

00133

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

10
11
12
13
14
15
16

VOLUME II

Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association
Kenai, Alaska
March 2, 2000 - 10:00 a.m.

17 MEMBERS PRESENT:

18
19 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
20 Fred John, Jr.
21 Clare Swan
22 Fred H. Elvsaas
23 Gilbert Dementi, Sr.
24 Kenneth Vlasoff
25
26 Helga Eakon, Coordinator
27
28 Joseph P. Kolasinski, Reporter

00134

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll call this meeting of Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back to order. I think we're waiting for a teleconference call. Should we go ahead with something while we're waiting? Helga, what would be your suggestion on that?

MS. EAKON: Well, maybe we can update the newcomers how we changed the agenda yesterday.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Yesterday we handled all of the proposals except for Proposal 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 because we have people who wish to speak to those proposals today. We're waiting right now for a teleconference call from one of them. After we finish that, we're going to go on to 8(C), which is agency reports.

MS. EAKON: No, fisheries.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And fisheries.

MS. EAKON: No, we're going to go into fisheries straight away after Tom Carpenter.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, my fault on that. We are going into fisheries straight away. I didn't see where I put that down, yes. So, should we take fisheries now while we're waiting for that call or would we be better off just trying to make the hook-up and then.....

MS. EAKON: Because he is going to call directly here, so we're going to hear a mmmmm, in which case we can just drop everything and hook him up. So we can -- let's go ahead and proceed and then, when we hear that tone, we can pick him up.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Oh, that's the one that I gave somebody wrong information on last night. I thought he was talking about something else. Any fisheries report from.....

MS. EAKON: Peggy Fox will start off. We're going to start off with the memorandum of agreement and move on to in-season management, followed by tribal involvement and finish off with fisheries projects.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

00135

1 MS. FOX: Good morning. For the record,
2 I'm Peggy Fox, the deputy assistant regional director for
3 subsistence working out of the Office of Subsistence with
4 the Fish & Wildlife Service. And, as Helga indicated, I'm
5 here to talk to you and get your comments on several
6 subjects related to fisheries. I will start off with the
7 status report and an interest in receiving your comments on
8 the latest draft of the federal/state cooperative
9 memorandum of understanding.

10
11 The first thing I'll note is that we have been
12 asked to rename that a memorandum of agreement by some
13 council members and that seems to be getting a lot of
14 support. So, for the rest of my discussion, I will refer
15 to it as a memorandum of agreement.

16
17 The draft that you have before you I mailed out to
18 individual council members, hoping that you'd have an
19 opportunity to look at the changes that have occurred since
20 the regional caucus at the end of January. Again, for the
21 record, just let me indicate that we provided a first draft
22 to all council members during that time and during your
23 council caucuses asked for comments and we got a lot of
24 good comments. We also got some conflicting ones. So the
25 board, on some particular items, needed to give us some
26 guidance on how they wanted us to proceed.

27
28 On the side where we had a lot of agreement, there
29 was a lot of council members that wanted to see a more
30 visible role for the councils in this agreement. So, as
31 you'll see in a number of the bracketed areas, we have
32 specifically identified where the regional advisory
33 councils are involved. In other cases, wherever it says
34 public involvement, there is the assumption that I hope
35 you'll see there that that includes the councils, the
36 committees, the general public, everyone. But there are
37 some unique opportunities for the councils in this
38 agreement, but that also means some unique commitments on
39 your part.

40
41 For example, as this process evolves, we're going
42 to be getting into some very specific protocols about how
43 the federal agencies and the state agencies are going to
44 work together to exchange information, make decisions in
45 terms of in-season fisheries management and those things
46 will take, with your direct involvement, some time on the
47 part of some council members to participate. And what
48 we've, you know, talked about so far with our -- in our
49 federal/state work group is having one or two council

50 members join with the people that are identified to develop

00136

1 those protocols. So there will be some invitations. I'm
2 not sure how that will be processed like on a statewide
3 level, but the councils will all see some increased
4 involvement in fisheries issues, planning and decision-
5 making as this part of our program evolves.

6
7 In the area where there was disagreement was on the
8 role of the tribes in this process. Some council members -
9 - and I should let you know, too, in the eastern, western
10 and Y-K councils took a formal step in developing formal
11 recommendations. The other councils didn't, so I have
12 comments and input from individual councils and then I have
13 council recommendations. At any rate, on that issue, some
14 felt the tribe should be a signatory, some felt the tribe
15 should be very visibly identified in here to participate in
16 this process as well as the councils. Some felt that the
17 tribe should not be signatories and, in fact, were strongly
18 opposed to it. So, the guidance from the board is that
19 this is a memorandum of agreement between the state and the
20 federal agencies involved in this that provides for
21 extensive participation by councils, by tribes and by
22 others. And that, in fact, what we want to do is encourage
23 people to use the councils as the forum for discussing a
24 lot of these issues and for participating in the processes
25 where councils are always asked to provide recommendations.
26 So that's how we came out on that issue.

27
28 Let me see if there's anything else that I might
29 want to particularly bring to your attention. I think
30 that's, in general, in covering general things, those were
31 the highlights of the things that I thought you might be
32 interested in and I guess I'd like to conclude my comments
33 on this subject and ask for questions or further input on
34 the second draft.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any
37 questions for Peggy?

38
39 MS. SWAN: Yes.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Clare.

42
43 MS. SWAN: The page 7 -- I hope we have the
44 same thing. On statement number 11 on page 7, it says this
45 establishes guidelines and mutual agreements by which the
46 signatories shall coordinate, but does not create legally
47 enforceable obligations or rights. That means that -- you
48 know, how is that going to play out on the ground? In
49 other words, if someone is doing something in their area

50 and in order to discuss -- and maybe not everyone agrees,

00137

1 are they going to have to stop the action and have this
2 legal -- decide whether it's legal or decide the law and,
3 you know, who has the right to do this. It's not going to
4 be covered -- these things will not be covered in the --
5 decided upon in this agreement. Is it just going to make
6 -- are we going to have to have another agreement or other
7 agreements besides this in order to continue?

8
9 MS. FOX: Yes. And that's where I was
10 talking about the development of protocols, which is
11 section 5, I think. Yeah. This agreement, in itself, is
12 an umbrella -- what we call an umbrella document and it
13 talks about guiding principles about how we're going to
14 work together, it talks about general areas of agreement,
15 what we agree are important things and important ways of
16 doing business together. But the -- it's like the details
17 are left to committees to work out in terms of a protocol
18 and that's where I was talking about how we're actually
19 going to work on the ground in season will result from a
20 process where this committee, with some council member
21 participation, will develop some very specific details on
22 how that will go.

23
24 For example, what I anticipate it will say is that
25 councils will be included in pre-season meetings and I'm
26 going to talk directly to your role when I answer this
27 question and not everything else it might cover. But it
28 will say that councils will be included in meetings, be
29 provided the opportunity to participate and be heard in
30 those pre-season meetings.

31
32 You will also be a part of the current
33 decision-making process that the state uses when they
34 approach the necessity to issue an emergency order. It
35 also will say that the councils will be directly involved
36 in post-season meetings where the state evaluates what
37 happened that season and kind of looks at some changes that
38 might be needed in the next year. Now, that decision-
39 making process we are calling generally the in-season
40 decision-making process, but it includes pre- and post-
41 season discussions and decision making.

42
43 So, those are the types of details that will be
44 worked out and agreed to in these protocols. But this sets
45 a framework so that, as people are involved in this
46 statewide, everybody understands -- should understand, we
47 hope, that we have agreed to work together and to
48 coordinate and to cooperate and that that's the message
49 that we're sending to everybody who's involved. And, you

50 know, that's the role of managers to do so that, as it gets

00138

1 out to the field, they've got guidance.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, on that number 11,
4 now my understanding of that is that it says does not
5 create legally enforceable obligations or rights, which
6 basically means that the federal government cannot take the
7 state to court because they didn't do something that the
8 federal government thinks they were obligated to do and
9 they don't have any legal rights to do something that they
10 understood for themselves that were in here. In other
11 words, basically this is a document that says you guys
12 can't sue each other over failure to do something in this
13 document.

14

15 MS. FOX: Absolutely correct. Thank you
16 for that follow-up. I didn't get back to the original
17 question. These are the types -- and in this category of
18 general provisions, these are the types of things you'll
19 see in every memorandum of agreement. Just for your
20 information, too.

21

22 MS. SWAN: Are we then -- I guess I just --
23 I think the best way to get all this fishing stuff done is
24 just to go do it, you know, but I'm wondering if we're
25 going to be -- if this is an umbrella document, how leaky
26 is it going to be?

27

28 MS. FOX: Well, to coin a phrase, the
29 devil's in the details. I think that's the more difficult
30 part, but this is a step that you have to take to be able
31 to get to that point.

32

33 MR. DEMENTI: Can I ask a question? Would
34 Alaska Intertribal Council be one of the signatories then?

35

36 MS. FOX: No. The signatories haven't
37 changed. It's still the boards, the State Board of Game,
38 the State Board of Fisheries, the commissioner on the state
39 side and all of the federal subsistence board on the
40 federal side. Opportunities for their involvement in the
41 program are laid out in here. Not specifically as an
42 organization, but it addresses Native organizations and
43 numerous locations, but they would not be a signatory.

44

45 MR. ELVSAAS: Did you say Native
46 organizations?

47

48 MS. FOX: Yes.

49

MR. ELVSAAS: That's not acceptable.

00139

1 There's half a dozen so-called Native organizations right
2 now in the state that have nothing to do with Natives, but
3 they're riding on the Native dollar and it's just a
4 criminal thing. The tribes have to be involved at some
5 point. I don't think that they necessarily have to be
6 signatories to the agreement because, as I envision this,
7 we're talking right now about the federal public land as
8 it's spelled out. We're not talking yet about state lands
9 or other lands. Right now we're only talking about federal
10 public land. And I would envision this going on -- if the
11 things works, that this will include state lands eventually
12 also. If it doesn't, I don't see much hope for the
13 agreement.

14
15 I mean right now the tribes and the Native people
16 are relying on federal management of the resources in
17 Alaska because they found that the state does not support
18 subsistence other than lip service. We hear all these
19 stories about gloom and doom about how the resource will be
20 lost if we don't have state management.

21
22 Well, history shows right during the period of
23 Statehood all the great resources of Alaska that everybody
24 came here for disappeared as soon as the state started
25 managing it through their mismanagement. So I would think
26 that, you know, we need to get an agreement going so we can
27 work together, but we need to look at this as the first
28 step.

29 I don't think that Native organizations, as such,
30 is the proper format for this at all. I just don't see
31 Natives getting participation in. If it says tribes, I
32 agree with it, but if it doesn't say tribes, that's --
33 tribes have to have input into it. If you're going to look
34 at the local knowledge and the people on the ground, you're
35 talking about the tribes. The Native organizations are
36 basically in the big cities and they belong there.

37
38 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Clare.

41
42 MS. SWAN: I would agree with Fred. I
43 think because -- I mean it tries to be my -- to talk about
44 this without including politics and I agree with you, it
45 should not be politicized, but it is, so we have to be
46 aware of that. I think that when you say Native
47 organizations, it's really true, what is that?

48
49 What happens here -- a lot of things have been said

50 and people get up and they support Native organizations,

00140

1 they support tribal people, but when you get up and you say
2 -- for instance, when you say -- they talk about rural this
3 and rural that and they have to have all these things, in
4 my mind, when I'm hearing that, I'm saying, oh, wow, you
5 know, that's very good, they're supporting tribal people.
6 Wrong. In my role as -- what I'm doing -- I'm from Kenai.
7 They're not talking about us. We're not rural. They're
8 not talking about anybody who's urban. See, so here you
9 have this other layer of things.

10
11 Subsistence is a very personal thing, as you
12 probably heard last night. I think that when you talk
13 about tribes, I think that tribes should -- I don't
14 necessarily agree that they need to be signatories, but
15 they need to be working with that because it is what it is.
16 I mean subsistence is personal and it's what you do at
17 home. You may do a lot, you may do a little, but it's what
18 you do. And that's true for everyone as well as tribes.

19
20 So I do concur with what Fred says. I think he's -
21 - I think that this will only work for a while if it is not
22 changed, if the mission isn't changed. I think it's just
23 one step.

24
25 MS. FOX: Ralph.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, correct me if I'm
28 wrong. My understanding of this is that this is a
29 memorandum of agreement between two public agencies, how
30 they're going to be working together and the inclusion of
31 the public layer tribes, Native groups, advisory councils,
32 things like that, is how they're going to include them, not
33 as working together, but how they're going to include them
34 as input.

