has caused considerable confusion and
22 should be rectified, liberalizing the season length is
23 not warranted in our opinion. The conservation concern
24 for marten populations which resulted in the season
25 closure in 1989 and 1990 has not gone away. Even without
26 the use of motorized land vehicles on Federal lands,
27 northern Chichagof Island has consistently produced some
28 of the highest harvest levels of martens per land area
29 anywhere in the State of Alaska.

29

30

31 In 1996 an estimated 80 percent of the
32 marten population was trapped even with the road
33 restriction in place at that time. In fact the road
34 closure may have benefitted the harvest of marten by
35 creating unharvested refugia from which martens dispersed
36 to fill areas vacant by those that were trapped. This
37 system may result in higher long-term sustained yields of
38 harvest than having the entire roaded portion open to the
39 island of trapping. It's a question of whether you want
40 a short-term gain or perhaps longer-term fluctuation in
41 those populations.

41

42

43 Closing roads in old growth reserves
44 would help to mitigate the opening of other roads to
45 trapping with motorized vehicles, and, in fact, if that
46 was the case, we would then go to the State Board to do
47 the same thing. And in doing this, we believe this would
48 also meet the requirements in the Tongass Land Management
49 Plan.

49

50

50 Allowing the use of motorized vehicles

00397

1 for trapping of Martens would very likely have negative
2 effects on the populations and long-term sustained
3 yields. Effects of trapping from roads have been
4 documented on Chichagof Island. In a nine-year long
5 radio collar study of marten at Salt Lake Bay on this
6 area, we have determined that all martens in a watershed
7 were vulnerable to trapping from only one road in the
8 watershed. Streams at valley bottoms were often
9 boundaries of home ranges for resident animals and
10 riparian corridors were travel routes for transient
11 animals. Therefore they would all be vulnerable to
12 trapping from one road. As a result, that's why we
13 suggest if the roads are opened, that you go with a
14 shorter season that aligns with the State season.

15

16 The in-season management season described
17 in the proposal will likely be an unreliable tool for
18 management. Sex ratios in the harvest is often cited as
19 a traditional management tool. However, it has never
20 been quantitatively analyzed for reliability. In some
21 unpublished work done by Rod Flynn who's been working
22 with marten there for over 10 years, he has found that
23 based on live trapping study of animals and an extensive
24 sample of trapper carcasses, sex ratios of the harvest
25 provide little usable information on the state of the
26 marten population. In years of high and low harvest when
27 martens were abundant and scarce, males always comprised
28 more than 50 percent of the martens trapped, therefore
29 sex ratios of the harvest would be unlikely to ever
30 detect a decline in the population. The ratio of
31 juveniles to adult females also has questionable power to
32 predict the state of the population. Several adult
33 females collared on Chichagof Island for a four or
34 five-year period in a row never produced young, so it
35 cannot be assumed that each female produces off spring.

36

37 Reproduction on Chichagof Island is also
38 strongly related to the abundance of long-tailed voles,
39 the primary prey of martens there. Vole populations
40 fluctuate widely from year to year as does the
41 reproductive success of marten. And our data indicate
42 that in years of low vole abundance, few juvenile martens
43 are produced or survive, which links to the in-season
44 management strategy.

45

46 Certainly in-season management has some
47 certain benefits trying to gather that information, but
48 one of the real questions is how really in-season can it
49 be.

50

00398

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions for
4 ADF&G. Thank you.

5

6 Tribal governments. Any tribes wishing
7 to comment? Other agencies? Fish and game advisory
8 committee? Summary of written public comments.

9

10 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we received
11 no written public comments on this proposal.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Public
14 testimony is now open. I don't have any white cards. Do
15 you have any, Dr. Schroeder. Is there anybody in the
16 audience that would like to testify on this proposal,
17 Proposal 11?

18

19 We're at Council deliberation. What's
20 the Council's wish? Ms. Phillips?

21

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Move to adopt Proposal 11.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please state the
25 page where the language is?

26

27 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, Page
28 209.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There is a motion
31 to adopt the language on Page 209, Proposal 11. Is there
32 a second?

33

34 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a second.
37 Maker of the motion. Please proceed.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Move to amend to insert
40 for marten, the Forest Supervisor may close the Federal
41 trapping season for marten in consultation with the ADF&G
42 when sex and age ratio thresholds are exceeded. And then
43 the parenthesis stuff.

44

45 MS. GARZA: Second.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please -- are you
48 getting that?

49

50 MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

00399

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you read
2 that one more time, please, Patty?

3
4 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, the
5 Forest Supervisor may close the Federal trapping season
6 for marten in consultation with ADF&G when sex and age
7 ratio thresholds are exceeded. And in parenthesis, total
8 males harvested above 55 percent, and total young of the
9 year:adult females fall below four to one, parenthesis.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
12 and seconded to insert that language on the amendment on
13 Page 209. Discussion on the amendment.

14
15 (No discussion)

16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ready for the
18 question on the amendment? All those in favor of the
19 amended language, which would add make sure that it's
20 marten, for marten on Page 209, please signify by saying
21 aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
26 same sign.

27
28 (No opposing votes.)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amended motion
31 is before you. The language is on 209. Ms. Phillips.

32
33 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, this
34 proposal came before us at previous wildlife sessions
35 because there was as conflict between the State regs and
36 the Federal regs on trapping for marten. And at the
37 request of the SERAC, Forest Service biologists go
38 together with Hoonah -- members of the Hoonah Tribe to
39 try to resolve some of those differences, and the result
40 is the proposal we have before us.

41
42 While I do value the information from Dr.
43 Titus, I have a differing opinion on the Marten
44 populations. Number 1, they are not native to Chichagof
45 Island. They've been transplanted there. The marten are
46 highly transitory while voles are not transitory at all.
47 Marten will cross over mountain ranges to access other
48 areas of Chichagof Island in search of food.

49
50 I happen to live in a leadtoo area. I'm

00400

1 surrounded by surrounded by leadtoo and wilderness areas.
2 And if you go to the grassy flats in the spring after the
3 snow or when the snow is melting or just after the snow
4 has melted, you will find vole trails all over the flats,
5 all over the beach fringe.

6
7 The marten tend to eat the tiny song
8 birds, or tiny birds like spruce grouse or tiny birds
9 like that, other birds such as that, and I would rather
10 have our native bird population on the increase.

11
12 And staff analysis has shown that there's
13 currently not a conservation concern with marten
14 populations on Chichagof Island.

15
16 The State currently allows the use of
17 motorized vehicles for the taking of marten, mink or
18 weasel.

19
20 To ensure over-harvest does not occur,
21 ADF&G and Forest Service biologists will monitor the
22 harvest and determine sex and age ratios in the harvested
23 populations.

24
25 Thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
28 rationale for recommendation. Dr. Garza, comments? Are
29 you ready for the question? I don't know if we
30 rationalized this good enough. Are you satisfied with
31 that? We have an amended motion before you. Are you
32 ready to vote on that?

33
34 MS. GARZA: Question.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's
37 been called to vote on the amended motion as shown on
38 Page 209 and as amended to add for marten. Proposal No.
39 11. All those in favor of the adoption of that language,
40 amended language, please signify by saying aye.

41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
45 same sign.

46
47 (No opposing votes.)

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is
50 carried. This is last proposal. Proposal 11 has passed

00401

1 with the amended language on Page 209.

2

3 I don't have any idea where we are. Just
4 give me a second. Yeah, we know that several of the
5 Staff has to make connections, but we also have people
6 who have been asked to testify, public testimony, and
7 we're going to give them that opportunity.

8

9 Mr. Willard Jackson, would you please
10 come forward? Public testimony on making Ketchikan rural
11 for the purposes of ANILCA.

12

13 MR. JACKSON: My name is Willard Jackson.
14 I'm Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 14 president. I want
15 to welcome you into our ANB hall. As you look around to
16 your back, you're going to see some of our elders. Some
17 of them are still living today, lifetime members. I'm
18 just merely an instrument of what they've taught us over
19 the year of today.

20

21 I was given a box here in coming up to
22 give out to the Council members.

23

24 Within this Council I have many family
25 members. The Tek-wa-dee. Through Richard Stokes on my
26 grandfather's side from the Stikine. Harvey Kitka who's
27 father is Herman Kitka, who knows our Tek-wa-dee story
28 very well. To Mike Douville, who's also a family member
29 of mine on my mother's side, Esther Shay Takyey.

30

31 We brought with us also a resolution that
32 was brought before this floor two days ago. I'm merely
33 just a rookie. I'm just beginning in what I'm doing, and
34 I'll be 56 in May, just a young man in trying to
35 understand our cultures and our traditions and our way of
36 life that is still amongst us today.

37

38 We do have a box here we want to hand
39 out. We want to hand out some things to the Council.
40 And it's a gift from Camp 14.

41

42 We want to thank you for coming into the
43 Ketchikan area through Bill Thomas. Bill Thomas is my
44 mentor. You noticed I stood way over by the door. I got
45 tired of being hit with his cane. He reminds me of my
46 grandpa. Bill is also related to me on my mother's side.

47

48 My mother, Esther Shay, is still with us
49 today. She'll be 87 in April. And she brought me up in
50 my culture and my traditional values. And it's real good

00402

1 to see they're still alive and well today and being taken
2 care of, not only by our Tlingit brothers and sisters,
3 our Haida and Tsimsian, but also by our others in our
4 manageability of where we're at today and guardship for
5 the future of our grandchildren.

6

7 I would like our secretary, Duandare to
8 read the resolution that was signed by myself, Willard
9 Jackson, ANB President, Camp 14, and signed by Merle
10 Hawkins, ANS camp President.

11

12 MR. STANLEY: Hello. My name is James
13 Stanley. I'm the secretary for Alaska Native Brotherhood
14 Camp 14, Ketchikan. I'd like to read a letter.

15

16 To SERAC Committee meeting February 25th,
17 2003, from ANB/ANS Camp 14 Presidents. Date, February
18 25th, 2003. Topic, Ketchikan made rural for ANILCA.

19

20 Whereas Ketchikan has undergone many
21 changes since ANILCA was passed due to declines in the
22 timber and fisheries industry, and

23

24 Whereas many of the residents in the area
25 use the subsistence resource due to the high unemployment
26 and poor economic opportunities, and

27

28 Whereas Ketchikan has one of the largest
29 native populations in Southeast, about 4800 individuals
30 in KIC and Saxman IRAs, with a high percentage being
31 underserved and unemployed, and

32

33 Whereas these people live a life of
34 cultural and traditional values which are connected to
35 the land and sea, much like that enjoyed by their
36 brethren in surrounding villages and cities,

37

38 Now therefore be it resolved that the
39 Alaska Native Brotherhood, Camp 14, Ketchikan, and Alaska
40 Native Sisterhood, Camp 14, Ketchikan do request
41 consideration that Ketchikan be converted from urban
42 status to rural status, and its citizens be allowed to
43 enjoy the same privileges that many of their relatives
44 and family currently enjoy.

45

46 Signed Merle Hawkins, Camp 14 President,
47 ANS, signed Willard Jackson, ANB Camp 14 President.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00403

1 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
2 Bill Thomas. I'm a member of Camp 15, so we're a rival
3 camp. I didn't bring any bribes for you. And this is
4 Camp 14's style. They're used to bribing, and you guys
5 fall for it.

6
7 But the resolution is a good resolution.
8 I think the timing for it is right, and I want to extend
9 my thank you and appreciation to Mr. Boyd yesterday for
10 clarifying the timing of the process, and when the
11 process will start and when notices will go out with
12 regards to considering these types of requests on cycle,
13 when the determinations are out for review and
14 consideration.

15
16 The resolution mentions the demographics
17 in pretty general terms, but they're accurate. And from
18 what I heard yesterday from the non-tribal members, that
19 they're interested in not being left out and considered
20 second-class situations. You know, I don't mind being a
21 second-class citizen, but some people have objection to
22 that. But I think the timing is right, and I haven't
23 necessarily done a feel on a community-wide basis with
24 the non-tribal members, but the catalyst of the society,
25 this community is used some access to the abundance of
26 natural resources that are available. And it's not
27 respect to any single culture. We all share one culture
28 in common and that's the culture of survival. And we
29 want to take advantage of what is better for our health.
30 Some of us are born with inherent dietary needs, others
31 have acquired a taste for that, and they also realize the
32 benefits of the health that is derived from being able to
33 harvest these resources.

34
35 And so I think it will go further than
36 that. It will also give people that haven't bothered to
37 read Title VIII an opportunity to see the positive intent
38 that Title VIII had for making these resources available.
39 I shouldn't say they made them available. They've been
40 there a long time. The resources. And we've used them
41 longer than Title VIII's been in place. However, I kind
42 of like bureaucrats, you know, so we try to include them
43 in our way of life.

44
45 But we're asking for your support in our
46 request to be considered when the time comes to consider
47 our status as being eligible for rural status in the
48 Federal arena for consideration to be beneficiaries of
49 Title VIII.

50

00404

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, all
4 three of you. We certainly have indicated in the past
5 that that has support from some of the Council. I can't
6 speak for all of them. I can speak for myself, and I've
7 publicly said it in previous meetings as well as this one
8 that I fully support Ketchikan's rural status for ANILCA
9 purposes.

10

11 I will ask the Council what their wishes
12 on this. They may have questions for you as well as
13 possible action. I don't know. Council. Dr. Garza.

14

15 MS. GARZA: You be nice to me now. I've
16 got all the power. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

17

18 To the Alaska Native
19 Brotherhood/Sisterhood Camp 14, I very much appreciate
20 your presentation. It's a concern that I have as a
21 Southeast resident, as well as a Ketchikan resident, that
22 we need to encompass all of our residents in Southeast
23 into subsistence rights and opportunities. And in this
24 process of this 10-year review, it's been very ambiguous
25 to me as to how we as a Council provide the input to the
26 Federal Subsistence Board, and the Federal Subsistence
27 Board has not decided when they will be entertaining
28 these ideas and making decisions, and I understand that
29 they have a process they have to work through.

30

31 But I think it's very smart of you to
32 just take the lead and say, okay, here's our resolution.
33 This is what we want you to support. Take it forward and
34 go forward however you can, because it does help us to
35 have marching orders, and it's my intent to work with you
36 as much as I can to try and reach this end, because I do
37 believe in what you have said. There are so many
38 Ketchikan residents, 4800 of them which are native, but
39 in addition, the others that are non-native, the many of
40 them that testified yesterday, are living here not
41 because they're making lots of money, not because it's
42 really warm, not because they can drive to another town
43 in 10 minutes. They're living here because they love
44 this lifestyle, because they love this heritage as the
45 one girl yesterday morning spoke to. And so I think that
46 we all have characteristics, which is I guess the word we
47 have to use, and what will go forward to Federal
48 Subsistence Board, we all have characteristics of rural
49 residents in this community. And for that reason, I
50 think we need to support you.

00405

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

4 Mr. Adams.

5

6 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, thank you, and
7 thank you, Camp Number 14, and is it 15, Mr. Thomas? I
8 didn't know there was a Camp 15 in Ketchikan, so, okay,
9 thank you.

10

11 But anyhow, I really appreciate, you
12 know, your warm welcome here, and I just wanted to
13 emphasize, you know, the importance of not only
14 supporting this resolution, and I think we're going to
15 probably try to do that from this forum here today, but
16 also to get as much, you know, community support as you
17 possibly can.

18

19 I was talking to a gentleman yesterday.
20 I think his first name was Merle, and he was sitting
21 here, and he wanted to know the process and how to go
22 about, you know, getting Ketchikan recognized as a rural
23 status, and I kind of, you know, gave him some
24 guidelines, but I emphasized the importance of community
25 support in this issue, and I think you've got some of
26 these people that will be willing to support you in this
27 effort, so I would deeply encourage that. And I think
28 the forum is there, I think the interest is there. This
29 guy said that he was even going to, you know, get it
30 highly publicized in the Ketchikan paper. So with that,
31 you know, I would just encourage you to go that forum and
32 we wish you good luck.

33

34 And for the sake of Mr. Thomas, we are
35 going to miss you. We already do. And you provide us
36 with, even today, you know, with words of wisdom that we
37 all open our ears for. So thank you and that's all I
38 have, Mr. Chairman, for now.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

41

42 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 I do support your resolution. However, should you be
44 successful, you have to agree not to dig clams where I
45 do, or pick berries or hunt. I'm only joking. But I do
46 support you, and while -- if you did achieve rural
47 status, it's not the answer to everything, but certainly
48 it would be a help for you.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think the

00406

1 vehicle might be that with the Council's wish, if it's
2 the Council's wish to endorse a resolution similar to
3 what we've done in previous years, we can then send that
4 around for the final wording, but we can get it real
5 close that our intent is real clear what the Council
6 would like to do. Dr. Garza.

7

8 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, if the Council
9 would allow me to take this proposal up out of the
10 agenda? Hearing no objection, Mr. Chairman, I would Move
11 that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council support the
12 resolution of the Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 14 in
13 their efforts to have Ketchikan included in the rural
14 definition under ANILCA. Further, Mr. Chairman that we
15 develop a resolution of our own, including criteria that
16 will somewhat match the ISER report that we can present
17 to the Federal Subsistence Board.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 MR. STOKES: I'll second that motion.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been
24 moved and seconded. As I said, we were going to revise
25 that language so that it meets everyone's intent, but
26 clearly it is in support of the resolution before you
27 from ANB/ANS Camp 14, and also other information that
28 we've got. Is there any question on that at all? Dr.
29 Garza?

30

31 MS. GARZA: No, we can vote on it.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you.
34 Does everyone understand the motion that's before them?
35 It's two-part. Number 1 is to support the resolution of
36 the ANB/ANS Camp 14 as well as develop our own that will
37 embody the ISER recommendations. All in favor, signify
38 by saying aye.

39

40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
43 same sign.

44

45 (No opposing votes.)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The resolution is
48 hereby adopted. We support you and we appreciate your
49 presentation, and as we've said in the past, we will do
50 what we can, but we encourage you to do what has been

00407

1 suggested. You need to reach out to your neighbors. You
2 need to have them also step up to the bat with you and I
3 think that would be most effective. Thanks. Great
4 presentation.

5

6 MR. THOMAS: Our president has spoken.
7 Thank you.

8

9 MR. JACKSON: There's an old song,
10 cha-day, may our voices be heard across our grandfathers'
11 land. Cha-a-day. As I grew up in this community of
12 Ketchikan with my father Milton Jackson and my mother
13 Esther, the values that my father taught me at the table,
14 and the language and the culture that my mother bestowed
15 in me as a Tongass man, Kek-wa-dee. We will forever be
16 grateful for you being here and hearing our voice, that
17 you will carry this across our grandfathers' land. That
18 the values that we look at today are merely just here for
19 just a few more moments, and I've always got to look at
20 who's behind me, and that's my grandchildren, our
21 children's children. And that's a valuable asset that
22 we're going to leave behind them is their way of life off
23 the land and off the sea. Tlingit people are ocean
24 people. We've lived on the sea, we've lived on the land.
25 We've lived with the Tsimsian. We've lived with the
26 Haida. And today we're living with others, and we can
27 conduct ourselves in a good way. To this Council, Mr.
28 Chairman, John Littlefield, and others behind me, the
29 Forest Service and the Fish and Game, thank you for
30 allowing us to be here, and thank you for letting us
31 share how we feel as people. (In Tlingit)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

34

35 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, this proposal
36 has passed, so I just want to move on to administrative
37 stuff. In working on the resolution, I want to ask help
38 from ADF&G Subsistence Division. I had asked Mike to
39 stand guard and knowing that we're running late, I just
40 want to make that sure I can work with you over the next
41 couple days.

42

43 The data that ISER provided I think is
44 outdated and doesn't demonstrate the dependence on these
45 resources from the Ketchikan area.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mike, will you
48 work with us on that, and try to get.....

49

50 MR. TITUS: (Nods affirmative)

00408

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
2 much.

3
4 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I request and
5 ask unanimous consent for a suspension of rules for about
6 one minute?

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
9 objection from the Council? So ordered. Go ahead.

10
11 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
12 never really took the time to formally welcome this body
13 to Ketchikan. I'm really proud to see everybody here.
14 And I'm real confident in the Council that I'm looking
15 at. And I also want to express my appreciation for
16 having the opportunity of working with each of you.
17 You've all been very supportive in many, many ways, and
18 as well as Staff, people in the back of me, the
19 Department, OSM have been helpful personally and in a
20 team effort on doing things. I can't have gone 10 years
21 without learning, and learning for the positive, and hope
22 to be a positive contributor in the future.

23
24 So your kind gestures of acknowledgement
25 yesterday, I don't have words to express my thank you and
26 appreciation for those. I've never experienced that
27 before. And like I always tell people I work with, I'm
28 generally more interested in results than I am rewards or
29 awards. But you get as old as I am, you take anything
30 any more, so I was really happy to get the awards.

31
32 So I want to wish you the best of luck to
33 the Council, to the Federal Subsistence Board, to the
34 Department, and to the people that are involved in this
35 process and are beneficiaries of the process, that this
36 go forward in a positive manner. And I think everybody
37 I've mentioned have grown in this process. Some of it we
38 like personally, some of it we have no control over what
39 we have to do.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
44 much for your kind words. Do you have anything else? Do
45 you have another presentation?

46
47 MR. STANLEY: Yes, we do, Mr. Chair.
48 First of all, we'd like to say thank you for the coho
49 eggs that you brought forward for us to give our elders
50 in the community.

00409

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: (In Tlingit)

2

3 MR. STANLEY: And that's it. Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right now while we
6 have all the Council here, I'd like to take care of
7 something that I believe we can do real shortly is the
8 time and date of one year out meeting. Our next meeting
9 is in Craig, tentatively set for October 6th. We need to
10 come up with a year meeting as well as finalize the Craig
11 meeting, and I'm hoping that won't take too long.

12

13 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, if Council
14 members would look at the last page of their Council
15 book, it gives us the meeting advisory window for our
16 fall meeting, and we'll note that we're scheduled to meet
17 in Craig at that time. There was also interest on the
18 part of a number of Council members in taking some time
19 prior to this meeting to see some of the areas on Prince
20 of Wales that we've been talking about so intensely for a
21 number of years, particularly to visit some steelhead
22 sites and to see something of deer habit on the island,
23 so we try to do that before the Craig meeting.

24

25 The winter 2004 meeting, the meeting
26 window opens on February 18 and closes on February 21.
27 We need a suggestion on where this meeting will
28 tentatively be held, and some dates.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I recommend
31 Scottsdale. Ms. Phillips.

32

33 MS. PHILLIPS: I would like to suggest
34 Sitka in March. Late March.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Sitka late March.
37 Others? Dr. Garza.

38

39 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, just because
40 regions do try to snatch up weeks, if we could
41 specifically say that last week and it will get as close
42 -- it will get us as close to herring eggs as we can get,
43 so it would be the week of March 17th in our window.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The week of March
46 17th. It's fishing season time. It may not be fish egg
47 time.

48

49 MR. SCHROEDER: Does any Council member
50 know if there's any conflict with anything else that

00410

1 might be occurring at that time? I think is that after
2 Gold Metal, presumably?

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. First Sitka
5 is going once. Any objection or changes from just Sitka.
6 Unit 4. Okay. Well, Unuk 4. And so we'll go with
7 Sitka, and what about the last week, any objection to
8 that? The week of the 17th in Sitka.

9

10 Do you want to revisit the Craig and firm
11 that up?

12

13 MR. SCHROEDER: I think we're set and
14 ready to go for Craig. I'd just like very quickly to see
15 if Council members are interested in a day or two prior
16 to our formal meeting beginning for both a joint purpose
17 of possibly a half day on Staff training and Council
18 training, and some time to do some field observation of
19 deer and steelhead sites.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think that's a
22 wonderful opportunity. Other Staff, how long would you
23 want -- or other Council, how long do you think that
24 would be appropriate, a half day, a day?

25

26 MS. GARZA: I'd say a week.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: A week in
29 Scottsdale.

30

31 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I think it
32 would be good to see the Staney Creek area, the area that
33 Merle Schultz did talk about where there's the 25-year
34 old growth, and perhaps some of the steelhead creeks
35 where we either do or don't have issues with
36 conservation.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd also like the Council
39 to note that the Federal Subsistence Board was discussing
40 where they would be going on their summer field trip, and
41 there was some interest on the part of some Council
42 members in going to Prince of Wales. That won't work out
43 at that time, but on behalf of the Council, with your
44 permission, I'd extend our invitation to any Federal
45 Board members who wish to see something of Prince of
46 Wales at that time. Chair Demientieff in particular was
47 very interested in getting some on-the-ground experience
48 on Prince of Wales.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

00411

1 MS. GARZA: Apparently I'm the secretary
2 to more than one people on this side. We want to see
3 caves, too.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Anything else on
6 the time and date? I just wanted to make sure if we
7 adjourned and ran out, that we weren't out of business.

8
9 Okay. I want to go to the Fisheries
10 Resource Monitoring Program. We have lots of stuff to
11 take care of. I don't know if we're going to take care
12 of all of it. Fisheries resource requires millions of
13 dollars that we pass through and acknowledge. Very
14 important. We need to have that information at least
15 presented to us. Doug McBride.

16
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two minutes.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Doug, would you
20 please give us a couple minutes? We'll be right back.
21 WE'll take a stand-down for a couple minutes.

22
23 (Off record)

24
25 (On record)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're back
28 on the record. Fisheries resource monitoring program.

29
30 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of
31 the Council. My name is Doug McBride. I'm with the
32 Office of Subsistence Management, and within the Office
33 of Subsistence Management, there's a section in there
34 called the Fishery Information Services, which is where I
35 work. And my job and the job of the Fisheries
36 Information Services is to administer and oversee what's
37 called the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program. And as
38 Mr. Littlefield referenced a couple of minutes ago,
39 that's the investment on the part of the Federal
40 Subsistence Program in assessment work for fisheries
41 management of subsistence fisheries on Federal public
42 lands.

43
44 What I'd like to do today is provide just
45 a very, very brief overview of the performance of the
46 programs that we've funded so far to date. And then
47 following my brief overview, there are several
48 investigators that are here that are going to be making
49 while brief presentations, more detailed presentations on
50 the projects that they are doing. And what we're trying

00412

1 to do was make an opportunity for some of these
2 investigators to report on their performance and on their
3 progress on their projects, and particularly
4 investigators which you're going to see in the future
5 because they either are or will be we're sure submitting
6 future proposals for consideration for funding.

7
8 The material I'm going to be covering
9 today is in your book. It's under Tab D, and I'd
10 specifically like to direct you right now to Page 214,
11 which is a graph that we've seen before, but I thought
12 this would be a good place to start. This is just a
13 pictorial of the finances of the Fishery Resource
14 Monitoring Program on a statewide basis. And so what you
15 see across the bottom are the years. The program started
16 in the year 2000. And then each bar is the amount of
17 money that has been invested, or in the case of 2004, is
18 available for investment for this program. And like I
19 say, I don't want to spend a lot of time on this, but as
20 you can see, the program started with about a two and a
21 half million dollar investment in 2000.

22
23 Then the following year was our single
24 biggest one, because we had year two of the 2000 program,
25 plus what is envisioned and what has been the annual
26 allocation for this program, which was seven and a
27 quarter million dollars, so in that second bar, that top
28 part, that's the full seven and a quarter million
29 dollars. And you can see that we allow programs up to
30 three years duration, so you can see that playing out
31 over time.

32
33 And so as you move across the board, or
34 across the horizontal axis, you come to 2004, and what I
35 want to direct you to is that top part of the graph that
36 says \$5 million. In 204 we will have completed most, not
37 all, but most of our prior obligations for funding, and
38 so there will be \$5 million available for programs in
39 2004.