35
36 MS. FOX: Yes.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And what this basically
39 covers is the fact that the federal fish management has got
40 to coordinate with the state fish management or nothing can
41 happen.

42
43 MS. FOX: Yes, that's correct.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this is just setting
46 out how those two agencies are going to be working
47 together. That's why nobody else can be signatories to
48 it.....

49

MS. FOX: That's right.

00141

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: because those are the
2 two agencies that have to agree to work together. The rest
3 of us become players in giving them information.

4
5 MS. FOX: Yes. And part of, hopefully,
6 some of the decision-making processes, like in-season
7 management. I say hopefully because that hasn't been
8 developed yet, but that is the strategy.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean it has worked in
11 the past in areas like on the Yukon-Kuskokwim with their
12 Yukon-Kuskokwim group, it's worked in Prince William Sound
13 with the -- I'm not sure what we call it, but we have a
14 group that works with the Fish & Game that gives advice.
15 They don't have to take it, but a lot of times, if they can
16 incorporate it, they do. And that's basically what you're
17 looking at here, is you're looking for public involvement.
18 So, from that standpoint, a Native organization would be
19 able to be involved in it as public.

20
21 MS. FOX: Exactly.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And tribes could be
24 involved in it more directly as it applies to their local
25 area. Fish & Game advisory boards would be representing
26 people in their area and even individuals would have a
27 point of having input into what's going on right here. But
28 you're setting out how the two of you agencies are going to
29 be working together.

30
31 MS. FOX: Exactly. And I would note that
32 this is probably one of a very few times that agencies even
33 include the public in the development of these kinds of
34 documents and I don't think that the councils are
35 necessarily aware of that. This is often considered an
36 administrative procedure and not really subject to public
37 input, but our program has made many strides in the area of
38 involvement and inclusion. So you're seeing a document
39 that -- and it's new and it's different. People don't also
40 -- they take a look at this and wonder, you know, where did
41 this come from and what's this all about. Well, you often
42 don't see them. They're done, you know, between agencies.

43
44 (Phone ringing in)

45
46 MS. EAKON: That's Tom.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can you hold your
49 question, Fred? We have a question, Peg. We'll hold it

50 for after we're done with Tom.

00142

1 MS. EAKON: Good morning, Tom Carpenter.
2 This is Helga.

3
4 OPERATOR: Hi, I have him on the phone. Are you
5 ready for me to release him?

6
7 MS. EAKON: Yes.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sorry for the
10 interruption, Peg.

11
12 MS. FOX: That's okay.

13
14 MS. EAKON: Good morning, Tom Carpenter.

15
16 MR. CARPENTER: Hi, how are you, Helga?

17
18 MS. EAKON: Just fine. I'm going to turn
19 you over to Ralph Lohse, the chair of the Southcentral
20 Regional Council now for your public testimony.

21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good morning, Tom. Can
25 you hear me?

26
27 MR. CARPENTER: Good morning, Ralph. How
28 are you?

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fine and dandy. Beautiful
31 day down here on the Kenai. I hear you're having rain in
32 Cordova.

33
34 MR. CARPENTER: It was still nice
35 yesterday, but it's raining today.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Can you give us a
38 list of the proposals you'd like to speak to?

39
40 MR. CARPENTER: Yes, I would. I would like
41 to testify on Proposal 14, Proposal 16, Proposal 17,
42 Proposal 18, Proposals 19 and 21 and Proposal 23.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, Tom. I'm sorry to
45 tell you this, but we handled Proposal 23 yesterday
46 already.

47
48 MR. CARPENTER: Well, that's fine. I was
49 just going to make a short comment and say that our

50 advisory committee had supported that proposal. And also

00143

1 on Proposal 19 and 21 I just have some short comments. The
2 majority of my comments will be addressing Proposals 14,
3 16, 17 and 18, dealing with moose and the goats in
4 Tatitlek.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. If you want to
7 start, why don't we just go right down the list. Take 14
8 and we'll go right down the list of them then.

9
10 MR. CARPENTER: Okay, very good. Once
11 again, my name is Tom Carpenter. I'm testifying from
12 Cordova for the Copper River/Prince William Sound Fish &
13 Game Advisory Committee. My first comments will be
14 directed at Proposal 14 for the harvest limiting closure of
15 public lands for goat in Unit 60. I've read the staff
16 comment and basically I would concur with the staff
17 recommendation or our advisory committee would concur.

18
19 The major problem that we had with this proposal
20 was not necessarily with the raising of the subsistence bag
21 limit in the desired area, but it was the fact that we
22 felt, as a community, in looking at past harvest records,
23 that Cordova and also Chenega showed a substantial harvest
24 of goat in the area that the village of Tatitlek was trying
25 to basically have the area of harvest for themselves. So we
26 would agree with the staff on this one that an increase in
27 the federal subsistence bag limit is warranted and we also
28 agree that Tatitlek should not be the sole user of that
29 particular area.

30
31 I can answer questions. That's basically all I
32 have to testify on Proposal 14 about. I can answer
33 questions now or I can just continue and go on to Proposal
34 16.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Why don't you hold on for
37 a second and I'll see if -- Ken's sitting right here from
38 Tatitlek and I just wondered if he had any questions you
39 wanted to ask Tom. Ken, did you -- you got what he said
40 right there?

41
42 MR. VLASOFF: As far as being the sole
43 people that hunt that area, I think that area would only be
44 for us after it was shut down, Tom. I think that's the way
45 we worded it.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you understand that
48 one, Tom?

49

MR. CARPENTER: Yes, I did. And I

00144

1 understand exactly where you and the village are coming
2 from. You know, I talked with several people in town here
3 that were former residents of Tatitlek and I understand
4 that the people of Tatitlek, you know, have definitely
5 shown that they have a big desire and a big need for those
6 goats. During the advisory committee though, we felt that
7 the way it was written, because the federal board has
8 already given Cordova, Tatitlek and Chenega a positive C&T
9 for that area, that the federal board would have to go back
10 and make another C&T determination to take Cordova and
11 Chenega out of that.

12
13 Basically, the way we looked at the statistics that
14 the Forest Service had given us through the federal
15 harvest, there has not been really any new information to
16 prove that there needs to be an area that's an exclusive
17 area for the village. And the reason that we say that,
18 Ken, is that if you look at the data over the past five or
19 six years, the federal subsistence season in the unit that
20 we're talking about, RG-249, has never had a closure take
21 place.

22
23 Now, on the state side, there's been a closure in
24 five out of the last six years. So, on the subsistence
25 side of things, we're looking at it as, you know, there
26 hasn't been a closure, so there must be some opportunity
27 left. So, if there's opportunity left, we feel that the
28 people from Tatitlek still have an opportunity to go over
29 there.

30
31 So, not to take away from any of the harvest from
32 the people of the village, we just want to still be
33 included in the subsistence area because of the findings
34 that the federal board gave in the past.

35
36 MR. VLASOFF: Tom, I don't think we would
37 have a heartache with that. The reason we selected those
38 particular areas is traditional hunting ground.

39
40 MR. CARPENTER: Right. And we understand
41 that completely, Ken. So, just to get the point across to
42 you and the rest of the board, we do not have a problem
43 with what the village is asking for. We, as a community,
44 want to be included. We do not want that area to be
45 exclusive to Tatitlek and I hope you can understand that.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ken says he doesn't think
48 there's any problem with that. So, thank you on that one,
49 Tom.

00145

1 MR. CARPENTER: You bet.

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 16.

4
5 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Proposal 16, that's
6 dealing with the C&T determination for moose in Unit 6(A)
7 and B, which would be Bering River and Martin River areas.
8 That's directly east, southeast of Cordova. I'm trying to
9 find the right tab here so I can get my notes. Okay,
10 Proposal 16. This proposal was put in by, I believe,
11 either Don Kompkoff or the Village of Chenega Bay. This
12 has been.....

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, can I interrupt you
15 on that one?

16
17 MR. CARPENTER: Excuse me?

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I interrupt you on
20 that one?

21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Sure.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ken just told me that Don
25 just wanted to drop that proposal.

26
27 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. If you want to drop
28 that proposal, then we have no problem with dropping it.

29
30 MR. VLASOFF: It saves time.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.
33 There's no reason to testify on it then if it's not going
34 to be handled.

35
36 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Just for the record,
37 I'd like to just put on the record that this proposal had
38 been deferred for several years and that the people of
39 Chenega and Mr. Kompkoff have had ample opportunity to
40 bring evidence forward to the board in regards to this
41 proposal and our committee and I would say the regional
42 council and the federal board have not seen significant
43 evidence as of this time to support this. So, if it's
44 being dropped, then we have no problem with that.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, 17.

47
48 MR. CARPENTER: Proposal 17 is to establish
49 a moose season in Unit 6(B) and 6(C). This proposal was

50 put in by the Native Village of Eyak. The Native Village

00146

1 of Eyak is one of two Native organizations in Cordova. The
2 other one being the Eyak Corporation.

3
4 The proposal calls for establishment of an
5 additional federal season for Cordova residents only and
6 this would be for the area 6(C), which is between town and
7 the Copper River, and Unit 6(B), which would be from the
8 Copper River to the Ragged Mountains, approximately 75
9 miles from Cordova due east.

10
11 Currently there is a state drawing system set up in
12 Unit 6(C), which is the closest area to Cordova. This area
13 typically having a state draw only for 20 to 25 bulls and
14 for five cows. That hunt is available for any Alaska
15 resident. Unit 6(B) is a registration hunt. A portion of
16 this area is bordered by the Copper River highway, which
17 gives access to people that register who also must be a
18 resident of the state. They have access along the highway
19 through walk-in hunts. They also have access through
20 several drainages that come out of the Martin River area.
21 Some of the access points being along the highway, the main
22 mode of transportation on those hunts, other than the walk-
23 in, are river skiff, airboat and airplane.

24
25 The hunts have been altered in the not-so-far
26 distant future by the State Board of Game. There's a very
27 serious problem in Martin River area, that would be Unit
28 6(B), in regards to the calf production. The calf
29 production the last four years has not been any greater
30 than 4 percent. This has, unfortunately, eliminated the
31 cow hunts and it's also reduced the bull harvest four out
32 of the last five years by approximately 10 animals. So
33 there's a serious predation problem or migration problem
34 that is occurring in Martin River. So that is something to
35 very much consider when you're talking about this proposal
36 the way it's drawn up by the Native Village of Eyak in
37 regards to that area.

38
39 Unit 6(C) is the closest to town. That hunt is,
40 like I say, a draw hunt only. That's a very successful
41 hunt. 85 to 95 percent of the moose in that area annually
42 are taken by residents of Cordova or people within Unit 6,
43 being Valdez, Tatitlek, Chenega. There are approximately 5
44 percent of the permits that are typically drawn from people
45 from outside of the Unit 6 area.

46
47 This hunt -- and, basically, the hunt in Unit 6(B)
48 has been addressed very severely by this advisory committee
49 and the Board of Game through a moose management plan that

50 was drafted in the mid '90s and this plan calls for an

00147

1 increase in the overall population of moose in Unit 6(C) to
2 where we can have an overall harvest of possibly double
3 what we have currently, which would be 30 animals. We're
4 hoping to get the numbers up by 2004 to approximately 45 to
5 55 animals, so there is going to be an increased harvest.

6
7 We don't feel that the way the proposal is written
8 that it would be possible, number one, for it to be
9 enforced. Number two, we would have a dual management
10 system via the forest service in town who are the federal
11 game managers and the Department of Fish & Game, who are
12 the state game managers. You would have to have two
13 systems. Currently, we don't feel that an additional
14 manager would be a wise thing to do at this time. We feel
15 that the drawing systems and the registration systems that
16 the state are providing for the residents of Alaska do a
17 fine job in allocating the animals out to the different
18 participants.

19
20 We agree that the hunt should be kept the way it is
21 currently. We also feel that if the board so desires to
22 make part of this hunt a federal hunt, that they must
23 solely consider Unit 6(C) and totally eliminate 6(B)
24 because of the biological factors that are taking place.
25 There are five cows that are available in 6(C) through the
26 state drawing system and I have read the staff comments.
27 We, at this time, do not agree with the staff that the five
28 cows should be included in a federal hunt. But if there
29 was going to be some action taken, we would feel that that
30 five cows would be the most that we could possibly agree
31 to.

32
33 So that's all I have to testify on Proposal 17. If
34 you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them right
35 now.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom on
38 this one? (No audible response) Tom, do you want to go on
39 then?

40
41 MR. CARPENTER: Sure, I'd be glad to go on
42 then. Proposal 18.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wait a second. I had one
45 question. I think you said that currently in 6(C) 85 to 95
46 percent of the animals are going to Cordova residents right
47 now.