40
41 Now, as we discussed at the last meeting
42 in Hoonah, and actually we discussed it a year ago at the
43 meeting, one of the things we've tried to do is go
44 through what we all a strategic planning exercise, to try
45 to help focus our attention on that \$5 million and try to
46 sort out the highest priority things that we might want
47 to consider funding. And so if you look at the next
48 page, on Page 215, what you see there are series of
49 bulleted questions. And again I don't want to go through
50 this in a lot of detail, this in fact what we did six

00413

1 months ago in Hoonah, but what we've envisioned for
2 strategic planning is to ask a series of questions and
3 then work with you to provide answers to help direct what
4 we think might, or what we want as priorities for the
5 program. And like I say, you can read those questions.
6 We've gone through these before.

7

8 I would particularly point you to
9 question number 2, which is issues and information need
10 which likely require annual collection of long-term data
11 sets. What we tried to do there was provide some
12 direction for which programs we might want to consider
13 funding longer than three years, and the order in which
14 we'd want to consider those.

15

16 But the final question on there, the
17 results of the projects to date, that is the one piece of
18 this plan that we have not addressed. We really were not
19 in a position to do that back in Hoonah and that's what
20 we told you then was we'd come back with a report of
21 performance and progress at this meeting. So that's what
22 this presentation is about.

23

24 For the overview of progress, if you turn
25 the page to Page 217, you'll see a table, and this is
26 table of everything that we have funded in this program
27 so far. And the first column are just project numbers.

28

29 The next column of data type I think most
30 of you remember that we have two different classes or
31 types of programs. The first monitor, SST, stands for
32 stock status and trends. Those are programs that assess
33 fish populations by and large, so we're trying to assess
34 abundance, assess migration patterns, age composition,
35 those kinds of things. But then the other category of
36 project are what are called HMTK, which stands for
37 harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge.
38 And those are programs that are primarily focused on the
39 subsistence harvest itself. And looking at patterns of
40 harvest, levels of harvest, types of harvest, those kinds
41 of things.

42

43 The next column over is the project
44 title. Those are obviously the titles of the programs
45 that we've funded.

46

47 The next column over, the investigators,
48 those are all the different investigators associated with
49 each project. Most of our projects by design have
50 multiple investigators. One of the things we try to

00414

1 encourage is collaboration and cooperation between
2 Federal agency, State agency, and what we call NGOs,
3 nongovernmental organizations, which are largely tribal
4 groups or other rural organizations. But those are the
5 investigators associated with each project.

6
7 And then on the far right is the money
8 associated with those projects. And you can see how that
9 money plays out over time.

10
11 The rest of what's in the report is a
12 project-by-project summary of where we're at with that
13 project. And I'm not going to go through each project,
14 but I'm certainly open to questions on that. But what I
15 will continue to focus on is this table as just a summary
16 of overview.

17
18 And as you can see from the table, the
19 top half of the table has to do with sockeye projects.
20 That has clearly been the number 1 priority for the
21 Fishery Resource Monitoring Program in Southeast Alaska.
22 That was very much done by design. That was one of the
23 top issues and information needs identified by the
24 Council, and clearly having a time series of information,
25 particularly for sockeye salmon escapements, is an
26 incredibly important thing to do. And most of the
27 program has been focused on sockeye salmon escapement.

28
29 And in terms of performance, I think with
30 really very few exceptions, most of these projects have
31 performed and delivered the information as they were
32 planned out. Most of these projects are focused on
33 trying to estimate the level of escapement, or, your
34 know, spawning population in individual systems. That's
35 done usually with either a weir or what's called a
36 mark/recaptured or a tagging experiment. Those are the
37 two most common methodologies that we have in these
38 projects. Every one of these projects has a
39 collaborative or cooperative nature to it. One of the --
40 let's say one of the things that we highly stress in this
41 program is what we all capacity building, and as you can
42 see from what looks like alphabet soup there, but what
43 you can see from all the investigators there, is a very
44 wide range of cooperators that includes a lot of rural
45 organizations and tribal groups in Southeast Alaska.

46
47 I think the primary applications that
48 this information has been put to, there really are a
49 couple, most of these programs are designed to try to
50 figure out an appropriate escapement goal if you will, or

00415

1 a management target for those individual systems. A lot
2 of that type of information takes a while to get, but I
3 think there's been a much more immediate application. I
4 would say that a lot of these programs have been very,
5 very useful to both State and Federal managers to
6 configuring subsistence opportunity appropriately with
7 levels of salmon abundance, and I think there have been
8 examples where this information has been used either to
9 restrict opportunity on the part of either subsistence
10 users or other users when there's been a conservation
11 concern or problem, and I think there's been other
12 examples where particularly subsistence opportunity has
13 been liberalized when there's been fish abundance that
14 has been either greater than expected or greater than
15 known since a lot of these systems, there wasn't a lot of
16 escapement information prior to that.

17

18 There are a couple of projects that you
19 should think about in terms of, you know, what we might
20 consider for the future that really have not performed as
21 they were originally designed. Probably the most acute
22 example of that is the Virginia Lake project, which is a
23 small system over by Wrangell. And on that one there
24 really were some very unanticipated, unexpected
25 difficulties. To make a long story short, it is not
26 clear whether all the fish that are getting into the
27 mouth of the creek where our assessment program was
28 designed are surviving to make it up to the lake.
29 There's a series of very significant falls between the
30 mouth of the lake and the -- or the mouth of the stream
31 and the lake. And what we've done there is we've worked
32 with the Forest Service, who is the investigator on that
33 project, and in this final year, the third year coming
34 up, we've completely redesigned that program and we're
35 going to do a radio tagging study, and the whole idea is
36 -- I know this sounds like a very, very basic question,
37 but the whole idea of what we're going to do is to
38 estimate what proportion of the fish that make it into
39 the mouth of the stream actually survive to make it up to
40 the lake. And if the answer to that is not very many,
41 then I think the Forest Service outside of this program
42 is probably going to be looking real seriously at doing
43 some stream modification, steep passes, fish passes,
44 those kinds of things. There's already one steep pass in
45 the system, but there may be reason to -- some good
46 reason to think that more are needed for that system.

47

48 I think the only other project that I'll
49 mention in terms of not performing as planned from a
50 technical standpoint is what we call the trilogy of

00416

1 projects in the Kake area, particularly Gut Bay, which
2 has been the subject of regulatory action. They had a
3 very, very difficult time trying to estimate escapement
4 in there. That was designed as a tagging study. It
5 really hasn't worked. And we do want to try to look at
6 that in the future, because from a strategic standpoint
7 there's a really good reason to have some estimate of
8 escapement in there, and I think in the future one of the
9 things that we've got as a proposal right now is to look
10 at a weir in there. But again, just in terms of
11 technical difficulties that's probably the other example
12 where a program hasn't performed as originally designed.

13

14 I think in general all the rest really
15 have. It's really been I think a good thing. We're
16 getting I think very credible estimates of escapement in
17 the vast majority of these systems. In addition to that,
18 we're sampling the lake to get limnology, trying to
19 figure out what the carrying capacity of the lake. The
20 escapements are being sampled for age, sex, size
21 composition. In a lot of cases the harvest immediately
22 in front of the stream is also being monitored. We're
23 getting a lot of good information on that, and again
24 you'll be hearing some presentations on that following
25 mine.

26

27 On the second category of projects, the
28 harvest monitoring and TEK projects, has been a little
29 bit more of a mixed bag. I think in general again I
30 think we're getting very good information. But these
31 projects are a little more -- they're a little less kind
32 of off the shelf type technology I think, and in some
33 cases we've got projects that I think are performing, but
34 a little behind schedule. And some examples of that
35 would be like projects 104 and 105, and again we've got
36 that investigator here. He'll be talking to you about
37 that. But we're real confident that even though they're
38 behind schedule, we're going to get good information on
39 the subsistence harvest. That's what they're designed to
40 do.

41

42 Some of the projects are very much
43 performing as designed. And probably good examples of
44 that -- in fact, some of them have been completed, like
45 00-015. And then, unfortunately, the folks from Yakutat
46 didn't make it here, but 01-091, that project is
47 proceeding as it was designed.

48

49 Really the only one that we're going to
50 basically finish up work that's been completed, but not

00417

1 complete the third year of work is project 00-045, and on
2 that one we've had a change in investigator. We've just
3 been unsuccessful in finding another investigator. We've
4 been trying to do that for over year now. And so the
5 work that was started in years one and years two, our
6 social scientist on staff, Ms. Polly Wheeler, who you met
7 in Hoonah, she's going to be working with them to finish
8 that work up, and then we're going to take the third year
9 of that funding and try to plow that back into new
10 project starts.

11

12 I think with that, Mr. Chairman, I'm
13 going to stop my presentation, ask if there's any
14 questions about just the overview, and then like I say,
15 we've got several presenters, investigators here. There
16 ones that I know of are Mr. Jack Lorrigan with the Sitka
17 Tribe, Bert Lewis from Alaska Department of Fish and
18 Game, and Mike Turek from Alaska Department of Fish and
19 Game. They're all here to give you more detailed
20 presentations about their projects. And their projects
21 really cover a wide gamut, you know, the whole range of
22 what's on this table.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
25 questions at this time from Council for Mr. McBride? Dr.
26 Garza.

27

28 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
29 much appreciate the presentation as well as the summary
30 and the packet. And it does look like things are rolling
31 along quite well. The only question I had was I wasn't
32 sure what TST was under 038, the GIS data base
33 development.

34

35 MR. McBRIDE: 038?

36

37 MS. GARZA: Yeah.

38

39 MR. McBRIDE: Oh, other -- okay.

40

41 REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

42

43 MR. TUREK: Chair, Dr. Garza, that's a
44 consulting group, a computer consulting group. I think
45 that that may have been changed. They've had some --
46 they wanted to change the consulting group, and I'm not
47 sure if this is referring to the original group or the
48 new one. One of them was from Fairbanks. I think
49 they've changed that to a group in Juneau. That's really
50 all I can tell you right now. I can find out more from

00418

1 Brian Davis for you on that.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
4 questions for Mr. McBride or Mr. Turek? Cal.

5

6 MR. CASIPIT: Just a point of
7 clarification on Ms. Garza's question. The lion's share
8 of the money is going to Fish and Game and the
9 Tlingit-Haida Central Council. That small portion of the
10 computer support is only a small subcontract that
11 Tlingit-Haida Central Council is taking care of.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Follow up or other
14 questions? Okay. Are you going to lead us through the
15 presenters?

16

17 MR. McBRIDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Like I
18 say, there are three investigators that are here.
19 There's Mr. Jack Lorrigan with the Sitka Tribe. The
20 Sitka Tribe's been involved in several of the sockeye
21 assessment projects. There's also Mr. Bert Lewis from
22 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and Alaska Department
23 of Fish and Game has clearly been a major player in
24 sockeye investigations, and then also Mr. Mike Turek who's
25 been the primary investigator for the harvest monitor/TEK
26 projects. So, Mr. Chairman, it would be your pleasure as
27 to the order in which you'd like.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Lorrigan.

30

31 MR. LORRIGAN: Can everybody see that?
32 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Counsel members, my name is
33 Jack Lorrigan. I'm the biologist for the Sitka Tribe.
34 And I'll be reporting on the three projects that the
35 Tribe has been involved with since 2001.

36

37 This first project, Salmon Lake, involves
38 three partners, actually four. The Tribe, the Fish and
39 Game, the Forest Service and NSERAA, Northern
40 Southeastern Regional Aquaculture Association. And one
41 of the reasons why this project is so important to four
42 groups is that the sockeye and coho returning -- well,
43 there's two species we're looking at. There's quite a
44 gauntlet of fisheries that the fish have to pass through
45 as they're coming into town.

46

47 This is an ocean view of Sitka, and the
48 fish coming back to Sitka would have to go to the right
49 in order to hit Silver Bay. As silvers are coming home,
50 they encounter this and this. So that run is both runs

00419

1 of coho and sockeye experiencing quite a bit of
2 exploitation. And that's actually a herring fishery, but
3 when they're after the chums pretty heavy in Deep Inlet,
4 that's what it looks like.

5
6 This hear the project, the weir goes in
7 the 1st of June and it's pulled the 31st of October,
8 because we're looking at two species, and that's pretty
9 much when the coho run is over in there. This year with
10 the mark/recapture estimations, there's about 1,051
11 sockeye into the lake. That doesn't make a subsistence
12 opportunity to the tribe. That' fish that are needed in
13 the lake, so as far as we're concerned, those fish and
14 probably a couple thousand more are probably needed to
15 seed the lake sufficiently.

16
17 Coho do real well at reseeding the lake
18 at lower numbers, but this year we had about 1100 fish
19 come back to the drainage. And I say drainage, because
20 they don't all pass through the weir. There's a number
21 of fish that stay below the weir and don't even bother
22 coming through, because they either were in that lower
23 stream estuary, or have no need to come in.

24
25 NSRAA is doing the tagging, the juvenile
26 tagging, because they're going to start boarding boats
27 here pretty soon to look for coho interception. So this
28 year they've been trying to shoot for about 5,000 smolts
29 per year to get a number of -- for statistical reasons in
30 and to ensure that some of those fish are up and they
31 find them -- hopefully find them or don't find them in
32 the fishery, the chum salmon seining, the commercial chum
33 troll, coho troll and the guided sport fleet.

34
35 You can turn it off.

36
37 The lake is about, from high water is
38 about a half mile from tidewater, so we use a helicopter
39 to get the gear in there. It's much better than hiking
40 it in. We prebuilt the floating weir. The Tribe has
41 developed or created a floating weir. It's the only one
42 in Southeast other than the one at Yakutat, and we built
43 it in the warehouse, and then we just floated it to the
44 lake.

45
46 Local hire at work. Every summer so far
47 I've been able to hire or keep employed at least seven to
48 eight people.

49
50 A floating weir is designed to take heavy

00420

1 flows. there's an angle iron beam imbedded in the stream
2 bed. The panels are attached to the cable, which is
3 attached to the angle iron, which is buried in the stream
4 bed. It allows the weir to fly during different flows.
5 There's -- let's see if we can get a picture of it. If
6 you'd notice down in the lower right-hand corner there's
7 baffles that are laying flat, almost parallel with the
8 panels. Those are adjustable, so during heavy flows you
9 can make kind of like an elevator on an airplane wing.
10 It will bring the weir up and keep the tips out of water,
11 and the water will pass through. Now, if a log were to
12 break loose and come down to the weir, it would just go
13 right over the top of it and on down the stream, and the
14 weir would pop back up. With traditional weirs that
15 wouldn't happen. You'd have to saw the log up or you
16 risk losing your weir.

17

18 This is where the trap in the original
19 weir were joined. There's a herring net web that kind of
20 block that passage. It's been modified since this
21 picture. There's a heavy duty seine bunt between the
22 trap and the weir now, and it seems to be working a lot
23 better.

24

25 The adults are worked up. They're
26 anesthetized, measured and weighed. The sockeye in
27 Salmon Lake are being floy tagged 100 percent for
28 mark/recapture reasons. Scales are taken for aging. The
29 fish are released. As I stated before, this year
30 probably a little over 1,000 sockeye got into the lake
31 and about 1100 coho.

32

33 I mentioned to the council earlier in
34 this meeting that Redoubt sockeye management plan has
35 been enacted by the Board of Fish. During times of low
36 abundance at Redoubt, when Redoubt is not able to sustain
37 a fishery, usually what happens is Redoubt gets closed
38 and Salmon Lake gets closed, the next lake that gets used
39 is Klag Bay which is north of Sitka about 45 miles by
40 boat.

41

42 The weir's usually installed mid June and
43 pulled around September 12th, 11th time period. We had
44 3700 coho coming through, and this year we had 17,000
45 sockeye go through the weir. Our mark/recapture
46 estimates indicate that the weir is very tight. Almost
47 identical numbers at the weir versus mark/recapture in
48 the stream. This year we had about 4,000 more fish this
49 year than last year, and it was very apparent that there
50 was quite an effort on this stock out front. In fact a

00421

1 little after the 4th of July they'd only had 39 fish
2 through the weir, and they were getting hammered out
3 front. And based on the evidence at the weir, Fish and
4 Game decided to close Klag Bay until some rain came, and
5 allow those fish to pass upstream.

6
7 We estimated via creel census that about
8 2600 sockeye were harvested, and maybe more. I haven't
9 got the information back from Fish and Game on all the
10 reporting that they're supposed to be doing.

11
12 Again these projects couldn't happen
13 without Federal support. We had a little dog and pony
14 show, and we had some of the higher-ups come out and see
15 what we were up to. And I think a good time was had by
16 all.

17
18 We weren't able to get three, four years
19 of funding for Klag Bay, so 2003 will be mainly funded
20 from the Sustainable Salmon Funds from the Governor's
21 Office with some match from the Federal side, but it will
22 be a much scaled-back operation out at Klag. We're going
23 to have -- we're just basically going to count fish.
24 There's not going to be any mark/recapture. There's just
25 not the funds to finance a crew out there to do that.
26 And based on this last year's data on the recaptures,
27 we're fairly confident that site the weir is located,
28 that the fish aren't getting through. They have to get
29 by us, so nobody's sneaking by.

30
31 Redfish Bay. That's not turning out.
32 This looks better on the screen.

33
34 In year 2000 there was an illegal seining
35 event that happened during the year which some manager
36 feel really impacted that run. Those responsible were
37 prosecuted and they lost their boat and some fishing
38 privileges and got some time in jail.

39
40 However, Tumakof Lake is one of the most
41 productive lakes on the west coast for its size. It's a
42 mile and a half long by about a half mile wide. It's 100
43 meter deep in some of the deeper areas, and it's very,
44 very productive. And that's some of the reasons why we
45 go down there.

46
47 Because of that event, Sitka Tribe of
48 Alaska applied for monitoring funds for this stream, and
49 we wish to apply again, because the life cycle of the
50 sockeye is roughly four to five to six years, and the

00422

1 bird year in question of whether or not that seining
2 event impacted it wouldn't happen until 2004 and 2005.
3 So we'll have to figure out some way to get some money to
4 fund a crew down there.

5
6 Our interest in Redfish Bay stems back
7 thousands of years. These are ancient weir stakes in the
8 estuary. Archaeologists estimate they're several
9 thousand years old.

10
11 Mr. McBride and Terry Suminski and I
12 looked for a weir site back 2001, and we put the weir in
13 for the first time in 2002. The cabin looks right down
14 on the weir.

15
16 There's roughly 24,000 sockeye that got
17 by the weir. About 1300 were harvested. And our
18 mark/recapture estimates were within the 10 percent error
19 range. There were so many fish coming through, we were
20 trying to tag 15 percent, but there's just -- we just
21 couldn't keep up with it, so it went down to 14.5 or
22 something like that, or 13.2 we think. And our recapture
23 rate was about 12.4 I think.

24
25 These projects have provided a lot of
26 employment for the Tribe. That's just a handful of
27 people that are involved with the process of handling
28 this money and getting the projects done. The
29 partnerships we've developed out of this with Fish and
30 Game and the Forest Service have been very valuable. And
31 I would like to thank them.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is that it then?
34 Are there any questions for Mr. Lorrigan or comments from
35 Council? Very good presentation, Jack. Thank you. Mr.
36 Bert Lewis.

37
38 MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, members of the
39 committee, thank you for the opportunity this afternoon
40 to give this short presentation on sockeye salmon
41 subsistence projects. My presentation is going to
42 consist of some repetition with a brief overview of the
43 stock assessment, some of the results that we're seeing,
44 some of the benefits and what I think are some of the
45 future options for us.

46
47 I'll start with what have we done. As
48 you know, a series of lakes have been selected according
49 to sockeye stocks that are important subsistence
50 resources on them, and they cover pretty much the whole

00423

1 range of Southeast Alaska. The sockeye salmon stock
2 assessment projects are designed to assess the health of
3 the sockeye population in each lake. These stock
4 assessments are based around the life cycle of a sockeye
5 salmon, looking at all the different life stages that we
6 can get our hands on pretty much.

7

8 An important one is escapement, and we
9 are monitoring that as you've heard through
10 mark/recapture methods or using a weir.

11

12 We're also collecting biological data as
13 Jack mentioned a minute ago, including scale sampling to
14 determine the age of returning adult salmon.

15

16 One component that's pretty valuable is
17 the hydro-acoustics estimates to look at juvenile sockeye
18 salmon. This figure you see here is basically a fish
19 finder printout. Each of the red dots represent a fish,
20 and this is Kanalku Lake. Kanalku Lake had the lowest
21 fry density of any lake that we looked at in 2001, and
22 you can compare that to Hetta Lake which had the highest
23 density of fry of any lake that we looked at. And these
24 become important as you'll see later.

25

26 We're also monitoring the limnology as
27 Doug McBride mentioned, looking at the food resources
28 available in the lakes to support the juvenile sockeye.

29

30 Well, what have we learned from this
31 project? I'm not going to go into too much detail. The
32 reports are out. Last year's annual reports are out and
33 you can look at those. But we feel that we've identified
34 some healthy stocks. It's important to keep in mind that
35 this is only two years of sampling, but during that time
36 these six lakes have all had good escapement, and have
37 supported some level of subsistence harvest.

38

39 We've also identified potentially
40 depressed stocks. Again, the same caution that it's only
41 two years of data, but Falls Lake and Kanalku have had
42 very little escapement. It's not clear what's going on
43 there. And we feel that more data is required before any
44 management decisions are made.

45

46 Kook Lake also had low escapement, and it
47 appeared that there was a debris jam at the outlet. And
48 that's being removed on an annual basis now. It seems to
49 be allowing more fish to escape into the lake. Hopefully
50 we'll see a response in that population.

00424

1 And we also have some uncertainty with
2 results of the project. Hetta Lake. Prior to the
3 project implementation, people of Hydaburg and the people
4 on the project told us about tremendous escapement the
5 year before, which is supported by the high density of
6 fry that you saw the next year in the lake. But the two
7 years that we've been operating the project, escapement
8 has been pretty low. So low in fact that it's been
9 difficult to operate our mark/ recapture. So it's not
10 clear what's going on there. It could be a cyclic
11 population. Again we need to track it through the entire
12 life cycle of the sockeye salmon to see what's going on.

13

14 Hoktaheen Lake has been a little bit
15 difficult. The fish came in, spawned, and died in such
16 rapid succession that it limited our project function.

17

18 And Klawock Lake, there's a lot going on
19 at Klawock Lake. Pretty complicated. And it's uncertain
20 what the status of that stock is, but I think we're
21 starting to get a handle on it.

22

23 A couple of unsuccessful projects that
24 Doug McBride also mentioned. Hasselborg River. We
25 attempted implement our standard stock assessment on the
26 Hasselborg River, but because of river flows and current
27 issues, not very conducive to the project, so that
28 project was abandoned. I believe Kook Lake was added as
29 this one was dropped.

30

31 And then Gut Bay, Doug talked about that.
32 Difficult to work in Gut Bay. And weather made it hard
33 to get in there in a timely manner, so for two years now
34 we've been unable to get a good escapement estimate. As
35 Doug mentioned, in a proposal that's up for review I
36 believe, we're proposing to put a weir in there.

37

38 So there's another round of funding
39 available right now, and we've submitted seven proposals
40 which are basically a continuation of these projects,
41 with some modifications, including a reduction in costs
42 hopefully, and a shift of responsibilities to the tribal
43 agencies.

44

45 We feel it's important, because sockeye
46 salmon continue to be the most important subsistence fish
47 resource.

48

49 Why continue this research? As I said,
50 when you look at the stocks that are potentially healthy

00425

1 or depressed, we only have two years of data, and you
2 could potentially be sampling during a peak or a low
3 point of it, and two years might be misleading. We feel
4 that five to six years minimum data collection is
5 required to get through an entire generation of sockeye
6 salmon. We also feel that identifying long-term projects
7 based on some of these criteria, including importance to
8 subsistence users, important management issues,
9 supportive tribal government cooperating on the project,
10 and support from Federal and State agencies.

11

12 One of the benefits of continuing these
13 sockeye salmon projects is increased responsibilities,
14 participation and funds for the cooperators. As Doug
15 McBride said, capacity building has been an important
16 component of these projects, and we're working with seven
17 tribal governments, employing 20 tribal technicians,
18 providing staff support for the cooperatives, and
19 building infrastructure at all levels of the projects.

20

21 Capacity building is really about the
22 people. And over the past two years we've been able to
23 bring people together to work on these projects. A great
24 example is Jack Lorrigan, the fish biologist for the
25 Sitka Tribal Association, and as he continues to learn
26 and work with the State about data analysis, his capacity
27 for the Sitka Tribal Association should really expand I
28 believe.

29

30 Another example is Anthony Christianson
31 of the Hydaburg Cooperative Association who has been
32 instrumental in having the Hetta Lake project run
33 smoothly. He hired Robert Sanderson and Lee Charles who
34 have been a great crew. Lee Charles is being trained as
35 the crew leader this year. Tony also recognized the need
36 for additional subsistence monitoring and co-authored a
37 proposal for a stock assessment project on Eek Lake which
38 has been funded, and we're kicking that off this year.
39 So that project, and working with Hydaburg has really
40 been rewarding.

41

42 Similarly, John Feller is coming back for
43 his third year as field crew leader of the Wrangell
44 Cooperative Association, and we are giving the staff at
45 their office more and more responsibility in running the
46 projects.

47

48 LeRoy Martin of the Angoon project,
49 pictured in the center is crew leader and has field
50 operations oversight.

00426

1 The Klawock project has also been working
2 with capacity, with increased capacity. Henry Kennedy
3 has been with the project for three years and should be
4 coming on as crew leader in the future. Pete Brown, very
5 enthusiastic, coming back for his second year.

6
7 So that kind of is a look at what some of
8 the people involved with the project are, and that's what
9 the capacity building seems to be really all about in my
10 mind. And it's been a pleasure to work with these
11 people.

12
13 Looking at the historic relationship of
14 government agencies and some of these communities, it
15 hasn't been that productive, and I think this is an
16 opportunity to start off on a good footing. And there's
17 been a range of acceptance of these projects, but in
18 general they've been well received and meeting with a
19 fair amount of success. A good example of that is Robert
20 Sanderson out of the Hydaburg Cooperative, and his public
21 relation skills are really outstanding. Anyone that
22 knows Bob knows that he's perfectly willing to sit there
23 and tell you the -- about the fish of Prince of Wales
24 Island and what the benefits are of these project. And
25 he's been a real asset to the program, too. Learned a
26 lot from Bob.

27
28 Sockeye subsistence projects allow
29 management flexibility because of adequate information
30 that is provided by these projects. Residents and Alaska
31 Department of Fish and Game have worked together with
32 project information to modify permits and manage
33 fisheries. Some examples of that you've already heard.
34 Klat, Sitkoh and Falls Lakes permits have been changed to
35 trip limit rather than annual limits -- no, I'm sorry,
36 that's backwards, from trip limits to annual limits. If
37 someone takes the effort to go all the way out to Falls
38 Lake and catches a big mess of fish, they're only allowed
39 20 fish on that day, so this was a reasonable management
40 decision.

41
42 Klag Lake as you heard was re-opened
43 after closure when escapement came up.

44
45 Another good example is the Angoon
46 internal regulation of Kanalku fishing. When the project
47 presented data of low escapement, and the hydro-acoustic
48 estimate that you saw before, people recognized that
49 Kanalku fishery was suffering, and they voluntarily
50 imposed a moratorium on subsistence harvest at Kanalku,

00427

1 and hopefully we'll see a response from that. And as we
2 monitor it through time as it rebounds, no reason why we
3 shouldn't start the subsistence harvest back up. They'll
4 be in charge of that.