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: Eighty-five to 95 percent

50 of the animals that are harvested, and this is over the

00148

1 last 10 years is the data that I've looked at, so that's
2 giving you a pretty good average. Yes, they are going to
3 people from Cordova or people -- there are some people that
4 are drawn from Tatitlek and Chenega and some from Valdez.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. To residents of
7 Prince William Sound in other words.

8
9 MR. CARPENTER: Residents of Prince William
10 Sound. But 85 to 95 percent of the moose are typically
11 going to Cordova residents either through harvest or
12 through people that are just sharing with friends
13 throughout the community.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thanks. I just
16 wanted to clarify that. 18.

17
18 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Proposal 18 is
19 dealing with ceremonial moose for the Native Village of
20 Eyak. This moose would be taken on federal lands in Unit
21 6(B) or 6(C) for an annual Memorial Day celebration. This
22 proposal has come up in the past. I think it was two or
23 three years ago when the federal board authorized the
24 Native Village of Eyak to harvest one bull moose and that
25 was done so. I don't want to go into this proposal too
26 terribly much because it has occurred in the past. And,
27 actually, during -- or under the state system as it stands
28 right now, the Native Village of Eyak could go harvest a
29 moose as this request from them asks for under the state
30 system, so they have opportunity right now to harvest the
31 moose for such a thing.

32
33 The main point and the thing that I would like this
34 regional council to look at is not that this one moose is
35 going to make a big difference one way or the other because
36 it is going to be used within the community, but the point
37 that our advisory committee would like to stress to you is
38 that the federal board, under the guidelines that it set
39 forth, has said that all residents of Cordova have a
40 positive, customary and traditional use for moose in this
41 area.

42
43 And the question that we would like to ask is, if
44 that is so, does a proposal such as Proposal 18 set
45 precedence and give one group of people within a community
46 that has a positive C&T as a whole more of a customary and
47 traditional use to where they could go and harvest outside
48 of everybody else?

49

And that's the one question that we'd like to

00149

1 stress to you and we'd like, you know, just some thought
2 and maybe some feedback because there has been people that
3 have come up to me and they have went to the federal
4 managers in this area and said, well, we understand why
5 they want to take this moose and we're not disagreeing that
6 it's for a good reason. But does somebody like the
7 pioneers of Alaska, who have been established longer than
8 the Native Village of Eyak, do they have the same right to
9 go to the federal board and ask for a subsistence moose?
10 And that's a question that I can't answer, but it's a
11 possibility that it's a question that you and the federal
12 board could possibly have to address in the future. So,
13 before this gets, you know, possibly more expansive in the
14 future, you know, it's just something to think about.

15
16 The one part of the proposal that we definitely
17 disagree with is in regards to Unit 6(B). And 6(B) is the
18 unit that I testified with on Proposal 17 earlier that has
19 real serious biological questions to answer about the calf
20 survival right now. The overall population in that unit is
21 down dramatically, the calf survival is down dramatically
22 and we would like to ask that if the board finds in favor
23 of this proposal, that they not include Unit 6(B) in their
24 finding, that they only include Unit 6(C), and this is
25 solely for biological reasons.

26
27 We would hope that the board would understand that
28 an additional moose taken in that area right now could have
29 an effect on the overall population and we don't want to do
30 any more damage than is being done right now. So that's
31 basically what I have to testify on Proposal 18 and I would
32 answer any questions at this time.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any questions
35 for Tom? (No audible response) No, Tom. You can go on.

36
37 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. I'm going to talk
38 about Proposals 19 and 21 at once if that's okay with you,
39 Mr. Chairman. I see they're lumped together in the book.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sounds good.

42
43 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Proposals 19 and 21
44 are dealing with a proposal that was put in by this
45 advisory committee in 1997-98. It's been deferred. Since
46 the time that the proposals have been put in, we have had
47 meetings with the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Service.
48 They have come to Cordova, they had a public meeting. They
49 also had a meeting about two or three weeks ago up north

50 here and discussed this. I got a letter from the Parks

00150

1 Commission. The park, at this time, has said that there
2 are people within the community of Cordova that do qualify
3 for a 1344 permit, I believe is the number. The community
4 as a whole, they found -- because of the way the
5 regulations have been written, the community as a whole, at
6 this time, we could not show that the community should be
7 included for a 1344 permit.

8
9 But the one thing I would like to stress is that
10 for those few people that do qualify under the Park Service
11 guidelines for a 1344 permit, which they would be
12 individual permits, the federal board needs to give Cordova
13 a positive C&T for moose and sheep inside Unit 11. If we
14 don't get that from the federal board, then those few
15 individuals, and I'm probably talking anywhere between 5
16 and 20, would not qualify for a 1344 permit because they
17 have to have a customary and traditional use first.

18
19 So that is basically what we're asking for right
20 now. You can put out of your minds that the whole town of
21 Cordova is going to rush into the park. Basically, what's
22 come out of these meetings is that a few people whose
23 families have had an extensive past in the park and in Unit
24 11 would qualify and would be able to hunt in that area
25 under the set guidelines. So it's not going to be the
26 whole town, it's only going to be a few people and we don't
27 feel that there's any endangerment or that there's going to
28 be an influx of people into that area that is going to
29 encroach on anybody else's subsistence lifestyle. That is
30 about all I have to say on that and, hopefully, the
31 regional council understands what we're asking for and,
32 hopefully, those few people can, you know, be allowed to go
33 hunt in their traditional areas once again. So that is all
34 I have to say about that proposal at this time.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, are you there?

37
38 MR. CARPENTER: Yes.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yesterday we talked to
41 Gloria on teleconference and she said that CRNA and you had
42 been in correspondence on this same issue and that they
43 were in agreement with the C&T for those individuals with
44 1344. She mentioned for the area south of the Chitina
45 River and that you and her had talked about that. Am I
46 correct in that understanding?

47
48 MR. CARPENTER: Yes. I've been in contact
49 with her and I spoke with her last year. I've also spoke

50 with her on the phone a couple times and, you know,

00151

1 basically we had come to an agreement that since there was
2 only going to be a few people allowed to participate in a
3 hunt in that area, that it wasn't going to be, you know, a
4 mass invasion and that's what she was worried about. South
5 of the Chitina River was definitely agreeable.

6
7 The only thing that I didn't agree on and something
8 that we talked about a little bit and she hadn't given me
9 an answer because she hadn't gone back and talked to, you
10 know, people within her Native association, is that there
11 has been some substantial hunting in the past north of the
12 White River, up in the White River country, by Rock Lake
13 and Ptarmigan Lake and there was quite a bit of hunting in
14 the passes that lead up to the White River valley. So that
15 would be the only other thing.

16
17 The area that she was talking about and I know that
18 you're familiar with, Mr. Lohse, would be the areas from
19 about Long Lake and the Crystalline Hills to the west. We
20 have no traditional, you know, use in that area and we are
21 not asking for that and we did come to an agreement. The
22 one thing is we would like the area from the Crystalline
23 Hills to McCarthy and up the pass to the White River area
24 to be included. Now, I don't know how that can be written
25 up, but that is something we would like.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, it seemed to me that
28 basically the headwaters of the Chitina, you know, the
29 McCarthy and the Zena area had had quite a bit of hunting
30 in the past, which is the headwaters up there. And that's
31 actually -- in a way, that's south of the mouth of the
32 Chitina, but it's not south of the Chitina River.

33
34 MR. CARPENTER: Exactly.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, okay. So,
37 basically, from what I understood from her, too, is that
38 even with a positive C&T for Cordova, it only applies to
39 individuals that qualify for 1544.

40
41 MR. CARPENTER: Exactly. And those people
42 would have to apply -- after a C&T is given to Cordova,
43 they would have to apply individually to the Park Service
44 for their own permit.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any questions for
47 Tom? (No audible response) Tom, I thank you for being
48 patient with us and getting back to us. I thank you for
49 the information.

00152

1 MR. CARPENTER: I appreciate the
2 opportunity to be able to testify. One thing I would like
3 to tell the board is that I did appreciate in the past
4 being able to come to the meetings personally and testify
5 because a lot of these issues are going to be getting more
6 and more serious in the future in regards to fish and I
7 have been in contact with several people in regards to this
8 matter and hopefully, in the near distant future, Fish &
9 Wildlife's funding will have some money set aside so that
10 participants like our advisory committee will be able to
11 travel and participate in person because, you know, I think
12 there's a big difference between talking on the telephone
13 and testifying and looking at the board and talking to the
14 people on the board and the staff personally. I think you
15 can get your point across a lot more and I think there's a
16 lot more information that can be passed along than just can
17 be on a telephone. So, hopefully things there will get
18 straightened out in the future and I thank the board again
19 for being able to testify and good luck on your
20 deliberations.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly, Tom.
23 Just remember one thing. We're not a board. We're just an
24 advisory council. We don't make the decisions.

25
26 MR. CARPENTER: You're right. I'm sorry.
27 Thanks a lot.

28
29 MS. EAKON: Bye.

30
31 MR. CARPENTER: Bye.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Peggy, are you
34 ready to come back? I think Fred had a question for you
35 just before you left. Did you remember it?

36
37 MR. F. JOHN: I've got a question. Usually
38 when we have our advisory meeting here, council meeting, we
39 have all the different agencies talk, the State of Alaska.
40 Usually we don't pay any attention to them. What's going
41 to happen in the fishery as if they have MOA with the
42 federal government? Are they going to be the dominant
43 dictator or whatever you want to call it? You know, that
44 will decide whether we're in the federal board.

45
46 MS. FOX: Let me share what I understand
47 the vision to be on our relationship with the State and how
48 that affects the councils. The State is still the primary
49 fishery manager. Always will be. We don't want to take

50 over management of all fisheries in the state. I mean it's

00153

1 never been our intent to do that. They will be the primary
2 manager. They certainly have the expertise and the
3 institutional knowledge over a number of years and we're
4 going to be tapping into their system. We are going to be
5 doing a lot of learning about how fisheries are managed.
6 We're going to be doing a lot of learning about fishery
7 stocks and trends, about users and uses, and what we're
8 doing is, because of our responsibilities in ANILCA,
9 positioning ourself as a part of the decision making when
10 it effects subsistence users. However, there's a lot of
11 other fishing that goes on. So the State will, as I
12 indicated, always remain the primary manager.

13
14 But our role is to participate directly in those
15 processes and in those decisions that affects subsistence
16 users and we've still yet to learn where all those
17 opportunities are, what we need to do. We're still
18 figuring that out as well as communicating that then back
19 to the councils as to what our role is and what your role
20 is. While we're doing that we're building technical
21 expertise. We've got a staffing plan, part of which has
22 been approved, part of which isn't approved, to hire a
23 number of our own fisheries biologists and I'm talking
24 about a range of people who are highly technically capable.
25 We call them biometricians. Analyzing information that we
26 get from the State and helping us to formulate our own
27 opinion on what's happening with the fisheries stocks or
28 trends or allocation issues or those types of things. So
29 we're going to have the capability to do what I call
30 oversight on what the State is doing in those areas that
31 affect subsistence users.

32
33 Concurrent with that, and that's in an area what we
34 call our new Fisheries Information Services Division and
35 there will be a number of highly skilled people working in
36 that on a statewide basis keeping track of what's going on
37 and they will be the key people we will rely on in inseason
38 management.

39
40 In another part of our organization, the part that
41 you're very familiar with, is the regulatory process and we
42 have teams established that support the councils. In this
43 case, each of these councils will be getting an additional
44 member, a fisheries biologist and we're planning on hiring
45 four to start. We think that that's sufficient but, as I
46 said, we're all learning. Four fisheries biologists to
47 work directly with the regulatory process. So you would
48 have a biologist, a fisheries biologist, just as you do
49 your wildlife biologist and anthropologist, shared with

50 another council, but they will be your technical staff to

00154

1 advise you on fisheries issues. And they will coordinate
2 with our Fisheries Information Service fisheries biologists
3 as needed when we need that kind of information to help
4 forward a regulatory proposal. I hope that answers your
5 question.

6
7 MR. F. JOHN: I'm still a little bit
8 confused. Sounds like the Katie John case. To take over
9 officially on federal land and everything really doesn't
10 have that much effect. I mean if you let the State be the
11 primary.....

12
13 MS. FOX: Yes, the State has to be the
14 primary manager. Our focus is on subsistence uses.

15
16 MR. F. JOHN: On federal land?