5
6 So in summary, these projects as they
7 continue into the future will determine and monitor the
8 health of these stocks, continued capacity building,
9 assure long-term sustainability of these important
10 subsistence resources, and guide management decisions.

11
12 That's all I have for you. Thank you
13 very much.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any
16 Council questions for Mr. Lewis. Great job. Thank you.
17 Dr. Garza, did you have.

18
19 MS. GARZA: Just one quick one. One
20 quick question, Mr. Chairman. So I guess both to you and
21 Jack, has the information that you've gleaned from these
22 projects been shared with the communities closest to
23 them?

24
25 MR. LEWIS: We have tried to have
26 community meetings through ANBs and the corporations, and
27 they have met with I would say limited success, mostly
28 because of very low attendance. And I don't know if it's
29 timing or because potentially of the historic
30 relationship between the community, and we're going to
31 try again with more of a cooperative approach rather than
32 just having a billing of Fish and Game sockeye
33 presentation, and doing something more cooperative this
34 year. But, no, I don't know how well it's reached the
35 community.

36
37 MR. LORRIGAN: I haven't presented this
38 to Council yet, but tomorrow I'm giving this basically
39 same talk to, a cabin fever talk there in Sitka. That's
40 one of the reasons why I have to go back today.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

43
44 MS. PHILLIPS: I would like to recommend
45 that you give a presentation in the high schools. This
46 capacity building is just really encouraging to me. It's
47 great to see our native people being involved in this
48 resource monitoring projects, and if we could get our
49 youth interested and steered in career directions, that
50 they can help capacity build, that would be great.

00428

1 MR. LEWIS: Yeah, last year I did give
2 presentations to grade school and high school in Hydaburg
3 and Klawock, and hope to do that again. It was well
4 received and it was either through a science class or to
5 a general assembly.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Great idea. Any
8 other Council comments. Good job guys. Mr. Mike Turek.

9
10 MR. TUREK: Chair and Council members,
11 I'm Mike Turek with Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
12 Division of Subsistence. I know it's getting late and
13 I'll try to be brief, and I'll just briefly go over the
14 projects, the FIS projects. I'd also like to discuss a
15 couple of Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund projects that
16 we've been funded for, and also the future projects we've
17 applied for from the FIS.

18
19 We're presently working on several
20 subsistence fishery projects, partially funded by the
21 Federal Office of Subsistence Management. Nearing
22 completion are our reports on subsistence sockeye salmon
23 fisheries on the Klawock River, Falls Lake, Gut Bay and
24 Bay of Pillars.

25
26 And our staff, Brian Davis, recently
27 completed work on a geographical information system data
28 base. This data base includes the 2000 subsistence and
29 personal use harvest data, and maps of the Federal
30 and the State customary and traditional use area. I'm
31 hoping I can get Brian to attend the meeting in the fall,
32 in October in Craig. We can demonstrate the work he's
33 been doing on these data bases.

34
35 Last winter Staff conducted subsistence
36 salmon harvest surveys in Kake, Angoon, and Hoonah. This
37 work is part of the Division's statewide subsistence
38 harvest assessment projection, also funded by the Federal
39 Office of Subsistence Management. And that's a statewide
40 project. And we're working right now on the report for
41 the yearly subsistence fisheries report that that project
42 produces. And we're doing quite a bit of work on that to
43 rewrite the chapter on Southeast, so we're using the
44 harvest data we collected last year in Kake, Angoon and
45 Hoonah. It will be included in that report. And that
46 report will be done I believe in April we should have
47 that done.

48
49 Our projects are also -- capacity
50 building is a large part of that, and the Klawock project

00429

1 in particular has been real successful in that way.
2 We've have had three people work for us in Klawock on
3 these projects, one of this is Pete Brown who was
4 mentioned working on a Commercial Fishery Division
5 project. So he's getting a very rounded experience. And
6 we hope to have he and/or James Rowen work with us in the
7 future. And that's been very successful. Staff, Nancy
8 Ratner has been working on that project. And the
9 original projected included work on the Sarcar River, and
10 we do have that in the project, but we ended up
11 emphasizing the Klawock River. And that's going to be a
12 very extensive report. Nancy is just finishing up the
13 draft, and I'll start working on the draft this winter to
14 get it prepared to share with the Klawock and Craig
15 tribes.

16

17 The Kake project is also a project we've
18 got going with the Organized Village of Kake, and that
19 also has capacity building potential. That went fairly
20 well. The Tribe ended up doing a lot more work on the
21 report than really was in the original plan, but that's
22 fine. They can handle some of the writing. I've gotten
23 all the material from them, and we're starting to work on
24 that draft.

25

26 So those are the two projects we've been
27 working on the longest.

28

29 Last summer we also started working on a
30 project in the Wrangell areas, which includes the Stikine
31 River. We took a field trip with some Federal Staff and
32 Mr. Richard Stokes up the Stikine River, and he told us
33 about the traditional use of the Stikine River. The
34 Wrangell report funding was broken up over two years, and
35 the majority of that funding will be spent this coming
36 year, and we'll be completing that report. A big part of
37 that report will be the Stikine River, history of the use
38 of the Stikine River. I'll be working on that a little
39 bit this spring, arranging a meeting probably in April
40 with the Wrangell Cooperative Association to try to start
41 getting that off the ground for this coming year.

42

43 We'll also be working this summer with
44 Professor Steve Langdon and the Central Council of
45 Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska on an FIS
46 project, the Hoonah and Klawock salmon survey. The
47 Division of Subsistence will be working on preparing a
48 descriptive analysis of Hoonah's historic and
49 contemporary subsistence salmon harvest, and this work
50 will be accomplished using previously published reports,

00430

1 technical papers, documents, and some key respondent
2 interviews in Hoonah. And we'll also be doing some
3 observation of the contemporary fishery and documenting
4 that.

5

6 I can't tell you too much about Professor
7 Langdon or Tlingit/Haida's aspects of that report.
8 Tomorrow afternoon I'll be meeting with Professor Langdon
9 and Tlingit/Haida to prepare for this coming season, and
10 I'm hoping that someone for either Professor Langdon or
11 Tlingit and Haida, a representative from Tlingit and
12 Haida will be able to attend the October meeting to be
13 able to discuss the work that they've been doing in
14 Hoonah and Klawock on this project.

15

16 Also a project that -- is the Prince of
17 Wales Island steelhead project, which if funding is
18 approved, we would probably start working on that in
19 August 2003. This is the project that you recommended
20 for us to work on. And partly due to staff limitations,
21 and also due to the situation where we're running into
22 Federal receipt authority, a problem with the State. We
23 have -- there's a certain amount of money, they call it
24 Federal receipt authority, that the Legislature allows us
25 to receive per year, and we've come up against that, so
26 we couldn't get any more money from the Federal
27 Government until after the fiscal year in July, and so
28 that's one of the reasons why we'll be starting on that
29 this fall, and then working into it into next spring.

30

31 Let's see. From 1997 to 2000, the
32 Division conducted comprehensive community subsistence
33 harvest surveys in 24 Southeast Alaska communities. All
34 that data, I believe even the 2000 communities, are now
35 available on our community profile data base. And we're
36 working on a -- we've got a draft report we've started
37 working on. Close to finishing the first draft. And
38 we'll be working with -- Jessie Bisard will be working
39 with us on that report for the 24 communities. And that
40 probably will be another year before we have that done.
41 That's quite a bit of work there, and due to not having a
42 research director for over a year, we were really slowed
43 down on that project. But now that Jessie's on board,
44 this is going to be a good opportunity for him to really
45 learn about Southeast Alaska subsistence harvest patterns
46 by working on this report with us. So I think that will
47 work out quite well.

48

49 Now I'll talk briefly about the Southeast
50 Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fund Project we're working

00431

1 presently. And that's a subsistence salmon survey in
2 Haines. Right now we're finishing up doing the survey
3 this year in Haines of subsistence salmon fishers.
4 During the summer we also worked with the Chilkoot and
5 Chilkat tribes documenting the fishery and doing some key
6 respondent interviews. And we're hoping that next year
7 we can do a harvest survey, salmon harvest survey in
8 Klukwan. We've talked with them about developing a
9 proposal to the State Board of Fisheries for a community
10 harvest permit, and also going to some kind of a harvest
11 calendar for the community. And so we're hoping we'll be
12 able to work with them through this summer and then this
13 coming year do a harvest survey in Klukwan.

14

15 We've also applied and received funding
16 from the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund starting this
17 next fiscal year and going for four years to develop a
18 Southeast Alaska traditional knowledge data base.
19 Southeast Alaska salmon traditional knowledge data base.
20 And that's going to be a project we'll be working with --
21 in our office, we're reviewing material we've collected
22 of the years, and putting that into ASAM data base. And
23 since this is Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund, we can
24 only work on material from salmon, with traditional
25 salmon knowledge. But I'm hoping -- what we applied for
26 for the '04 for FIS is a Southeast Alaska traditional
27 fisheries database through the Federal system, and I
28 would like to be able to use that funding to complement
29 the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund project, but also
30 use that money to document and put into a data base
31 information on other fisheries besides salmon.
32 Steelhead, hooligan, and trout that are managed by
33 Federal fisheries.

34

35 Let's see, I think that's probably all I
36 have. If you have any questions, I can answer questions,
37 but that's about it.

38

39 Also, what I've spoken to you is in the
40 report that I gave to you on the last three pages. That
41 would be Page 7, 8 and 9 I believe it is. So that's in
42 your report that I handed out earlier. But I'm also
43 available for any questions. Jessie and I are getting on
44 the flight this evening, so we'll be here until six
45 anyway. And then if you want to speak to me, you can
46 always give me a call in the office. But that's all I
47 have right now.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
50 Turek. Dr. Garza.

00432

1 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
2 Mike, I guess I just want to put a bug in your ear that
3 possibly with the Southeast Sustainable Salmon money or
4 the additional TEK work, if there's any way that we can
5 work Ketchikan into any of the projects so we start
6 getting some type of data. And if there are
7 opportunities separate from this round of funding that
8 ADF&G could find to find data on Ketchikan, I would be
9 filling to help work with you and support it however I
10 can.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 MR. TUREK: Chair, Dolly, yeah, actually
15 I've been speaking with Dr. Priscilla Schulty who was
16 here yesterday with ANB/ANS during the lunch, and she's
17 an anthropology professor who's lived here for over 20
18 years. And I've talked with her in particular on the
19 Unuk River hooligan. She is very close to both Tongass
20 people and Metlakatla people that have connections with
21 that fishery. And I've talked with her. And that's what
22 I was thinking with the Federal data base would be, a
23 part of that would be working with her, perhaps
24 collecting traditional knowledge and contemporary use of
25 that fishery for that data base. So I was thinking along
26 the same lines, and so I'm glad you brought that up.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council
29 questions for Mr. Turk? Thank you, Mike. Good report.

30
31 Would the Council like to take a break or
32 finish up this Alsek? I think we can do it real quick.

33
34 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's keep going.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's go. Okay.
37 We're on the Alsek, Rachel Mason and Judy Ramos are not
38 here. Dr. Schroeder.

39
40 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, ma'am.

43
44 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I did get a
45 call from Judy Ramos. She was very disappointed she
46 could not come down, but there was, of course, a death in
47 her family.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Okay.
50 Dr. Schroeder.

00433

1 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 And really this is Judy's report, and I'm not going to
3 give it. I'd like to encourage her to come down in the
4 fall and meet with the Council directly.

5
6 But I would just like to let the Council
7 know that some very good work is going on in Yakutat.
8 Judy's been working on subsistence projects and TEK
9 projects now for a number of years, we've been able to
10 put things together. And her current funding is through
11 the FIS system. FIS was able to fund a project dealing
12 with the Alsek River, and funding for that was joined
13 with other TEK funding.

14
15 What's going on in Yakutat has been a
16 major subsistence household harvest surveys which were
17 conducted a few years ago. Judy's current project has to
18 do with mapping the traditional subsistence territories
19 of Yakutat Forelands and other areas in the Yakutat Kwans
20 traditional use area. And she's particularly focused on
21 traditional knowledge of salmon management and
22 utilization.

23
24 These projects are pretty much on track,
25 and hopefully we'll have Judy and/or Rachel with us in
26 our Craig meeting to give us a full report.

27
28 So I just did want the Council to be
29 aware that we have some really fine work going on in
30 Yakutat.

31
32 Ms. Ramos may also be involved in some
33 coming FIS projects that are under discussion for funding
34 in this current cycle. I believe she may be doing some
35 work with the Sitka Tribe and with Division of
36 Subsistence. This is under discussion at this time.
37 That's all I've got on that one, so I promised to be
38 quick.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr.
41 Schroeder. Any questions for him? That was a very good
42 report. Okay.

43
44 Did Doug take off already? Okay. I just
45 wanted to maybe for Mr. Turek, these capacity building as
46 well as cooperation with the Department, seeking other
47 money and stuff like that, TEK projects. I see this
48 thing as complying with what the Council has been asking,
49 and I really think this program's working real well, and
50 I want to compliment all of you, and we'll just make sure

00434

1 for the record that Doug McBride knows that we appreciate
2 all of your work as well as well as the presenters. And,
3 Cal?

4

5 MR. CASIPIT: I just wanted to mention
6 something about the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund,
7 the Governor's fund. Apparently the stakeholder panel
8 that was put together originally under the previous
9 administration apparently was disbanded, is that correct?
10 And to me, especially me, I'm unclear as to how decisions
11 on how that money is going to be appropriated in the
12 future, and perhaps the Council may want to make their
13 feelings known about disposition of those funds, and
14 perhaps a letter to the Governor or something like that
15 might be in order.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I
18 think we should add that under habitat. Anyway, I do
19 appreciate that, and I think it's complying with the
20 Council. Are there any other Council who would like to
21 comment on that? We appreciate your work. Mr. Turek.

22

23 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Council, I'd just
24 like to add something. In the short eight years that
25 I've been with the Department, I've seen a real
26 significant change in particularly the Commercial
27 Fisheries Division since the funding for these projects,
28 and these projects were developed. It's really been an
29 education for people in the Commercial Fish Division in
30 Southeast. They're much more aware of subsistence
31 fisheries now, they're much more interested in them.
32 There are staff that are subsistence biologists now. And
33 I really saw that at this last Board of Fisheries meeting
34 in January, how it affected the leadership in Southeast
35 for Commercial Fish Division. Very sensitive to
36 subsistence and really very supportive. I heard things
37 from some of the Staff that I was really happy to hear
38 comments from them during the committee meeting report
39 writing, things that we've been saying for years, and
40 it's really good to hear them saying that now. So I
41 think one of the benefits of it is sort of capacity
42 building for the Department of Fish and Game, because
43 they're being educated about subsistence fisheries and
44 how to work with local people, and how to work in rural
45 Alaska. So I think that the capacity development is
46 going both ways. And I think that it's going into the
47 rural communities, and it's also going into the
48 Department of Fish and Game. So I think it's been very
49 successful, and it's happened very rapidly, so it's been
50 something really nice to see. So I just wanted to add

00435

1 that today.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
4 much. Let's take a real quick break. We've got some
5 business. We've got a couple extra guests here. Take
6 five minutes.

7

8 (Off record)

9

10 (On record)

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're on
13 item 11, agency reports, under Tab E. Dr. Schroeder.

14

15 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Casipit, I'd like you
16 to give the call for proposals.

17

18 MR. CASIPIT: All right.

19

20 MR. SCHROEDER: And I'd like to hear what
21 it sounds like.

22

23 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Schroeder,
24 Mr. Chairman. As you all know, the period for proposals
25 for the 2004 cycle for fisheries regulations is now open
26 and will be open until the end of March. There is a
27 proposal form for members who are interested. That is in
28 your book at Tab E, Page 223 and 224.

29

30 I'd like to mention as well that although
31 some of our fisheries Staff from the districts have had
32 to leave to go back home, all four of our subsistence
33 fisheries biologists are more than willing to work with
34 Council members and members of the public to formulate
35 proposals for consideration.

36

37 I know of several proposals that members
38 are interested in submitting. I know Ms. Garza and Mr.
39 Stokes would like to, number 1, resubmit the Stikine
40 River subsistence fisheries proposals, as well as a
41 companion c&t proposal as well to go with it. Like I
42 said to Mr. Stokes and Ms. Garza, I'd be more than
43 willing to either sit down in person or over the phone to
44 create those proposals to submit. We have some time, so,
45 you know, it will be at their convenience if they so wish
46 me to help them.

47

48 Other than that, that's all I had.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. For the

00436

1 record, it's March 31, is that correct?

2

3 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any members of the
6 Council have any questions for Mr. Casipit? Dr. Garza.

7

8 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, just a point of
9 order I guess. So this is a report. Is this the time
10 when we would submit Regional Advisory Council proposals,
11 or will we do that later in the agenda?

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I believe we'll do
14 that under item 12. I think there might be some that
15 come forward. Any other questions.

16

17 Okay. We'll go on to reviewing material
18 for the 2002 annual report. Dr. Schroeder.

19

20 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I did also
21 want to bring to the Council's attention particularly to
22 two seated members of the Council, that the membership
23 application and nomination packet for anyone who wishes
24 to reapply for the Council or to apply de novo is
25 tomorrow, February 28th. So I would encourage anyone who
26 needs to turn in an application to do so ASAP, and if you
27 know someone who is interested and on the edge and who
28 you think would be a good Council member, to encourage
29 them between now and close of business tomorrow to do so.

30

31 The next item on the agenda is review of
32 annual report material. What I have for the annual
33 report are a number of concerns that Council members have
34 given me individually, plus concerns that have been
35 raised as Council members went around the room at the
36 beginning of our meeting here. What I'd like to do is
37 put those together and circulate basically your concerns
38 back to you to see if I've got them correct, and this
39 would take place over the next few weeks. So that's what
40 I intend to do with the annual report item.

41

42 We could also spend a few moments right
43 at this -- right now if there were other items that a
44 Council member wanted to bring up. Alternatively those
45 could be added to my rough draft that I'd circulate to
46 you. Whatever your wishes might be.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council members,
49 is there anything that you would like to, for instance,
50 take out of 12 and make sure it's in the annual report,

00437

1 or any other items that you feel that we need to get
2 added? Okay. We'll revise that as we move along.

3

4 Draft regulatory coordination protocol.

5

6 MR. SCHROEDER: We do not have any staff
7 person present here to give a presentation on the
8 protocol. I will alert -- will point you to Page 225 in
9 your Council book, and there are brief write ups of the
10 status of what's been going on with regulatory
11 coordination protocols. And I'd beg your indulgence. I
12 really am not tracking the protocol coordination process.
13 If you have any questions, please bring them up with me,
14 and I'll get answers back to you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Casipit.

17

18 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 If you flip through that section, you will notice that I
20 am one of the members on that protocol work group, as
21 well as -- well, Bill Thomas was on that work group. I
22 guess OSM will have to make a decision on who's going to
23 replace him. But I encourage the Council to closely
24 review the protocol, which actually starts on Page 228,
25 and give us your thoughts and feedback so that we can
26 take that back for incorporation into the draft.

27

28 I wanted to mention as well that there's
29 some outstanding concerns that are in here I think that
30 we all share. And some of the commitments that are made
31 in this protocol are going to require funding commitments
32 that at this time some of us at least in the Federal
33 program, and some in the State, are unclear how some of
34 that work is going to be funded and taken care of. So
35 those are some of -- like anything, the devil's in the
36 details. And to the extent that we can get input from
37 the Council on the details is at least where I'm coming
38 from, is where I would really like some input from the
39 Council on.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Council
44 input. First on Page 227, Bill Thomas was listed there,
45 no longer a member. What's the Council's wish? Dr.
46 Garza.

47

48 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, so on that
49 panel, do we have the authority to change that person,
50 and if so should it be the Chairman?

00438

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Could you answer
2 that, Cal, please?

3
4 MR. CASIPIT: I think OSM would be
5 looking for the Council to suggest a name to replace
6 former Chairman Thomas. I don't think it has to be a
7 chairman.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

10
11 MR. DOUVILLE: I think it does.

12
13 MR. CASIPIT: What's that?

14
15 MR. DOUVILLE: I think it does.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

18
19 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like
20 to make a motion appointing our acting chair to that
21 position.

22
23 MR. ADAMS: Second.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
26 and seconded, but on procedure, is this what you need?
27

28 MR. CASIPIT: I think a name has to be
29 suggested to OSM to replace Mr. Thomas.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: so it would be the
32 -- make.....

33
34 MR. DOUVILLE: Our acting chair being Mr.
35 Littlefield.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I hear the train
38 coming in. Is there any discussion?

39
40 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

43
44 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Casipit, what is the
45 length of duty in this position?

46
47 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Kookesh. If
48 you will look at the timeline that's on Page 226, the
49 assignment would wind up -- well, actually probably the
50 last meeting that the representative would have to attend

00439

1 would be somewhere at the end of this calendar year to
2 finalize the protocol.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council
5 members, discussion on the motion.

6

7 (No discussion)

8

9 MS. GARZA: Call for the question.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those in favor
12 of the train to put me in to put replace Bill Thomas,
13 please signify by saying aye.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed,
18 same sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes.)

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We will recommend
23 the Chair's name to OSM. The next is Page 228, the draft
24 protocol. Council comments. Mr. Casipit, could you
25 explain if any action is needed at this time, or maybe
26 give us some guidance here, please?

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: No action is needed at this
29 time. I realize this is probably the -- you know, since
30 you got these books a couple weeks ago, this is really
31 the first time that you've had the opportunity to review
32 this, and I realize that you may need more time to
33 review, and it would be perfectly acceptable to make your
34 feelings known either through Bob or me at a later date
35 that can be carried through to OSM and the protocol work
36 group.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

39

40 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I agree with
41 Mr. Casipit. I think that this is an incredibly
42 important area, but I have not looked at this document.
43 That's my fault. And perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could
44 through Mr. Schroeder set an audioconference for the
45 Council specifically to the subject matter in a week or
46 two, so that we do have a response. A week? Two weeks?
47 Two? In two weeks.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. This would
50 be an informal discussion, because of FACA requirements,

00440

1 it would just be information. Is that correct?

2

3 MS. GARZA: However we can properly do

4 it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Because it
7 will not be a noticed meeting and it's not in public, so
8 everything that we do, I think it should take place in a
9 couple weeks like you say, but for the record, it will be
10 informational to pass on informal recommendations.

11

12 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, could we recess
13 until that audioconference and make it part of this
14 meeting?

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh?

17

18 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman, it is listed
19 as part of our agenda, so I'd like to see it continue in
20 that capacity. That way it will carry the -- it has that
21 weight going in.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree it's super
24 important. We've already seen some of that happen at
25 this meeting. Do you have any comments on that, Dr.
26 Schroeder, how that could be accomplished, and whether
27 specifically we could recess to that meeting to be held
28 as soon as possible and conclude the business on draft
29 regulatory coordination protocol by perhaps having an
30 open line to the public or something?

31

32 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think
33 that we could do that. Probably the OSM would accept
34 comments from the Council in any case as long as they
35 were our usual well thought out and reasoned comments.
36 Cal, is the timing on this such that the Council would --
37 that important decisions would not be made before our
38 fall meeting?

39

40 MR. CASIPIT: Yes. Again looking at the
41 timeline, and knowing the press of business for some of
42 the other work group members through the summer, I
43 anticipate that the next draft probably wouldn't be done
44 until after the next meeting. But it would be important
45 for the Council to send the input in as soon as they can
46 so that it is available for us to consider, you know, as
47 we meet.

48

49 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think the
50 Council in its transcript from this meeting has expressed

00441

1 a number of concerns about exactly this topic. We might
2 see that what we're doing over the next couple of weeks
3 is putting better voice on those concerns that are
4 already there, fleshing them out and getting them in to
5 OSM. And we could act by more formally at our next
6 noticed meeting. The suggestion would be that we turn in
7 our comments and concerns and then bring this up as an
8 item at our Craig meeting.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, I see October
11 2003 is when the second draft protocol will be reviewed,
12 so we need to make sure we have comments by the next
13 meeting.

14

15 MR. SCHROEDER: We would then, if we're
16 clear with that, we wouldn't hold our meeting open for
17 two weeks. I would schedule an audio conference, and
18 then we'd work from there on getting something in
19 expeditiously to OSM. Whatever we turn in, we could then
20 act on officially when we're at a noticed meeting in the
21 fall.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. That would
24 be within a month say so that we don't get into
25 summertime activities, and we can take care of this here
26 rather quickly in the next weeks or month. And that
27 meets the best schedule of the Council members. Perhaps
28 e-mail if you have it, or whatever will set this up where
29 the most participation date.

30

31 Okay. The Forest Service was next, but I
32 believe Ken addressed that. Was there any other members
33 of the Forest service like to comment? Please state your
34 official name for the record.

35

36 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Council,
37 David R.K. Johnson, subsistence coordinator for the
38 Tongass. I just want to make a couple comments briefly.

39

40

41 First of all, I hadn't made any comments
42 with respect to Chairman Thomas. I believe Mr. Thomas is
43 to the Federal Subsistence Program as to what Mr. Michael
44 Jordan is to basketball. And just as Michael Jordan is
45 going to step down from the Wizards as a player, Mr.
46 Thomas has stepped down from the chairmanship. He will
47 still be involved in the Federal Subsistence Program, and
48 will still continue to be a force that will be important
49 to this body and to the people of Southeast Alaska as
50 well as to the people of the rest of the State.

00442

1 Lastly, I appreciate having the
2 opportunity to still work with the Council. I appreciate
3 the good work that was done this time, and I look forward
4 to our next meeting.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
9 much. Just a second. Any Council comments for the
10 Forest Service?

11
12 I have one comment. I was very pleased
13 to note the Forest Service willingness to be involved
14 more actively in the subsistence as it pertains to the
15 Tongass National Forest because of its land. And I
16 encourage that to the Forest Service that they continue
17 that. Thank you very much.

18
19 Alaska Department of Fish and Game made a
20 presentation earlier, but, Mr. Turek and others, we will
21 give you the chance.

22
23 MR. TUREK: Chair and Council, I'd just
24 like to thank you again for inviting us to your meeting,
25 and I always enjoy seeing you. I'm looking forward to
26 the October meeting on Prince of Wales Island and Craig.
27 And I hope to be there early so if you're having a field
28 trip, if I could come along, that would be great. A
29 number of things, of course, POW deer, but we've got the
30 salmon projects on Prince of Wales Island and the
31 steelhead, so it would be a real opportunity. And I hope
32 I can bring some of my other staff, Nancy Ratner in
33 particular, and Brian Davis down from Anchorage for that
34 meeting. So looking forward to that.

35
36 And just good luck and keep up the good
37 work, and if I don't see you before then, I'll see you in
38 October.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any Council
41 comments. Mike, again -- excuse me, Mr. Adams.

42
43 MR. ADAMS: I just wanted to thank Mike,
44 you know, for the fine work that he is doing, you know,
45 on behalf of the State and for the people of the State of
46 Alaska. It's always been, you know, working with him. I
47 worked with him on a tribal level on occasion, and I just
48 wanted to show you my appreciation, Mike.

49
50 Thank you.

00443

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other council?
2 Mike, again I'd like to thank you. I did not mention
3 specifically the work that you did on the proposals that
4 were supported by the RAC in the Hoonah meetings. Your
5 work as well as that of Terry Suminski and Pete Probasco
6 surely convinced the Board of Fish to act favorably on
7 all of those motions except for the ones that we have the
8 Stikine issue, and I think that's going to be resolved.
9 And thank you very much for your help on those issues.