17
18 MS. FOX: On federal lands. But we don't
19 manage sports fishing on federal lands directly. We don't
20 manage commercial fisheries. For example, in the Y-K
21 Delta, there are commercial fisheries going on within our
22 area of jurisdiction, but we won't get involved in that
23 unless there is a demonstrated nexus with subsistence where
24 there's an adverse effect. So we're not -- we're focused
25 on subsistence uses and where there are connections with
26 other uses, like sportsfish, just as we do with wildlife.
27 There's a parallel there. We don't get involved in closing
28 federal public lands to other users unless there is a
29 resource concern. Otherwise we don't manage it, we don't
30 work in it.

31
32 MR. F. JOHN: Maybe I'll get it straight.
33 Up in Batzulnetas, where the court started amongst our
34 fishing, we use our traditional way and everything. We use
35 the old fish trap and everything in that creek. How would
36 T&C work in there? Like, you know, the State -- I don't
37 think -- do you know if the State got that place open or
38 just under federal?

39
40 MS. FOX: There are subsistence
41 regulations.....

42
43 MR. F. JOHN: I'm a little bit concerned
44 and I'm a little bit kind of wondering what the Katie John
45 case is doing if the State is still the powerhouse in
46 fishing? I guess that's what I was going to say. It
47 sounds like federal is under the State in this.

48
49 MS. FOX: No.

00155

1 MR. F. JOHN: Except for subsistence you
2 say, huh?

3
4 MS. FOX: Yes.

5
6 MR. F. JOHN: Okay. That's good enough
7 then.

8
9 MS. FOX: Yeah, except for subsistence.

10
11 MR. F. JOHN: I'll get it.

12
13 MS. FOX: That's okay. As I indicated,
14 this is a tremendous learning curve for all of us.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Peggy, I want to
17 understand something I didn't quite realize before, too,
18 and I'm trying to go along with Fred here. Now, on federal
19 land, the federal government will manage subsistence and
20 manage for subsistence, but will not be managing sport and
21 commercial. So, consequently, if there is a problem in the
22 subsistence area, in other words there's not sufficient
23 fish in the subsistence area, then -- and something needs
24 to be done, let's go the whole scenario and say that we
25 need to close commercial fishing and we need to close
26 sportfishing down to allow subsistence fish up there. Does
27 the federal government have the authority to do that or do
28 they work with the State for the State to make the
29 decisions on those other fisheries?

30
31 MS. FOX: That's an answer that will vary
32 around the state. The best area of opportunity where we
33 have the most effect would be in areas where we have the
34 jurisdiction of those waters for the purposes of
35 subsistence management within federal public lands. Where
36 I'm talking about as an example is right down to the mouth
37 of the Yukon and the Kuskokwim. We have refuge lands and
38 so that area is included within the boundaries of a
39 conservation system unit and there are commercial fisheries
40 going on within those waters.

41
42 Now, if the run didn't look that good and the users
43 upstream said, hey, you know, we don't think we're going to
44 get the fish that we need, and I'm very generalizing this
45 if you will, and they're at the pre-season meeting and
46 indications are the State is still going to open a
47 commercial fishery for a length of time that upstream users
48 feel is very threatening to their ability to get their fish
49 and they have information to show, but the State moves

50 ahead, if the State moves ahead because that commercial

00156

1 fishery occurs within our jurisdiction, we have an
2 opportunity to intervene and if they issue an emergency
3 order, issue our own special action, this type of decision,
4 and prevent that opening.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

7
8 MS. FOX: But if it occurs in an area that
9 we don't have jurisdiction, you're talking in those cases
10 about an extension of our extra-territorial jurisdiction
11 and there are, of course, a number of rivers where that
12 will be the case. And then that's something that is a lot
13 more difficult and probably will not happen within one
14 year, will not happen that season, the effect of that. So,
15 what I want to say, just one more thing, is that -- I'm
16 sort of getting into my in-season discussion, but our focus
17 is on prevention. We really want to get people involved in
18 fisheries management planning and in the pre-season
19 discussions and work that all out before we get in the
20 middle of it.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: See, that's what I see
23 this as. In those kind of situations, it would be a lot
24 better to be working with cooperation with the State in the
25 areas that they have jurisdiction that overlap the
26 subsistence problem than it would be to be an antagonist
27 simply because you cannot make quick decisions as an
28 antagonist, but as a cooperative agreement that you're
29 going to work together to accomplish these goals. So,
30 technically speaking, you are, unless you're willing to
31 take it to court and go through all that, you really are
32 limited to doing it in cooperation because they have the
33 authority either preceding you or on other fisheries that
34 impact you.

35
36 MS. FOX: Yes. And that's basically what
37 we're trying to do, is work before we get to that point and
38 that's where these protocols are very important. It's very
39 important that we work out the details so that we build
40 that cooperation.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I understand.

43
44 MR. VLASOFF: I think we should listen to
45 the biologists instead of trying to set precedence ourself
46 because they should know, especially these dynamite
47 biologists you're talking about. Just because somebody
48 thought there wasn't enough fish, that isn't enough reason,
49 you know.

00157

1 MS. FOX: You're correct in that.

2

3 MR. VLASOFF: And a lot of times it becomes
4 political instead of.....

5

6 MS. FOX: Absolutely. And we need somebody
7 to help us sort through that. You're right.

8

9 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman?

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Clare?

12

13 MS. SWAN: How about funding? You know,
14 time goes and this is March and.....

15

16 MS. FOX: The fish are coming we say.

17

18 MS. SWAN: Yeah. And in order -- and you
19 have to do your protocols and you have to do all this
20 stuff, do you have the money?

21

22 MS. FOX: Yes, we have funds.

23

24 MS. SWAN: Can I ask, you know, for what?
25 Are they earmarked for what kinds of things? Do you have
26 it for what you just spoke of?

27

28 MS. FOX: The only way in which it's
29 earmarked is we have identified a portion, over half of our
30 funds to go for what we call resource monitoring and that's
31 comprehensive. That's a lot of projects on the ground.
32 Some examples of which are putting in a weir in a river to
33 help count fish, to help gather information on where the
34 fish are going and how many, to working with certain
35 communities and certain areas to gather traditional
36 knowledge.

37

38 It's a tremendous range of types of things that we
39 will do under the broad category of resource monitoring and
40 you'll be hearing a lot more about specific proposals and
41 specific projects a little bit later in our presentation.
42 But most of our funds are going towards information
43 gathering in order for us to be able to add to the total
44 information we have about fisheries. Not to duplicate what
45 the State is doing, but to add to it. And that's like, I
46 think for next year if we get those funds, \$7 million. For
47 this year, it's four to five million, something like that
48 this year that we got. Just for that purpose. To build
49 our knowledge base, to build the State's statewide

50 knowledge base on fisheries, everybody benefits if we add

00158

1 to the knowledge and don't duplicate what the State is
2 doing.

3
4 Now, the rest of that money then goes towards
5 building the staff that we need to be able to effectively
6 participate in this fishery, in this fishery management
7 statewide. Some of those are in Anchorage, like I talked
8 about the experts, the high-caliber experts. It's also to
9 add to the council system a more technical staff. It's
10 going to cost us a lot more money to run the councils, we
11 have more meetings. We are going to be asking that you
12 send more of your members to more meetings on these
13 fisheries issues.

14
15 It also goes towards putting more staff out in
16 other areas of the state where the issues are around in-
17 season management in particular. So, across the state,
18 we're going to be adding about 17 positions if we get those
19 approved. That's the component that is yet to be approved,
20 is what goes out in the field, I'm sorry to say. But about
21 17 positions outside of Anchorage that will be working
22 directly with local communities and working directly with
23 the State to help make things go smoothly and effectively.
24 So we have the funding to do that.

25
26 MS. SWAN: I'm sorry. I just need to
27 know.....

28
29 MS. FOX: That's okay.

30
31 MS. SWAN:is all this that you've
32 just discussed, is that part of what you're talking about,
33 what you're calling protocols? Is that part of that or is
34 that going to be something different?

35
36 MS. FOX: The protocols is one part of the
37 planning that you do before you launch, you know, fully on
38 this cooperative working relationship out on the ground.
39 That will take -- you know, we're estimating that will take
40 from now until next fishing season to get these protocols
41 completed. So we are, this year in particular, doing a lot
42 of things very quickly because we have to. October 1st we
43 were told we're it. We can't, you know, ignore the fact
44 that we've got to be involved in inseason management and
45 we've got to get some projects started. We've got the
46 money. It was available October 1st. And to start doing
47 some things right away. Well, it was a very short window
48 to get going and we were prevented from doing anything
49 before that by Congress, so we're doing a lot of things

50 very quickly. That's why this MOA process is trying to,

00159

1 you know, go through very quickly, that's why the projects
2 for this year are going a lot faster, but there will be
3 more deliberative, lengthy processes in the future to get
4 broader involvement and that's maybe some better solutions
5 to some of these things. The protocols are part of getting
6 everything in place and everything understood and agreed to
7 so that in subsequent years it should go more smoothly
8 because everybody knows what to expect.

9
10 MS. SWAN: Okay. So we have to do that
11 first and that's not part of the -- where you're talking
12 about the gathering, the resource monitoring, that's not
13 part of that?

14
15 MS. FOX: There is a protocol on the.....

16
17 MS. SWAN: For resource monitoring?

18
19 MS. FOX:exchange of information and
20 that's where the State and the federal government will
21 agree on how they're going to exchange information, how
22 they're going to use it. In other words, if the State
23 gives us information, they're very concerned about how we
24 use information that they give us, so we've got to talk
25 about how are we going to do that respectfully. And if we
26 don't agree with it, we need to sit down and talk to them
27 and work something out, you know, understand better what it
28 is. So that is one of the protocols.

29
30 MS. SWAN: Okay.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, correct me if I'm
33 wrong, but won't the protocols also cover who's responsible
34 for gathering certain kinds of information?

35
36 MS. FOX: Yes.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Like you said, how you're
39 going to share that information and who is going to make
40 decisions based on that information and who they're going
41 to consult to make those decisions.

42
43 MS. FOX: Yes.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, I mean, you're going
46 to have to have somebody in charge of making a decision in
47 the field, but you're going to have to have a protocol that
48 what kind of information he has to have to make that
49 decision and who he has to consult before he makes that

50 decision, but it needs to be down so when a decision needs

00160

1 made, he doesn't have to think, now who do I have -- who
2 should I go see and what should I look at.

3
4 MS. FOX: It's all spelled out.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it's all spelled out.

7
8 MS. FOX: Yes.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that those of us that
11 aren't part of the process can sit down and look at it and
12 say if this guy is managing, this is what he's going to do
13 and in these kinds of scenarios this is what's going to
14 happen.

15
16 MS. FOX: Yes. Yes, that's the goal.
17 That's what we're working towards. And I think that's what
18 we absolutely have to have. It's almost more than a goal.
19 It's something that we have to have.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I know it's also the
22 thing that all user groups fear the most, is not having a
23 basis to understand what's going to happen.

24
25 MS. FOX: Such as last night. The fear of
26 the unknown, yes.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You know, if anything can
29 happen, then you can't plan for anything, but if you know
30 that if such and such and such and such and such and such
31 shows up, this person makes a decision based on this, then
32 you have a way of looking at it and saying, well, this is
33 why this is going to -- you know, we don't have to fear
34 this this year, we do have to fear this this year or
35 something to that effect.

36
37 MS. FOX: Yes. Another example of a
38 protocol is fisheries management planning. The State has
39 several fisheries management plans around the state and
40 that's where the issue of allocation is dealt with. And
41 that's a process that we're going to work out a protocol on
42 how we are going to be involved to assure the priority for
43 subsistence.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In the allocation process.

46
47 MS. FOX: That's right, in the allocation
48 process. And so, as those plans come up for review by the
49 Board of Fisheries on a regular basis, then we are going to

50 be building in our involvement in that so that when it does

00161

1 come before the Board of Fisheries, we have weighed in and
2 that priority is provided for. Some of them need revising,
3 some of them don't. Some of them -- what we're hearing is
4 some users feel like the allocation is appropriate and
5 adequate, but in other areas of the state there's a lot of
6 difference of opinion.

7
8 MS. SWAN: I don't want to sound like an
9 old rump head, but maybe I am. This is amazing to me that
10 we've done all this stuff for all these many years and you
11 mean we have to start over again and rearrange the
12 information or decide if we like it or what we're going to
13 do with it? Are we going to be re-inventing fish wheels
14 here? I just -- maybe I'm just looking at it all at once,
15 you know. And maybe I'm so dumb I thought it would be
16 easier.

17
18 MS. FOX: Well, let me make one statement
19 though that might help. This has come up at another
20 council as well. We're not going to advocate any changes
21 unless they come through you. If you tell us there's a
22 problem that we need to deal with, we'll get involved.
23 Take fisheries management plans for example, as I
24 indicated. If you feel that they are adequately providing
25 for the subsistence priority in the area for which you're
26 responsible, why get into it? No, we're not going to.
27 We're only going to focus on where you tell us there are
28 issues or there are problems that this program needs to
29 focus on. That's the way it works in wildlife, that's the
30 way it will work in fisheries. So, no, we're not going to
31 turn the State system upside-down and look for problems.
32 We're not going to do that. We're going to do that based
33 on what you tell us.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Clare, I think kind of
36 what you're asking is why do we need to go through this
37 whole process. Basically, we brought another player in and
38 you've got to set some ground rules for players to play
39 together. In this case, the player is involved in only one
40 section of it and is limited to the area that they can
41 apply their jurisdiction. Now, how do they correspond with
42 somebody who has a jurisdiction in another area and how do
43 they agree to get along to make the decisions that will
44 benefit both. I think that's why all of this has to -- it
45 looks like re-inventing the wheel, but you're actually
46 re-inventing the game.

47
48 MS. FOX: I think there are changes that
49 are going to result from our involvement in fisheries like

50 you haven't seen in wildlife. We haven't had a memorandum

00162

1 of agreement with the State in terms of how we worked
2 together on wildlife. We spent years working on that, but
3 we never got to the point of signing it. We couldn't get
4 agreement. Everybody kept thinking it will go back to the
5 State. Didn't really feel like they needed to commit.

6

7 MR. F. JOHN: That was my question.

8

9 MS. FOX: Right. But now, this is far too
10 complex, it's far too -- there's far too many implications
11 for other people in the state. We have to commit to
12 working together very effectively to avoid a lot of
13 problems; you know, people getting caught in the middle.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
16 Peggy or should we let her go on with the.....

17

18 MS. FOX: Other subjects.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you going to in-season
21 management next?

22

23 MS. FOX: Yeah. Okay. My purpose in
24 talking about in-season management with you today and with
25 the other councils is obviously the fish are coming. We
26 have to figure out how we are going to work together this
27 summer and, you know, assume our responsibilities and our
28 mandate to protect subsistence. As I've already indicated,
29 we're not adequately staffed as yet, we don't have the
30 information we need to be positioned for full federal
31 involvement and in-season management. So we're having to
32 look at some ways in which we can honor that responsibility
33 and follow through with it and, yet, recognize that it may
34 or may not be to everybody's satisfaction. But,
35 nevertheless, that's where we're at.

36

37 We did an analysis, looked at things statewide and
38 said, well, where's the highest risk of there being a need
39 for us to intervene in inseason management and we
40 categorized different areas of the state and I'd just like
41 to share that with you for your information.

42

43 The highest risk area will be the Yukon River
44 region. That's where perceptions are there's a limited
45 resource and there's an awful lot of demand and there are a
46 lot of differences of opinion on allocation. There's been
47 a lot of emergency orders issued in that area and there's a
48 lot of people who are very dependent on those resources.
49 So that's our highest risk area.

00163

1 Areas we categorized as medium risk are the
2 Kuskokwim, the Gulf of Alaska and the southeast regions.
3 Low risk areas are the arctic, Kotzebue, Norton Sound,
4 Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula and Cook Inlet regions.
5 That's a first, you know, out of the door, so to speak,
6 assessment. We did some work that may be refined over
7 time. Certainly will be refined the more we learn about
8 it. We feel pretty good that that's probably, in terms of
9 high, medium, low, a good categorization of risks. So then
10 we took a look -- a closer look at then, well, if we need
11 to do that.....

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, can you go through
14 those again.....

15
16 MS. FOX: Yes, I will.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:just a little slower?

19
20
21 MS. FOX: Yes. Highest risk is the Yukon
22 River, medium are the Kuskokwim, Gulf of Alaska and
23 southeast regions. The low risk areas are all the rest;
24 the arctic, Kotzebue, Norton Sound area, the Bristol Bay
25 region, the Alaska Peninsula and Cook Inlet.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, are some of these in
28 these categories because -- not so much because of their
29 risk, but because of the lack of federal land and lack of
30 possibility of federal involvement. I was just looking at
31 -- I'll take one right at the top.

32
33 MS. FOX: Yes.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Cook Inlet for example.

36
37 MS. FOX: Yes.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean Cook Inlet
40 basically -- the problem with -- not problem, but as far as
41 federal involvement in Cook Inlet is concerned there isn't
42 any federal land except the little bit way up in Highwater.

43
44 MS. FOX: Right, right. In other words,
45 the risk is oriented towards the need for federal
46 intervention.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It isn't anything
49 to do with the State of the fisheries, but the possibility

50 of the federals getting involved in the fishery.

00164

1 MS. FOX: I wouldn't put it that way. It's
2 both of those. It's also where there are conservation
3 issues as well as where is the need or the opportunity for
4 us to intervene.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So it's
7 conservation and opportunity for involvement.....

8
9 MS. FOX: And it's focused on salmon.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:and salmon.

12
13 MS. FOX: Yeah, it's focused on salmon.
14 Obviously there are a number of other fisheries that people
15 are dependant on, but salmon is the one where we can create
16 the most problems if we're not very careful about how we
17 manage things.

18
19 So, part of looking at places like the Yukon-
20 Kuskokwim and so on is providing for a delegation. The
21 board, in the past, has very carefully and very slowly
22 moved in some areas to delegating decision making during
23 the seasons, during wildlife seasons, to field managers.
24 For example, over in the Togiak area, caribou come through
25 that area. They don't come through at any particular time.
26 I mean they kind of -- that Mulchatna herd has been
27 building and things have been going. It's kind of not
28 something you can predict. But when they come in, you need
29 to take advantage of that opportunity before they leave.
30 So the board, recognizing how long it takes to get a
31 special action approved delegating that field manager.
32 When levels reach a certain population size, I think it's
33 10,000, and it's within this season, that refuge manager
34 has the authority to open that season and the authority to
35 close it, you know, whenever that's appropriate.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the protocols are set
38 up as to what it takes to open it and what it takes to
39 close them.

40
41 MS. FOX: Exactly. There's specific
42 criteria, right, and that's kind of in place and then that
43 delegation can be done within ours. Recognizing that
44 fisheries is probably going to really accelerate our need
45 to be able to provide that delegation. We did put that in
46 the revised regulations that were issued January 1st is
47 that we can categorically delegate -- we really didn't have
48 that in the regulations before, but we did it kind of case
49 by case almost to see how it would work and it worked very

50 well. But, like you say, with certain criteria and

00165

1 guidelines going along with it. So we put that in the
2 provisions and so that's what we're looking at for this --
3 the purposes of this in-season management is to delegate to
4 certain officials over the state the opportunity to
5 participate directly and make decisions on behalf of the
6 board in those instances where that may be called for
7 within the season, the fisheries season.

8
9 However, again, it's very, very critical that we
10 provide precise guidelines for those individuals, for their
11 participation, so they understand their authorities and
12 they understand when they don't have authority; that some
13 issues need to be taken to the board.

14
15 This year, as we look at that, we're looking at
16 especially this year highly limiting the opportunity for
17 anyone to file a special action. Like I said, we don't
18 have the staff to do the analysis and we don't have the
19 information yet. Next year it will be in position. So
20 we're considering this. This is not a board decision, but
21 we're considering this and so I want to let you know in
22 advance things that we're thinking about. And that is to
23 say, in this example for this year, that we limit the
24 opportunity for special actions on fisheries to times when
25 there is a conservation issue, escapements at risk and to
26 times when there is some kind of documented evidence that
27 the subsistence users will not get their allocation. And
28 we're relying this year in particular on State allocations,
29 but if their harvest is at risk, then we will get involved.

30
31 Those are the two instances in which we anticipate
32 limiting, I mean we're thinking about this, subject to
33 further input from the councils, special actions for this
34 year and that would be the delegated decision, type of
35 decisions that we would make.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, I kind of can see
38 where you would get your involvement of the public and
39 tribes and individuals and groups would be in developing
40 those guidelines. That's the area that they or we would
41 have the biggest impact. You know, what are the triggers
42 that trigger either closing or opening something.

43
44 MS. FOX: Yes. Okay.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that would be directly
47 tied to needs or allocations or whatever you want to call
48 it.

49

MS. FOX: Right. Now, we've received --

00166

1 you know, just to give you some other examples, what if
2 somebody wanted to do a special action based on gear or
3 some user conflict or other types of things that we deal
4 with in special actions for wildlife. We would be telling
5 those individuals that that will be addressed during the
6 annual regulatory process. It will not be ignored, but it
7 will be taken as a proposal to change the regulations and
8 incorporate it in the annual regulatory process. But we
9 feel those types of things can wait. Like I say, we don't
10 know everything. I don't know if the certain mesh size is
11 just absolutely critical. I don't know, but we're learning
12 about that. But we're thinking right now in terms of
13 trying to narrow down what we will be involved in and what
14 can wait. We're thinking gear issues, methods, means, user
15 conflicts issues, can be channeled to the annual regulatory
16 process.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
19 Peggy?

20
21 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman. The real
22 problem I see under this scenario is no different than
23 what's happening right today. With the user conflicts and
24 the problem of people upstream saying the fish aren't here
25 yet, don't open the season any place, but at the same time
26 they're down in the saltwater and they're coming up the
27 river. Now, what's going to happen if you have a late run
28 and you have people that say, well, historically, on this
29 day, we had lots of fish, today we have none because
30 they're stopping them all down stream? Do you get involved
31 in that? That's a natural occurrence and nobody can
32 control the fish. So there has to be certainty that all
33 the user groups have access. If there's absolutely no fish
34 coming in, certainly I can see closing the whole thing down
35 to just the subsistence fishery, but knowing -- I'm a
36 commercial fisherman. I know when the fish are in the
37 lower inlet. I know when the boats are getting the fish
38 long before we get fish. After the run passes us by, we
39 know the fish further on up the inlet are being caught in
40 great numbers and that's the way the fishery works. So
41 we've got to be sure that you have access to all the
42 information and this learning curve, as you call it, I
43 guess, on fisheries management, the State has all that
44 information and it's not private information, it's public
45 information. So I think you need to take a good look at
46 that.

47
48 In my case, I'm looking at Cook Inlet, but when you
49 look at the Yukon River and you have people up near the

50 Canadian border that are still waiting for fish and they're

00167

1 just slaughtering them at the mouth, there's big problems,
2 but everybody has to understand that that's the way the
3 fish run is. So, given that, I can see where we can't just
4 say, well, the State is going to manage the fishery
5 totally. There has to be involvement.

6
7 And I think if you look at the time frames of the
8 Federal Subsistence Board and the advisory council and the
9 time it takes to get something moving, we're looking at the
10 loss of two seasons before anything meaningful happens.
11 There has to be some way similar to what we talked about
12 yesterday in the Tetlin thing where there has to be some
13 realistic on-site hands-on grasp of things when it gets
14 serious. I don't know how you're going to get that in the
15 protocols and how the State is going to view it, but it has
16 to be there.

17
18 MS. FOX: Yeah, I totally agree and those
19 are all issues that we are currently wrestling with. And,
20 you know, again, our focus is on prevention and trying to
21 work with the State. Not in opposition to it, but work
22 with the State to the degree that that's possible and get
23 involved in the processes that they already use. We've got
24 people from councils attending meetings this week on the
25 Kuskokwim. Other councils will be attending meetings next
26 month -- well, it's already March, but in March there's
27 other pre-season meetings for the Yukon and then another
28 one for the Kuskokwim.

29
30 We have been sending council members to those as
31 well as some of our staff to start to get involved in the
32 decision-making process for fisheries this year. Learning
33 as early as anyone else does about what the predictions
34 are, how those predictions are turning out based on most
35 recent information, looking at potential needs for shifts
36 in allocation. All those things that get discussed, the
37 details that get discussed before the season starts. We
38 are asking council members to attend. You may be asked to
39 attend when those meetings are identified and the dates are
40 set as well to identify a member or two that can go and
41 start to participate in that process and represent on
42 behalf of the users in the region. And we'll be there as
43 well.

44
45 So, I agree, we need to work very closely with the
46 State and we can't wait until the protocols are all done.
47 We've just got to start doing it. And it will evolve, it
48 will, but I think the most important thing as we sit down
49 face to face with the people that are involved in this

50 process and we just start getting involved and making sure

00168

1 they hear our input and that it gets adequately considered.