10

11 Any other State wish to make comments.

12

13 National Park Service, Mr. Summers.

14

15 MR. SUMMERS: Mr. Chairman, Council
16 members, my name is Clarence Summers, National Park
17 Service subsistence coordinator, Anchorage Office.

18

19 I just want to thank you for giving me
20 this opportunity for a short comment. I just want to
21 remind you that Bert Adams was recently reappointed as a
22 member on the Wrangell/St. Elias Subsistence Resource
23 Commission. And for the new members I've got a handout
24 on the role and function of the subsistence resource
25 commission program for the Park Service and I'll share
26 this with you. This appointment is for three years, so
27 Bert's officially on until November of 2005.

28

29 On another note, I forwarded a letter to
30 I think Bob Schroeder, which is an example of a letter of
31 notice. We're trying to do this now to notify Commission
32 members when an appointment has occurred, and this will
33 hopefully be signed by Mr. Littlefield and sent to both
34 the Park Service to acknowledge the appointment and to
35 Bert so that Bert has an official record. We're trying
36 to do this with the appointing sources. Currently the
37 Secretary of Interior, the Regional Councils in the
38 appropriate area and the Governor make appointments to
39 Park Service Subsistence Resource Commissions.

40

41 That's all I have for now on commission
42 matters. Any questions before I close with a final
43 comment?

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

46

47 MR. ADAMS: Well, it's always good to see
48 you, Clarence. I'm sorry we missed you last week when we
49 had our meeting, but, you know, I serve at the pleasure
50 of this Council here, and I just want to, you know, thank

00444

1 the Council members for having the confidence in my to
2 serve on the Commission. And like I said, you know, it's
3 always good to see you, so, thanks, Council.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
6 Adams. Did you wish to make any report on the
7 Commission's last meeting.

8

9 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
10 don't have my notes in front of me, but, you know, we met
11 last week, and I'll just tell you that many issues came
12 up that we were talking about here today, like the
13 designated hunt, and some of the other issues that, you
14 know, I can't recall right now.

15

16 But one of the things that I enjoy about
17 going up there was being able to try to see how different
18 it is in the Interior as it is down here. And in many
19 ways it is. But we all, you know, have the same
20 concerns, and we've seen -- I've seen proposals come
21 through this body during this meeting that were very much
22 the same as the ones we addressed during the Council.

23

24 And, you know, the designated hunt thing
25 was in great discussion up there, because of the -- and,
26 you know, we concentrated mostly on the goat and deer,
27 you know, designated hunt. And moose. But there was a
28 big concern up there with the caribou. It seems to me
29 like there was an opening and everyone went out there and
30 they started shooting, you know, and sometimes they shot
31 a lot of females, because it was done during a time when
32 it was very hard to tell the difference between a male
33 and a female. And that was a concern that we, you know,
34 were addressing. And one of the ways that we settled
35 that was because there was a potential for abuse, that we
36 accepted that proposal, but we aligned it with the State
37 regulations, eliminating that part in there where it said
38 something like 70 percent, you know, handicapped, and 65
39 years and older, and inserted in there instead that they
40 had to demonstrate a need of some sort.

41

42 I wish I had my notes in front of me. I
43 didn't expect you to call on me, Mr. Chairman, to give a
44 report. But to me that was about the most important
45 thing that we discussed and, I don't know, Clarence, if
46 you can fill in the blanks for me, I'd sure appreciate
47 it.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00445

1 MR. SUMMERS: Thank you, Bert. I think
2 there's one other item. The Commission at their last
3 meeting, which was in Tok, modelled a proposal after I
4 think the designated provisions that are currently on the
5 books in Units 1 through 5, and that's currently a
6 proposal that's going to go before the Board sponsored by
7 I believe the Subsistence Resource Commission. And so
8 that's one item of note.

9
10 Another one has to do with a
11 recommendation from the Commission to establish an
12 eligibility requirement in resident zone communities.
13 The National Park Service for subsistence eligibility has
14 identified certain communities as subsistence resident
15 zone communities. Yakutat happens to be one. Currently
16 there's no requirement on the length of time that an
17 individual has to reside in that community before
18 becoming eligible. And there's currently a
19 recommendation from the Commission to establish a
20 one-year requirement, which would -- and Bert may want to
21 address that. That seems to be at least the second at
22 least high point of the meeting that I can recall.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

25
26 MR. ADAMS: Well, thank you, Clarence,
27 for bringing that up. That was a big issue, and, you
28 know, I appreciate that. That's all I have, Mr.
29 Chairman.

30
31 Oh, another thing while I do this. I
32 wish I had more time to prepare my notes and everything
33 for that meeting, but this one followed a week
34 afterwards, you know, and I think it's a good idea the
35 RACs meet after our Subsistence Resource Commission
36 meeting. That way I'd have a better opportunity, you
37 know, to give reports, and I promise I'll be better
38 prepared next time.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Well, thank
41 you summarizing that.

42
43 Mr. Summers, I would like to thank you
44 for sticking with us. I know it's a late thing and we
45 look -- my wife particularly enjoyed your handouts, and
46 we look forward to those as well as the information.
47 Thank you for your report.

48
49 MR. SUMMERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
50

00446

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're on Item 12,
2 other new business. And others may have something else
3 on the list, but I'll go through what I had. Under A I
4 had the designated hunter program. Under B I had State
5 subsistence concerns. Under C I had habitat, the State
6 habitat discussion. Under D I had rural determination.
7 Under E I had Council proposals. Under F the annual
8 report items, specifically needs. And under item G we
9 had the Unit 8 aerial controlled use area as discussion
10 items. Were there any others that I missed under item
11 12?

12

13 With that, we'll go to item A, which is
14 the designated hunter program. Council comments on that.
15 My only comment on that was I think we made it clear that
16 we were supporting these things to come from the bottom
17 up. I think that was pretty much a reaction, that we
18 wanted unit specific designated hunter programs,
19 specifically then number of two, four, six, eight or
20 whatever it might be.

21

22 And is there anybody else that can add
23 something to that? This should be an item that's
24 probably included in the annual report. Mr. Kitka.

25

26 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
27 think this is one of the items that should be taken back
28 to the communities so that they can talk about it and
29 bring it back again.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's right. Any
32 community that wanted something different would be
33 expected to submit a proposal and bring that before the
34 Council at its next wildlife or fisheries, either one,
35 because there is a designated -- a similar thing in
36 fisheries. Mr. Douville.

37

38 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
39 There was one thing -- well, I'll just make a comment
40 here. I do appreciate the designated hunter. It is
41 really a fine thing, and it works for us, as a person
42 that uses the system.

43

44 Yesterday or the day before I made a
45 comment about the form that was used and the Forest
46 Services inability to fill out the form, which is really
47 uncalled for, because that person was not trained in
48 doing that. So I wasn't really bashing the Forest
49 Service, but what I did appreciate was a simpler form.

50

00447

1 I do have one concern. If we're able to
2 use a designated hunter system for say goat, and it was
3 brought to my attention that the ADF&G is the person you
4 go to, or the people you go to for that first permit or
5 registration, I know that they do not have a designated
6 hunter program. It is a proxy. And that to me is a big
7 confusing. So would a person have to go to the Feds and
8 get the second permit before the first one. Just a point
9 that I wanted to bring out.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You're right on,
12 Mr Douville. Maybe that's one that needs to be meshed in
13 with B as well as the protocol. It would be in the best
14 interest of everybody I believe that under our protocol
15 that these differing programs be as close as possible.
16 The designated hunter program was under quite a bit of
17 attack in Hoonah on different proposals. We did not see
18 any this time. I think the Council's been clear that
19 they do support the designated hunter program as
20 something that works. So perhaps we could make that an
21 item of State concern included under the next one, too.

22

23 With that we will go to State concerns.
24 I believe you added that, Dr. Garza. Okay. Again I just
25 would like to see here, I think we talked about a couple
26 times is differing regulations, dual management does no
27 one any good, and it doesn't do the fish any good, it
28 doesn't do the game any good, so the closer we can get
29 with our -- to meshing these regulations, the better off
30 the resource is going to be, as well as the users.

31

32 Habitat. Any action on habitat. There
33 were several comments that were made by Council members
34 under local concerns. This is before you got here, Ms.
35 Phillips. And at least two or three Council persons
36 mentioned that in their area discharge of water by boats.
37 What else did they have? I don't know. Clean water had
38 been mentioned. The Governor's switching Habitat from
39 Department of Fish and Game to Department of Natural
40 Resources. Any comments on those. You can go back,
41 that's fine.

42

43 MS. GARZA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Under
44 the subsistence concerns to share with ADF&G concerning
45 State resources, what I had in mind were things like
46 commercial development of black seaweed and commercial
47 development of asparagus, the Salicornia species. In my
48 position as marine advisory agent, I have been approached
49 by ADF&G when residents have approached them to develop
50 commercial fisheries and they don't know what -- or

00448

1 commercial harvest of those resources and they don't know
2 what to do. They don't have -- it's my opinion that they
3 don't have an easy process of getting information from
4 subsistence users whether or not it's an important
5 resource. It's not within our jurisdiction, but I think
6 if we could develop policies of important resources
7 outside of our reach, then that may help Fish and Game in
8 responding to those type of commercial requests. And so
9 it's too late in the day to do that now, but if we could
10 put that on the agenda for next meeting.

11

12 And then the other thing where, you know,
13 in terms of this correspondence, I mean, the other issue
14 is the aerial, the use of planes to go in and spot for
15 moose in Unuk. There's nothing that we can do about it,
16 but if we can pass that type of concern on to Board of
17 Game that it is affecting subsistence users, and that
18 they should more seriously consider those proposals when
19 they come to them.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. We'll
24 make note of that. The next one, rural determination.
25 Excuse me, Mr. Hernandez.

26

27 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
28 Littlefield. Before you move on, I was wondering if I
29 could just go back to the habitat issue.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: For the record,
32 I'm going to say unless someone wants to make a motion on
33 one of these, I would say that any of them can be
34 discussed. Please go ahead.

35

36 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Concerning
37 the removal of the Habitat Division from the Department
38 of Fish and Game to the Department of Natural Resources,
39 I thought that was a bad move. I don't know. I'm not
40 familiar enough with all of the villages that are
41 represented by the Council, but I know in my village we
42 have an area of state land that surrounds us. It's
43 always been set aside for community use, and we would be
44 somewhat worried with the changes in administration and
45 changes in policy that there could be some more
46 development take place on those lands, and the Department
47 of -- the Habitat Division with the Forest -- or with the
48 Department of Fish and Game I think was a good agency for
49 review of all State regulations involving the State lands
50 around our village, and I think we're going to lose a lot

00449

1 of oversight on those decisions by moving that department
2 to those responsibilities of permitting to the Department
3 of Natural Resources, so we were disappointed in that
4 decision, and I'd just like to make that known.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you like to
7 make a resolution, a motion to adopt that as a Council
8 resolution to.....

9

10 MR. KOOKESH: I'd like to comment, too.
11 I'd like to comment.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. First Mr.
14 Kookesh.

15

16 MR. KOOKESH: My comment to that, at this
17 point in time with the Governor's decision to move
18 Habitat, I think there's quite a bit of speculation going
19 on, and I'd like to see what he does first, because I
20 think we're trying to read too much into this. I'd like
21 to see what the Governor does before we as a body react.
22 Because all he's trying to do is streamline and
23 everybody's, from my understanding, there's quite a bit
24 of speculation out there. I think there's always room
25 for improvement in any organization, and we need to sit
26 back and take a look see before we start jumping too
27 fast.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Other
30 Council. Mr. Adams.

31

32 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with,
33 you know, the comments that Mr. Kookesh just made. It
34 might be a good idea just to sit back and watch this for
35 a while.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
38 Ms. Phillips.

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, my
41 comments aren't about the Habitat Division, but they are
42 about habitat. May I proceed?

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please do.

45

46 MS. PHILLIPS: Logging-related habitat
47 changes is causing a potential depletion of deer
48 population, and it is imperative that this Council be
49 watchful that the U.S. Forest Service utilize best forest
50 management practices in all forest management strategies.

00450

1 And I just want us to be watchful of those plans as they
2 come forward.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you.
5 Also on habitat, I received a letter from the United
6 States Fish and Wildlife Service that listed habitat as
7 the number 1 concern in reduction of species of fish and
8 wildlife. So we have a federal agency on one hand -- we
9 just want to make sure that there is some oversight here,
10 oversight remains. We don't have to do anything at this
11 time, but the Fish and Wildlife Service does have
12 oversight of those Federal lands that are affected, and
13 we want to make sure that we keep our eye on this at
14 future meetings.

15

16 Anything else? Any Council proposals.
17 Ms. Garza?

18

19 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
20 think that the Regional Advisory -- I'm requesting the
21 Regional Advisory Council support several proposals, and
22 they may be in part house cleaning or things that we
23 thought we had, but we don't.

24

25 One is that we need to support a proposal
26 for a customary and traditional use determination for
27 king, coho, sockeye, chum and pink salmon on the Stikine
28 River for Wrangell residents. The fact that we do not
29 have that c&t determination implies that any rural
30 resident could go into that area should we get a -- or
31 when we get a subsistence fishery in there. So -- and
32 that has caused ADF&G concerns. So this would help to
33 close a loophole. So I would so move, Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved to
36 add king, coho, sockeye and chum salmon on the Stikine
37 River as a Council-generated -- c&t designation as a
38 Council proposal. Is there a second?

39

40 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been
43 moved and seconded. Any discussion. Dr. Garza.

44

45 MS. GARZA: Mr. Stokes, do we need to add
46 steelhead

47

48 MR. SCHROEDER: Dick, for this one that
49 we've got up there, talking about c&t for Stikine, is it
50 okay if it's king, coho, sockeye and chum, or do we need

00451

1 to add other fish?