2

3 MR. ELVSAAS: Just one more question and
4 I'll be done. When you say prevention, what do you mean?

5

6 MS. FOX: I mean getting involved in these
7 pre-season meetings.

8

9 MR. ELVSAAS: I hope you're not trying to
10 prevent me from fishing.

11

12 MS. FOX: No, sir. Absolutely not.

13

14 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay.

15

16 MS. FOX: I'm saying preventing the need
17 for the federal government to intervene and.....

18

19 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay. Fine.

20

21 MS. FOX:you know, change in
22 emergency order. Let's work it out before that comes to
23 pass because you could start a -- you could be within hours
24 of a commercial fishery starting or maybe it's, you know,
25 within an hour and here comes the federal government
26 changing everything. I mean that causes all kinds of
27 problems for people. We want to make sure that we've got
28 our problems, our issues worked out before those seasons
29 open or close. But there's going to be a need to do that
30 in some cases, but we just want to try to avoid that.

31

32 MR. ELVSAAS: Nobody said life would be
33 easy.

34

35 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman?

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

38

39 MS. SWAN: It seems to me that the scenario
40 that Fred just spoke of there, you know, those are the
41 kinds of things that just come in and what are you going to
42 do? You know, what are you going to do with that? What
43 are you going to say to people? So, in this -- I know we
44 need all of the experts and I know we need -- and I agree,
45 you know, it's what I said a while ago, we've got all this
46 information already and I think it's going to take us two
47 seasons to get on the ground. But the thing is, when you -
48 - we talk about the memorandum of agreement and all those
49 kinds of things and I know we need all this process because

50 this is how the federals work. You've got to have a

00169

1 process, you know. You've got to have a lot of paper and
2 you have to have definitions and all this stuff, but we're
3 doing it for people, so it switches it.

4
5 I mean I think that the responsibility for -- it's
6 no different than the other kind of fisheries, the
7 commercial or sport, that people -- it just seems to me
8 that because subsistence is highly personal, people have
9 different ideas about it, how they use it, they need more,
10 some people need, because that's what subsistence is. You
11 take what you need and you get it over with and you put it
12 up and you go home and it's not about money and it's not
13 about fun, okay, necessarily.

14
15 It just seems that if you were to involve -- allow
16 the users themselves to be involved in it, be responsible,
17 have them really think about what is the result of this,
18 what do I need, what am I doing this for, then it would
19 make your job and theirs too a lot easier. And it would
20 also make the allocation easier because I think we would
21 all come to see that what subsistence people take is a very
22 small amount. That is to say if you take what you need,
23 and in that sense it has to be regulated, it's not
24 something that's free and we can do this because we say so.

25
26
27 But I think in doing all this regulation and the
28 paper and I recognize that you have to do it and I respect
29 that, but there needs to be a way to make people feel, the
30 people who live in the villages and people who take part in
31 this, that it's really -- that they really matter. And I
32 think you get the sense that, you know, we've got to do all
33 this first before you can take part in that. We've got to
34 have protocols, we've got to do all this stuff. So, in the
35 meantime, what happens?

36
37 And I don't know if that's going to come -- if
38 those two things are going to come together because -- this
39 is a sad situation anyway, you know, and I'm here and it's
40 hard to deal with, but I don't know that -- I think the
41 problems will remain, the same problems will remain unless
42 people, unless tribal people, the users realize that it is
43 their responsibility and that somehow you listen and you
44 hear what they have to tell you and don't beat them up with
45 statistics. This is just really overwhelming for me right
46 at this moment to see what you are charged to do and we're
47 all going to get together here and do this and make it
48 work. And we have to do it one step at a time, but we
49 don't have any time.

00170

1 MS. FOX: Now, I'm sorry if I relayed that
2 it's one step at a time. I was also trying to indicate
3 that while this protocol development is going on we've got
4 council members at pre-season meetings. We're not doing it
5 one step at a time. Each process has its steps, but there
6 are different processes going on. I mean we recognize that
7 we've got to get involved in the decision-making process
8 the State uses even if we don't have a protocol. I'm not
9 guaranteeing that this will ever get signed. There's no
10 guarantee of that. You know, you work on these things and
11 you discuss them and you try to figure out ways to work
12 together, but, as I indicated before with the wildlife
13 program, it never got signed. But we went on anyway and we
14 will go on.

15
16 Our reliance is on the councils, on you to
17 represent the users. We can't invite and don't want to
18 invite everyone in communities that are affected by a pre-
19 season meeting to be there. They have representatives that
20 they want to be at those meetings and to represent their
21 needs and their issues. Not everybody can travel, not
22 everybody can be heard. There just isn't time.

23
24 MS. SWAN: That isn't what I meant at all.
25 I meant that -- I don't mean somebody gets invited to come
26 to a meeting. I'm saying that they are involved in what's
27 happening on the ground in their village, what the results
28 are. That is what we're after after all, isn't it?

29
30 You know, witness the testimony that went on last
31 night. We say we want subsistence and they say, no, you
32 can't. They both have -- all of the people have valid
33 arguments. They have reasons and they are valid and you
34 have to recognize that. We all do. But how do we make it
35 work? You make it work because people make it work. It
36 doesn't mean -- by that, I didn't mean that you should have
37 all the people come to a meeting. Lord knows that's what
38 we do best is go to meetings.

39
40 But I'm talking about just what's going down in the
41 villages, in the subsistence fisheries. How are those
42 things working out for the people? Who's making them work
43 if they're working? What's happening if they're not
44 working? And the people know. The people who know -- I
45 mean the users know, the fishing people know and you need
46 to hear that more than -- you need to listen and hear that
47 more than has been happening. I don't mean that as a
48 criticism. I mean it's just so.

49

MS. FOX: Well, I hope, too, that as you

00171

1 become more aware of the types of resource monitoring
2 projects that we're doing that the -- one of the foremost
3 criteria is local involvement in that project, whatever it
4 is. Whether it's putting in a weir or hiring people to
5 work at that weir or at a counting tower or to gather
6 harvest information or to gather traditional knowledge or,
7 frankly, to hold a meeting to find out what the issues are.
8 Those are all the types of things that we're spending money
9 on. They are very focused on a local level. Extremely
10 focused. We have rejected umpteen proposals because they
11 were not discussed at a local level or they were not
12 supported at a local level. The emphasis -- and, like I
13 said, over half of our money is going in to that type of
14 work. Direct local involvement in subsistence fishery
15 management and that covers a wealth of different things.

16
17 We haven't been able to do that without funding
18 within the wildlife program. I mean we have many times
19 more millions of dollars with fisheries than we ever hoped
20 to see in wildlife. We had the funding to support this
21 council system, which is a huge chunk of our budget and
22 it's very high priority. With fisheries, you know, we're
23 blessed with having a lot more money to do more things on a
24 local level. Not only for the benefit of gathering
25 information to add to our total understanding of what's
26 happening to fish, but also to involve people locally.
27 We're going to be doing a lot of hiring locally, whether
28 it's with a contract or a permanent staff position, to
29 directly involve people on a local level. So I'm hoping
30 that that concern of yours is starting to be addressed by
31 this opportunity and the funding is the opportunity to make
32 that happen.

33
34 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chairman.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

37
38 MR. DEMENTI: In this letter it just said
39 for mostly important we have been delayed in hiring key
40 staff for positions involved in inseason management. How
41 long is this delay going to be? Is it going to be -- I
42 mean you're going to have positions by this summer?

43
44 MS. FOX: We don't know. The staffing
45 that's been approved so far didn't include the field
46 positions. Seventeen positions out across the state and
47 five more in Anchorage. A total of 22 positions have been
48 held up for further justification. Tom Boyd is in
49 Washington right now. The briefing with the assistant

50 secretary, John Berry, is tomorrow. He has invited us in to

00172

1 provide one more opportunity to justify not just the
2 positions, but how we're going to fill them.

3
4 The emphasis is that we do do some local hiring and
5 that we have some contracts, more contracting with the
6 funding that we have. In other words, they don't want to
7 add to the bureaucracy. We heard from Senator Murkowski
8 about that. We totally agree with that. We have reduced
9 the total staffing plan down almost to a third of what we
10 originally asked for and we have very much emphasized the
11 guidance from the secretary to do more contracting and to
12 do more local hiring. So we have to go back right now and
13 spell that all out and see if that's sufficient. And then
14 the decision is if we get any of those positions, all of
15 them or none of them. That's up to the secretary's office.

16
17
18 With this whole program, we've had to go back to
19 the secretary to get any staffing approved. That's a very
20 lengthy process and it has interfered directly with our
21 ability to get ready for this summer. So we're waiting for
22 that part of it. In the meantime, we are hiring positions
23 to fill the other -- the resource team additions; the
24 fisheries biologists that will add to the teams. We are in
25 the process of working on that right now. Adding the
26 expertise in fisheries to gather that information that I
27 talked about before so we can weigh in on in-season, those
28 positions have been approved. But the people out there
29 that we want to be in Bethel or Kotzebue or Fairbanks or
30 wherever where they're directly involved with those systems
31 where the in-season management is a major concern for
32 subsistence users are the ones that we're waiting for.

33
34 The other field positions are the ones that will
35 work directly on implementing these projects. You know,
36 whether or not we have a contract or cooperative agreement
37 or local hiring, who's going to work with them? Those are
38 also those positions. Until we get approval for the
39 positions, we can't even begin the personnel process to
40 seriously begin. I should say we can start some things,
41 but to hire those people, well, that's not going to happen
42 before this summer even if we get a decision tomorrow. It
43 just takes too long to hire somebody.

44
45 So those are the types of positions that have most
46 affected our ability to be ready this summer for the in-
47 season things and then we're very concerned about our
48 ability to administer the contracts and to hire locally
49 because you've got to have somebody to work with people on

50 a local level. People that are out there now have full-

00173

1 time jobs, have a lot of priorities, and a lot of
2 responsibilities. They can't just take on additional ones
3 without dropping something else and what's to give? I
4 don't know. Anyway, that's probably more than you wanted
5 to hear, but it's a little frustrating.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, those are just the
8 realities of what you're trying to do, basically.

9
10 MS. FOX: Exactly.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The realities are -- and I
13 think that's the thing that sometimes we have to remember.
14 The realities are that things can't change instantly and
15 that what you're hoping to do -- I've read through the
16 memorandum of understanding -- or agreement, I guess, now -
17 - a couple of times and, to me, like I said, what I see as
18 a working document where two agencies agree to work
19 together to try to accomplish some of these things that
20 you've been talking about, like bringing in public
21 involvement and things like that. And I look at the
22 protocols and the protocols are mostly protocols about how
23 you're going to establish protocols. I mean they're not
24 really.....

25
26 MS. FOX: So far, yes.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean they're not
29 protocols that apply to individual situations. They're
30 protocols of how you're going to work together to make the
31 protocols or guidelines to do individual situations and,
32 from that standpoint, I think, like you said, there's a lot
33 of work in there and it's a good first step. Whether or
34 not you ever get it signed off is.....

35
36 MS. FOX: I still think the process is
37 important.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The process you went
40 through basically says that you agree to work together even
41 on this process.

42
43 MS. FOX: That's right.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It means you have a better
46 understanding of each other.

47
48 MS. FOX: Yes.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And like some of the

00174

1 things that you've said today, I think there is a lot of
2 misunderstanding in the community and among -- and in fears
3 in people as to what you can do and what you can't do.
4 Just like when I look at your list of categorizing here,
5 there are a lot of areas that you don't have a big effect
6 on simply because they're not dealing with federal land.
7 And I keep thinking of the Cook Inlet one as an example.
8 Your impact on that -- your impact on subsistence in Cook
9 Inlet is going to be minimal because it's not federal --
10 the waters are not federal waters.

11

12 MS. FOX: Right.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's going to be a
15 hard one -- that's a hard one for people to understand, is
16 that you're not going to be able to change certain
17 situations. And what you've said so far is that we're
18 going to have to go through a little -- to really change
19 things, we're going to have to go through a little longer
20 process. You can't come in and make immediate in-season
21 decisions without, first of all, information and then
22 without setting up a system of doing it. And if they are a
23 certain kind of in-season situations, lack of allocation,
24 gear conflicts or something like that, these are going to
25 have to be put off for a year or two years down the road.
26 They're going to be in response to proposals that come in.
27 So everybody's pet gripe or lack or something is not going
28 to be solved instantly.

29

30 MS. FOX: That's correct.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's kind of what I
33 get out of it. Any other questions for Peggy?

34

35 MR. ELVSAAS: Just one observation. There
36 are, you know, federal lands both sides of Cook Inlet.
37 You've got the Kenai moose range. That's affected by the
38 major rivers here. The Susitna goes into federal lands.
39 And in the Lower Cook Inlet there's federal waters, so
40 there is federal properties. The other side of the coin is
41 where the basic concentration of fishing is State waters.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. I wasn't trying to
44 imply there was no federal involvement, but I was thinking
45 of in comparison with the Yukon-Kuskokwim or the Copper or
46 someplace like that where the federal waters.....

47

48 MR. ELVSAAS: Right.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE:you know, extend

00175

1 pretty much through the whole jurisdiction of the river or
2 at least in enough portions of the river that it's affected
3 that way. Peggy, what are we going to go onto next?

4
5 MS. FOX: The last one is tribal
6 involvement and I know we've had some discussion on that
7 already, but my whole purpose in bringing this before the
8 council is just follow-up to the council caucus discussions
9 and to let you know that the board has still not replied in
10 writing to the organizations that solicited -- well, not
11 solicited, but sent those letters to us and to the
12 secretary about our lack of Native involvement. We did
13 have a meeting with them, with representatives of AITC,
14 AFN, RuralCap and AVCP on February 3rd and gave them an
15 opportunity to further explain their positions and an
16 opportunity for the board to give -- you know, ask
17 questions and get further clarification of what the program
18 is and make sure there was understanding of how the program
19 works and how we feel that Natives are very much involved
20 in our processes through the councils. And I thought that
21 meeting, as did others, was very productive. Very
22 productive for building mutual understanding.

23
24 Some of the councils at the end of January asked us
25 to bring this topic back before them during the winter
26 meetings. So, for that reason, as well as the reason that
27 the board hasn't replied and is still looking for maybe how
28 thinking may have evolved since the end of January, do you
29 have further thoughts, do you have further input for the
30 board to consider around the issue of greater tribal
31 involvement in the program.

32
33 I guess I just want to add one other thing to that
34 before I get your comments and that is to say that, again,
35 back to the fact that we have this additional funding, we
36 have the opportunity to do a lot more things in terms of
37 involving people across the state in our processes and in
38 projects than we ever had before. So there certainly will
39 be greater involvement on the project end of it, you know,
40 with people at a local level and that will be, in many,
41 many cases, Native involvement because that's where the
42 issues are and that's where most of the rural residents
43 are.

44
45 So that will evolve on its own. It will grow,
46 there will be greater involvement, greater participation
47 and more opportunities for people at a local level to
48 participate. So that part of it will evolve. I'm here to
49 take any comments that you have back to the board on the

50 subject of tribal involvement if there's anything further

00176

1 you want to say. And I heard the comments earlier, but you
2 can certainly reiterate those or add to them.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have anything
5 for Peggy? Any suggestions or comments on tribal
6 involvement at this point in time?

7

8 MR. ELVSAAS: No. Just keep going.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think you've probably
11 heard the concerns of some members of the council. And,
12 like you said, the possibility for increased involvement of
13 tribes and individuals and communities is going to increase
14 in the future. That's part of the program. When I look at
15 the memorandum of understanding, the idea is that you bring
16 in locals, Natives, tribes, individuals and things like
17 that to help you with your understanding of the fishery.

18

19 MS. FOX: Exactly.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And organizations that are
22 involved in the fishery and things like that.

23

24 MS. FOX: Okay.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you going to go into
27 the projects at all, Peggy?

28

29 MS. FOX: Yes, we are. I guess there was
30 one other thing that Helga may not have been aware of. I
31 sent you a copy of the sustainable salmon policy that the
32 State of Alaska has in draft and I'm going to be attending
33 the Board of Fisheries meeting and providing them comments
34 from the board. Part of those comments, I'm hoping to get
35 some comments from councils and I don't know if people had
36 a chance to read it or have comments, but I can take those
37 comments next week if you want to send them to me. I can
38 take them today if you have any comments. If you don't,
39 that's fine. But I didn't want to miss an opportunity for
40 you to discuss that if you had some things that you wanted
41 to say on it.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've read it, but I don't
44 have any comments on it at this time. It's a hard document
45 to understand is my only comment on it. It goes back
46 around in circles so often that I'm not really sure what it
47 says.

48

49 MS. FOX: That's a good comment.

00177

1 MS. SWAN: I just said what he said. It's
2 obtuse. I don't know what it means. Hope you didn't spend
3 too much doing it.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

6
7 MR. ELVSAAS: Did you say you were going to
8 take comments from the councils to the Board of Fisheries?

9
10 MS. FOX: Yes. In addition to comments
11 from the agencies and so on. From the federal subsistence
12 program.

13
14 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, what I was wondering
15 about is should not our comments be from the Federal
16 Subsistence Board rather than the individual councils? We
17 may wind up with conflicting comments because of overlaps.

18
19
20 MS. FOX: They will be summarized and
21 provided on behalf of all the councils and the board
22 certainly and it's okay to have conflicting comments. It's
23 okay, I think, because all it says is that there's probably
24 an area that they need to look closer at and work harder on
25 because people have different opinions. There needs to be
26 some more information gathered about that subject so that
27 we can work that out. Yeah, I'm going to summarize them
28 and represent them, you know, as comments gathered for the
29 board to take to the Board of Fisheries.

30
31 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I would hope so
32 because, you know, that -- if you start a broad base of
33 comments coming in to the central board, the Board of
34 Fisheries, I would think that the Federal Subsistence Board
35 would lose something in that. You know, it is the board we
36 work for and we don't want somebody grand-standing it and
37 so forth, although we don't want to miss the opportunity.

38
39 MS. FOX: I was going to say, some people
40 use that opportunity.

41
42 MR. F. JOHN: After going to the State
43 fishery, as a person that fishes on the Copper River, on
44 the upper part, the State made -- the Chitina Dipnet
45 Association was just people from Anchorage and Fairbanks,
46 not from Chitina. They gave them, you know, the whole
47 thing, subsistence fishing right in Chitina. And when they
48 did that, they were having a meeting in Valdez and we had
49 one representative from the Copper River. The day that

50 person left, when there was no Native representative, they

00178

1 made that and I didn't like that very well.

2

3 MS. FOX: Well, for your information, I've
4 heard that they're going to revisit that.

5

6 MR. F. JOHN: That's okay. I mean I still
7 don't like it.

8

9 MS. FOX: Well, that would be a good
10 opportunity to be there with them. But it presents us an
11 opportunity to be there and to be heard on that subject and
12 maybe influence a change.

13

14 MR. F. JOHN: And I don't like where they
15 have meetings. They should have meeting in the Ahtna
16 region instead of way down in Valdez where you have to --
17 you know.

18

19 MS. FOX: I know. The board can't really
20 say much about that, I'm afraid, since we always meet in
21 Anchorage.

22

23 MR. F. JOHN: That's my comment.

24

25 MS. FOX: Okay. Thank you, Fred.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, I would just like
28 to, you know, remind the rest of the council members that,
29 you know, when you read something like that document,
30 express your comments on it as the way they impact you or
31 as the way that you understand them. Because if we have
32 conflicting comments, what that basically shows is that
33 it's not a clear document. That it can be interpreted in
34 so many ways that it's actually worthless. I guess that's
35 my biggest problem with it. It was so indefinite that
36 whoever interpreted it could interpret it the way they
37 would like to interpret it, you know. So I guess the word
38 she used, obtuse, circular, whatever you want to use, is my
39 comment on that document. So, if somebody else sees it
40 different, I think we need to have those kinds of
41 expressions because that shows -- you know, that gives them
42 something to work at, like you said. So I don't think we
43 have to be afraid.....

44

45 MS. FOX: No, not at all.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:of putting in
48 comments that disagree, even with other board members or
49 council members or that disagree with the board. The idea

50 is that we want to get the comments in and let those

00179

1 comments have an effect on how somebody else tries to
2 revise or tries to meet the needs of people that read it.

3
4 MS. FOX: So, if you have further thoughts
5 on it, just give me a call or let me know and next week, as
6 I pull this together, I'll be glad to take them. It's
7 supposed to affect all fishery management planning with
8 regard to salmon, so it's a pretty important document. And
9 if it's inadequate, they definitely need to know that.
10 Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any more
13 questions for Peggy before she leaves? No, everybody
14 looked up at the clock, saw it was two minutes to 12:00 and
15 they didn't want to ask any questions at two minutes to
16 12:00. That was good timing.

17
18 MS. FOX: Thank you. I told Helga I could
19 do it by noon.

20
21 MS. EAKON: Yes, she did. Before Peggy
22 leaves our meeting, I would like her to make sure that we
23 have a common understanding of where we are at with the
24 Kenai rural process. Make sure everybody is on the same
25 page.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could you do that for us,
28 Peggy?

29
30 MS. FOX: Sure. I think I'll start with
31 the proposed rule that was issued, which established a
32 formal comment period, which closes at the end of March.
33 The hearing was held within that comment period, giving
34 people an opportunity to personally testify, but written
35 comments will be taken through the end of March. And as
36 you know our process, even during the week of May when we
37 consider this decision, more comments will be taken. But
38 what we're trying to do is gather -- try to kind of force a
39 time when we get people to give us comments so we can
40 summarize them and make them available to the board, but,
41 certainly, there will be additional opportunity during the
42 board meeting. And in talking with fish -- scratch that.
43 In talking with Mitch yesterday, we agreed Thursday
44 afternoon, May 4th in the afternoon, is when we will take
45 up this subject. In other words, get the proposals
46 completed and then move into this after lunch on May 4th.
47 So I'll let you know that.

48
49 In the meantime, we'll be gathering these comments,

50 summarizing them, probably trying to provide some further

00180

1 analysis. I think one of the things that was in the
2 proposed rule that is something that we need to follow up
3 more on is what are the potential impacts. What I heard
4 last night was a lot of fear about how that's going to
5 affect me and maybe we can do a little bit more analysis to
6 try to get a handle on what potential changes might occur.
7 You know, we haven't done that kind of analysis. If there
8 will be changes, I don't know. But, anyway, what might be
9 the potential impacts.

10 Now, I want to say that, clearly understanding that
11 the board will make their decision on the criteria that
12 they have been given by the secretary as to how rural/non-
13 rural determinations are made. I also say that knowing
14 that the analyses that have been done providing the board
15 some assessment of that are flawed. So the board is going
16 to have to do some decision making more in the area of
17 judgment than in the fact of having a good, strong analysis
18 on which to rely on, to help clearly lay out a path for
19 their decisions. But they accepted that and I think
20 knowing that they wouldn't necessarily have that clear path
21 anyway last May and are committed to making a decision this
22 May and settling this, at least for the period between now
23 and when the statewide analysis is done and, as you know,
24 that is several years off given the census process.

25
26 One other thing I wanted to say is, however, given
27 our knowledge about the flawed methodology that was used to
28 aggregate the Kenai and looking toward how might we do this
29 differently when we approach this statewide, we are
30 currently preparing what we call a scope of work to issue
31 out as a request for proposals to contract somebody outside
32 of this process to help us with establishing a
33 scientifically sound, if you will, and there's a lot of
34 subjection in that too, but something that you can rely on
35 and take to court if you need to as a process that we would
36 follow, a methodology to do the statewide rural
37 determinations with the 2000 census information. That's
38 going to go on -- that should be on the street, as we say,
39 that should be out for bid before May.
40 That is the plan, is to have that out for bid.

41
42 But I'm just flagging here that that methodology is
43 going to get serious look and revamping and hopefully by
44 some people who are highly qualified to do that type of
45 work. It's an area of skills that we are not capable of
46 doing and have learned that in the process of trying to
47 work with the information that we've had. So we need to
48 get people who have worked with this type of thing and have
49 them help us lay out a methodology. It will still be a

50 board decision and maybe even, if it affects our criteria,

00181

1 we'll have to go back to the secretary if the criteria,
2 themselves, are flawed. At any rate, we'll see what
3 happens there.

4
5 The board will have the final say, I believe, even
6 in working with the secretary as to what they think will
7 work on a statewide level. You will be involved in that
8 process. This isn't something that will be done
9 independently. And I'm talking more about the statewide
10 process now. But I just wanted to let you know that the
11 board will be making its decision without, you know, good
12 solid methodology, good solid analysis, but it's committed
13 to do that and we're trying to correct that for the future.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, can I go over this
16 now as I understand it and as I understood it yesterday.
17 Yesterday, my understanding was the board felt they didn't
18 have a sufficient process to really do it and they were
19 thinking of putting it off until they had this process in
20 place. It's a consistent, defensible process through a
21 subcontractor. But now, what I understand is that on May
22 4th they'll make a decision, but that decision be three
23 things. It can be either rural or non-rural or
24 insufficient evidence or is it going to be a decision as to
25 rural and non-rural?