2

3 MR. STOKES: No, I think that's.....

4

5 REPORTER: Microphone, please.

6

7 MR. STOKES: No, I think that's
8 sufficient. Stikine River fish.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We have a
11 motion before us for a c&t -- a SERAC-generated proposal
12 to support c&t for Wrangell for king, coho, sockeye, and
13 chum salmon. Any further discussion.

14

15 (No discussion)

16

17 MS. GARZA: Question.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's
20 been called on the motion to submit a SERAC-generated
21 proposal to establish a c&t designation on king, coho,
22 sockeye and chum salmon for the Wrangell community. All
23 those in favor say aye.

24

25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
28 same sign.

29

30 (No opposing votes.)

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That will be
33 submitted as a SERAC proposal. Any other proposals?

34

35 MS. GARZA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would
36 move that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council submit
37 a proposal to create c&t for use of hooligans on the Unuk
38 by Metlakatla residents. That is not currently in the
39 books.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second?

42

43 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been
46 moved and seconded that SERAC generate a proposal to
47 allow c&t designation for the Community of Metlakatla for
48 hooligan on the Unuk River. Is there any discussion on
49 this.

50

00452

1 (No discussion)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready for
4 the question?

5

6 MR. KOOKESH: Question.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's
9 been called. All those in favor of generating a SERAC
10 proposal to establish a c&t designation for the Community
11 of Metlakatla for hooligan on the Unuk River, please
12 signify by saying aye.

13

14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
17 same sign.

18

19 (No opposing votes.)

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Staff will prepare
22 that one, too. Any other proposals?

23

24 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, this is just an
25 area of perhaps clarification for c&t determination for
26 residents of northern Prince of Wales. If you look at
27 the Southeast Alaska summary of districts for fish and
28 the species and then the determination, in District 1, 2,
29 3, there is no list of the northern Prince of Wales
30 Island residents. It just says Craig, Klawock, Hydaburg,
31 Kasaan. And were they are listed is under the remainder
32 of Southeast. I'm assuming salmon, all rural residents.
33 While that may cover it, that can also cause concerns,
34 and I think it's a wiser move to, and I would suggest to
35 Mr. Hernandez that you may want to submit a proposal for
36 your communities specific to streams. And I can't do
37 that for you, because I don't know what you use. But I
38 think it should be done.

39

40 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You do not want to
43 move to that c&t designation? Okay. Okay. Mr.
44 Hernandez, do you understand the process there?

45

46 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I believe I do.
47 Would this be the time to make that or do I have until
48 the end of March?

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have time to

00453

1 get with Mr. Casipit, if you can respond and clarify
2 that, please?

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, we have until the end
5 of March to submit proposals. Again, Jeff Reeves I'm
6 sure would be more than willing to assist you in crafting
7 the proposals. I would be willing as well, so, you know,
8 we're more than willing to help.

9

10 The north Prince of Wales Island area has
11 been a concern for me personally as far as the steelhead
12 fishery. It has been -- you know, in coordination with
13 the State, that's one of the things that the State
14 biologist bring to me is that, you know, basically the
15 north Prince of Wales steelhead fishery that's on the
16 books now would be open to virtually any rural resident
17 of Southeast. And, you know, to the extent that we can
18 clean that up and, you know, that we'd be more than
19 willing to help.

20

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Cal.
22 We'll get together. That should be easy enough to do.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. You'll get
25 with Mr. Reeves, and he will help you with that. Dr.
26 Garza.

27

28 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, the last one
29 may just be a point of clarification. The issue of
30 Wrangell came up because of the transboundary and Stikine
31 issue with Pacific Salmon Commission. It also made me
32 realize that we don't have any thing on the Taku. And I
33 know that residents from Juneau as well as from Douglas
34 have submitted requests to be recognized in that area.
35 However, Douglas is not a rural community, so I'm not
36 sure what to do. But we should do something.

37

38 And then my final point, realizing maybe
39 we can't do anything, my final point is that I think that
40 each of us in our communities should look over this thing
41 on Page 51 and 52 of the Fishery Reg Book, and just make
42 sure that their communities are covered and their streams
43 are covered, because it's amazing what kind of little
44 errors can cause, or little omissions can cause major
45 issues with resource management.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Your words are
50 well taken. We will -- I will certainly urge do that. I

00454

1 urge all other Council members to do the same. Review
2 those c&t designations for communities you're most
3 familiar with.

4

5 Mr. Casipit, do you have any
6 recommendations on how we could establish a positive c&t
7 for Taku River, and who that would include?

8

9 MR. CASIPIT: I'm somewhat perplexed by
10 that issue as well. Since the most -- since the closest
11 communities currently are nonrural communities, by
12 creating a c&t on them, I'm not sure which communities we
13 would put in the request as to having c&t. You know, if
14 you look back at the ethnographic history, it's clear
15 that the people of Douglas and perhaps Juneau did -- or
16 do use, did use that area and do use that area, but since
17 under the Federal program those are nonrural areas, I'm
18 not sure what we do until those designations -- until or
19 if those designations change. So I'm somewhat perplexed
20 as to what to do there as well.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. This is one
23 that may -- we could ask you to look into State
24 coordination on this similar to what happened on Proposal
25 8, that, you know, there are users that may be from
26 nonrural areas right now that are definitely exhibiting
27 those c&t type uses, and we would like to figure out how
28 to do that. Any other? Dr. Garza.

29

30 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. The
31 final point is that when Dick and I met with ADF&G and
32 Trans Boundary Panel members, I think we crossed some of
33 the concerns we had in terms of the c&t for Wrangell as
34 well as some of the upriver stocks that they were
35 concerned about. We were able to look at the proposed
36 regulation dates and harvest levels, and we will be
37 submitting a proposal to amend our last proposal, or to
38 create a new one to address those issues, but still
39 provide opportunities for rural residents, and I think we
40 will be working with Cal on that. So I'm not asking for
41 Council approval, since we don't have the wording in
42 front of us, but just to let you know it's coming.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Dave, Mike
45 and I both have to get to the bank. How much time do we
46 have?

47

48 MR. JOHNSON: The bank lobby closes at
49 5:30, and I'd suggest you leave here no later than 5:15.

50

00455

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're just
2 about one. One question for Mr. Turek. I think I'd
3 asked earlier for the letter that was sent to Mr. Duffy
4 be made available on the Stikine and Taku, trans boundary
5 rivers. Is that available?

6
7 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, I do have an
8 electronic version of that, it wouldn't have the
9 signature, that I could leave with Bob Schroeder. But I
10 can get one with the signature back in the office.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. If you
13 could get that to Mr. Schroeder, and he can make sure
14 that that gets out to Council, because it does address
15 some of the concerns that we had on those rivers. Thank
16 you very much.

17
18 Annual report. Needs. The aerial
19 determination controlled use area. Council's wish. What
20 is the Council's wish on Unit 8 aerial controlled use
21 area? Dr. Garza.

22
23 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I would move
24 for unanimous consent that we have someone in -- I mean,
25 either Schroeder or Cal or habitat people send a letter
26 to the Board of Game and the Division of Wildlife with
27 the State of Alaska stating that we heard almost a day of
28 testimony about concern in the Unuk and moose hunting,
29 and using planes to spot, and the advantage it provides
30 for this small group of hunters, and that they take these
31 concerns into heart, because it is affecting hunters.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You've ask for
36 unanimous consent to have Staff compose a letter on this
37 Unit 8 aerial designation. Is there any objection to
38 that.

39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Is there a second.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville, did
43 you want the mike? Mr. Hernandez.

44
45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, just clarification,
46 isn't that Unit 1(A)?

47
48 MR. SCHROEDER: Proposal 8.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yeah, Proposal 8,

00456

1 Unit 1. Yes, Proposal 8. I don't know if we actually
2 even need a motion. We can just direct Staff to do this
3 if there's no one who objects. Mr. Douville?

4

5 MR. DOUVILLE: I agree, but, you know,
6 one thing I would like to say is that conservation was
7 not a problem, and the State doesn't get involved in
8 these things, or doesn't seem to like to unless there is
9 a conservation issue. However, fair chase was I believe
10 what the real problem was, and this violates it, so in my
11 opinion and everybody else that testified. So that is
12 what the concern is.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right. The letter
15 will include comments about fair chase, as well as
16 reasonable opportunity, recognizing the difference in
17 these programs, we did not expect to, nor did we need to
18 spend one day on this. That's our feeling. Anything
19 else. We're going to run through this real quick here,
20 make sure that everybody agrees that this is the
21 council's intent. Dr. Schroeder.

22

23 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think
24 we've only passed two resolutions. One resolution has to
25 do with Ketchikan rural classification. A second
26 resolution suggests replacing Mr. Thomas on the regional
27 coordinating protocol with our acting chairman. Those
28 are the only resolutions we have.

29

30 We're talking about an audioconference to
31 talk about regulation coordination, and that this will
32 take place within one month.

33

34 Issues concerning designated hunter moved
35 to an annual report item.

36

37 Let's see, Dolly, this was -- the issue
38 concerning possible commercialization of black seaweed
39 and other marine plants were moved -- go ahead.

40

41 MS. GARZA: Okay. It's opposing
42 development, not encouraging there.

43

44 MR. SCHROEDER: Did I say encouraging?

45

46 MS. GARZA: Well, you have in mind
47 development.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Have in mind
50 development. Have in mind no development.

00457

1 MR. ADAMS: Black market seaweed.

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. We didn't talk
4 about antlers as evidence of sex. That was something
5 someone brought up.

6

7 We talked a little bit about Habitat
8 Division support. We don't have any action on that.

9

10 We have Council-generated proposals
11 concerning Stikine River c&t for Wrangell for four salmon
12 species, and c&t for hooligan for Metlakatla residents,
13 and presumably we're talking about the Unuk/Chickamon
14 River area, is that right, Dolly?

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes.

17

18 MS. GARZA: Yeah.

19

20 MR. SCHROEDER: I spelled it wrong.
21 Let's see, I've got -- we know how we're dealing with the
22 annual report. We want a letter drafted by Forest
23 Service to Board of Game, Division of Wildlife Concerning
24 aerial spotting on the Unuk River.

25

26 And did we talk about something about
27 Sustainable Salmon Funds, or am I drifting off? What did
28 we want to do about that? We were -- there was
29 discussion there, and I'm not sure exactly what we're
30 doing. Help me.

31

32 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I know that
33 many of the tribes do apply for those funds.

34

35 MR. SCHROEDER: So did we want to direct
36 something to whom if we were going to say something about
37 this.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Schroeder, I
40 think we did to Mr. Turek, encourage them to continue
41 seeking out those funds for these programs as they were
42 quite successful and that. And I would encourage that. I
43 don't believe it was a Council action.

44

45 MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. So that's not a
46 Council action item. That's all I was -- that's what
47 I've got then.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any errors or
50 omissions, additions, corrections? Mr. Adams.

00458

1 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
2 found a letter that Mr. Clarence Summers turned over to
3 me when he came today. And it involves all of the things
4 that Subsistence Resource Commission, you know, did.
5 There's all of the proposal that were passed, and I'd
6 just like to turn it over to our Coordinator for
7 implementation in the minutes or somewhere.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. A copy of
12 that will be sent to all Council members. Dr. Garza.

13
14 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I understand
15 there was some interest in the Regional Advisory Council
16 supporting Bert Adams for the Board of Fish.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's correct.
19 Your wishes?

20
21 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move that the
22 Regional Advisory Council support Bert Adams for a seat
23 with the Board of Fisheries.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second?

26
27 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a second.
30 The motion before you is for the Southeast Alaska
31 Regional Advisory Council to support the appointment of
32 Bert Adams to the State Board of Fish. Mr. Adams.

33
34 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. It
35 completely slipped my mind. I did submit an application
36 to the State for a seat on the Board of Fish. And it's
37 my understanding that they're going to make an
38 appointment sometime early this spring. I think it's in
39 May. They've got one more appointment to make. And I
40 applied for that seat, and I appreciate your support.

41
42 I'm kind of having second thoughts right
43 now, because I heard that, like for instance, they're
44 having a meeting right now, the Board of Fish, or this
45 week, and it's the same time as we are having. And I
46 hope that, you know, if I do get appointed that it won't
47 conflict with the meetings that we are having, because
48 I'd rather be here for the next few years.

49
50 But thank you for your support. I

00459

1 appreciate it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I support you, but
4 you will find that it conflicts with everything.

5

6 Is there any other discussion on the
7 motion. Is there any other discussion on the motion?

8

9 (No discussion)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those in favor
12 of the motion to support the appointment of Bert Adams to
13 the Board of Fish please signify by saying aye.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed,
18 same sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes.)

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We support you,
23 Bert.

24

25 MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Good luck. Any
28 other business other than Mike and I have to get to the
29 bank, and we have to leave in eight minutes. Is there
30 any -- would the Council like to have last comments. Dr.
31 Garza.

32

33 MS. GARZA: I don't know that we all need
34 to, and I will be brief. As the Ketchikan host, I just
35 want to thank you so much for coming. It was very
36 important to Ketchikan residents to have you there. And
37 we surely are happy with the support for our efforts to
38 go rural.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

43 Mr. Adams.

44

45 MR. ADAMS: Just a thank you and
46 appreciation, you know, for the find welcoming dinner we
47 had on our first night here, Dolly. We really
48 appreciated that and goonachesh.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

00460

1 I'm going to echo that. Thank you very much. You're
2 very hospitable. Some of the best meals I've had. I
3 thought this was great. Ketchikan put on a good show.
4 Could you pass that on to everyone? We appreciate that.
5 Staff, you did a good job as normal. We appreciate your
6 help. Thank you very much. Is there a motion to
7 adjourn?

8

9 MR. ADAMS: So move.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any objection?

12 Thank you very much.

13

14 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

00461

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

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 Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 306 through 460 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the VOLUME III, SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 26th day of February 2003, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Ketchikan Indian Corporation, Ketchikan, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 13th day of March, 2003.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04 □