26
27 MS. FOX: I believe there's a wide range of
28 options that the board has. It doesn't necessarily mean
29 that -- for example, one side is they don't do anything,
30 retain the status quo. The other end of that spectrum is
31 the entire Kenai becomes rural.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

34
35 MS. FOX: But they can do something in
36 between. They can look at particular communities and say
37 this one needs to change, but this one doesn't. They can
38 do that as well. They have that. They can defer, but
39 that's status quo.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So they will make a
42 decision, but they have a broad range of decisions that
43 they can make, but they're not -- I guess my comment was
44 what I had understood yesterday, is that they felt that
45 they needed to wait until they got this other methodology
46 in place before they made a decision. Consequently, that
47 must have been a wrong understanding on my part that they
48 will make a decision of some sort, but they also, at the
49 same time, are going to be trying to contract out and put

50 this methodology in place so that they have a consistent

00182

1 defendable process to use in the future.

2

3 MS. FOX: That's correct and I will say
4 that last May is when they made that decision, when they
5 made the decision not to defer this issue to the statewide
6 process. I think very clearly that was the staff committee
7 recommendation, that they wait and look at this when we
8 look at all of the statewide rural determinations. The
9 board rejected that. They've already passed that. They
10 want to make a decision. So, no, that's not on the plate.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that was a
13 misunderstanding on my part yesterday then.

14

15 MS. FOX: Okay. Well, it happens in
16 between here and there.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does everybody understand
19 now what Peggy was saying? Okay. Any questions for
20 Peggy? Thank you muchly.

21

22 MS. FOX: Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for the
25 information that you gave us and lots to think about.
26 Before you go, do you need us as a council to take action
27 on this memorandum of understanding on the project list or
28 is it basically for our information as to where you're at
29 right now?

30

31 MS. FOX: On the memorandum of
32 understanding, yes, I will take a formal recommendation or
33 I will take comments. Either way, that's your choice how
34 you want to deal with that. I've gotten both at different
35 councils. Some made a motion and a formal recommendation
36 to, say, perhaps adopt it with these modifications. Others
37 just gave me input and that was fine. So, that's your
38 choice.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the same would be true
41 if anybody had any comments on the project list?

42

43 MS. FOX: Yes, that's true, on the project
44 list as well. Some councils like to do it very formally
45 and others don't feel a need to.

46

47 MS. EAKON: Before you leave, Peggy, one
48 more question, please, on the Kenai rural issue. Does the
49 council, at this winter meeting, need to affirm their

50 position or make some kind of recommendation at this time?

00183

1 MS. FOX: The board hasn't asked the
2 council to, but the council has that option. We have a
3 record of the council's position and I guess if it changes,
4 we certainly need to know that. If it doesn't, we have
5 that on record.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Well,
8 it's 10 minutes after 12:00. Do we want to give ourselves
9 -- let's give ourselves a little bit over an hour since
10 everybody has to go someplace. Let's come back at 1:30.
11 Does that sound legitimate to everybody? We'll recess this
12 Southcentral Regional Council Advisory meeting until 1:30
13 this afternoon.

14
15 (Off record)
16 (On record)

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sorry for the delay. I
19 was on the telephone. We'll call the Southcentral Alaska
20 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting back in
21 order. At this point in time, we are going to be
22 deliberating on the proposals in front of us, Proposals 12,
23 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21. Helga.

24
25 MS. EAKON: We still have one item under
26 fish to go, fisheries projects. Mary McBurney and Ken were
27 going to.....

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My fault and I apologize.
30 That's right. I forgot that from yesterday. Mary McBurney
31 is going to present us a little bit on the fisheries
32 projects report.

33
34 MS. McBURNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
35 council members.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What, for forgetting you?

38
39 MS. McBURNEY: No, actually, this is a good
40 exercise in patience. Also joining me is Ken Thompson with
41 the National Park Service -- excuse me, the Forest Service.
42 But we just wanted to talk a little bit about the process
43 for initiating projects throughout the state to deal with
44 subsistence issues.

45
46 First of all, last October the Federal Subsistence
47 Board made a commitment to initiate an annual unified
48 fisheries resource monitoring program starting in the
49 spring of this year and approximately \$4 million were made

50 available through the Departments of Interior and

00184

1 Agriculture to fund the effort. But in order to address
2 critical subsistence fisheries issues for the first year,
3 we've been working on a very short time frame and the board
4 adopted an abbreviated process for selecting year 2000
5 subsistence fisheries projects.

6
7 So far, over 100 proposals have been received and
8 reviewed and the process has given priority specifically to
9 fisheries projects that addressed critical conservation
10 issues related to subsistence fisheries or gaps in
11 information about specific fish populations or projects
12 that built on existing expertise and experience, projects
13 that had strong local support for local partnerships and
14 also projects that were directed toward efforts that did
15 not duplicate the work of other agencies.

16
17 At the end of January, the regional councils were
18 sent review packets of the first 17 projects and these were
19 approved by the board on February 3rd. A second group of
20 proposals is going to be distributed for RAC and public
21 review on March 17th and this is prior to the board's
22 opportunity to review and adopt the final proposal package
23 and they'll be doing that in early April. The list of
24 projects under consideration for April is going to round
25 out this year's field program. In developing these project
26 proposals for 2000, the board has made sure that various
27 agencies are working closely together and coordinating
28 their efforts so that we can get the biggest bang for the
29 buck. In addition, there's been a strong emphasis that
30 projects include local communication and consultation with
31 subsistence users, local communities and tribes and
32 regional organizations.

33
34 The first section of your briefing packet, and I
35 believe Helga handed those out earlier, includes a series
36 of one-page descriptions of projects that are proposed for
37 the Southcentral region at this time. One project, which
38 is Project No. 13, titled Abundance and Run Timing of Adult
39 Salmon in Tanada Creek was approved in the February package
40 of proposals. But, as you can see, there's also an
41 additional 20 projects that are currently under
42 consideration for inclusion in the April package. I don't
43 know if you've had an opportunity to really take a close
44 look at these project proposals, but if you have any
45 questions, we can pause at this time and entertain those.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary, could you kind of
48 run down the projects that would actually directly impact
49 southcentral?

00185

1 MS. McBURNEY: Sure.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And kind of give us some
4 comment on them?

5

6 MS. McBURNEY: And I'd like to invite Ken
7 Thompson up since many of the projects that are currently
8 in the works are being proposed through the Forest Service.
9 There should be a cover page that says projects for spring
10 2000 and these specifically are the projects that deal with
11 issues in the southcentral region.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. These projects 65
14 through 119 basically hit southcentral.

15

16 MS. McBURNEY: Correct.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I kind of caught
19 that, but I haven't had a chance to look to make sure they
20 were all southcentral.

21

22 MS. McBURNEY: These are all in your neck
23 of the woods.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: These are all projects
26 that affect this regional council.

27

28 MS. McBURNEY: Correct.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, did you want us to
31 comment on individual projects? Did you want to run
32 through these projects and basically run them by us or what
33 was kind of your idea at this point in time on this one?

34

35 MS. McBURNEY: Well, at this point, we
36 wanted you to see basically what was on the menu. As I
37 said, the first project, Project 13, has been given the nod
38 to go ahead, so it will be funded and operating starting
39 this summer. The other projects are those that are
40 currently still under consideration. They're begin given a
41 thorough staff review as far as taking a look at how well
42 they address the criteria that have been laid out for us by
43 the board for projects for this year.

44

45 Let's see. I would say that -- I would also like
46 to add though that there is an additional project, which is
47 Project -- I believe it's 71, which is the Copper River
48 Subsistence Salmon Fishery Evaluation, that as of this past
49 Monday was given approval to be included in the April

50 package that will go before the board. But before it does

00186

1 go before the board, it will be released for public
2 evaluation, for public review and comment, starting, I
3 believe, on March 17th. So you will have an opportunity to
4 take a look at that April package of projects and to
5 provide comments and guidance on them. So, if you would
6 like a little bit more detailed information on any of these
7 projects, we can certainly try to fill in the gaps for you.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, one of the criteria
10 that I understood was that it didn't duplicate.....

11
12 MS. McBURNEY: Correct.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:current things that
15 are already done. And I know that, to me, this is an
16 extremely important one on the Copper River. You've got
17 ADF&G Miles Lake sonar counter. That's something that has
18 been done for years. Basically, is this meaning that you
19 would join in with them for funding that project right
20 there? Because that is an existing project that has gone
21 on for -- well, since we started Copper River management
22 plan.

23
24 MR. THOMPSON: Ken Thompson, Forest
25 Service. Perhaps it would maybe be better if we did go
26 through and just capsulize these projects.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That sure would be good.
29 I think that would be real good.

30
31 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, because certainly we
32 intend to add to that Miles Lake sonar project.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it would be additional
35 gain and information.

36
37 MR. THOMPSON: Yes. It's a technology --
38 it's addressing the technology and there's apparently some
39 new technology available to improve the effectiveness of
40 that sonar.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. Maybe if it's
43 okay with the rest of the council, since these are projects
44 directly involved in our area, if we would just run through
45 them and a short capsulization on them and if anybody has
46 questions on them or comments on them, we can do that.
47 Because it will basically be our only chance to look at
48 these prior to decisions being made in April.

49

MS. McBURNEY: As a group.

00187

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As a group, right. And
2 maybe somebody will come up with something that they'd like
3 to discuss as a group. So, if that would be okay with you
4 guys. If that's okay with the rest of the council, let's
5 do that.

6
7 MS. MCBURNEY: All right. Well, let me
8 start off then with Project 13. And, as I mentioned, this
9 has been approved by the board and this is titled the
10 Abundance and Run Timing of Adult Salmon in Tanada Creek
11 and this is a weir project which is intended to acquire
12 three additional years of data on the Tanada Creek sockeye
13 to determine inter-annual variations in abundance. So this
14 is going to be a project that now will be funded. There
15 has been a commitment made for three years for this project
16 to continue.

17
18 It's also intended to determine the timing of
19 salmon runs in Tanada Creek. It has a component that will
20 correlate weir data with aerial observations and also it
21 has specific intent to provide hands-on educational
22 opportunity for local students to learn about the Tanada
23 Creek salmon run and how it's managed.

24
25 The second page, which is CR-65, is a project that
26 is -- has a potential to be funded at this point, but only
27 on a funds-available basis, since this one has a fairly
28 high sticker value to it. But it specifically is looking
29 at Chinook salmon escapement in several tributaries of the
30 Copper river. Specifically, it will be putting weirs on
31 five small tributaries of the Copper and also up on the
32 Gulkana in order to capture salmon that have been fitted
33 with radio tags by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game,
34 and so this is to actually get a good census number of the
35 number of fish that are escaping into the systems.

36
37 The next project, CR-71, is a -- this is the
38 project that this week was given the nod to be included in
39 the April package of projects and it's titled Copper River
40 Subsistence Salmon Fishery Evaluation 2000. For those
41 folks in the Copper River Basin area, you may recall that
42 back in 1996 that the subsistence division had done a
43 fairly extensive study of the fish wheel fisheries in the
44 area. And this project proposes to basically continue that
45 study and then also take a look at a few additional
46 factors, including what the possible changes might be of
47 the regulatory reclassification of the dipnet fishery at
48 subsistence. And, also, it is intended to collect
49 traditional ecological knowledge from Ahtna elders and

50 other residents in the region as they relate to the ecology

00188

1 of the Copper River area and the Copper River salmon.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So this one will pretty
4 much be an information gathering from people, not from
5 fish, itself.

6

7 MS. MCBURNEY: Correct.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sorry to interrupt you.

10

11 MR. THOMPSON: Ken Thompson, Forest
12 Service. I'll go through the rest of the list since the
13 rest of them were developed by the Forest Service, National
14 Forest System Alliance. There are 18 total projects. We
15 have generally categorized project as either addressing the
16 biology, the stock status and trend, type of information or
17 habitat or harvest assessment type projects, which includes
18 collecting information on what the subsistence harvest has
19 been, maybe how it relates to other harvests and that sort
20 of thing. So, of the total 18 projects on forest system
21 lands, 10 of them are the stock status or biology-related
22 project and seven are harvest assessment. We have one
23 additional project which will probably fall under
24 administrative funding and that's a training session.
25 That's the last one, 119, so it probably won't be included
26 in this list that goes before the board.

27

28 Project 102 is a harvest assessment project where
29 our people believe the existing fisheries information has
30 not been all pooled together into one pot where it's easily
31 accessible. This could become part of a statewide effort
32 that will take place to bring all of the harvest
33 information and stock status information that's available
34 now into one point within probably the Office of
35 Subsistence Management. But this would be perhaps part of
36 our contribution to that effort.

37

38 Project 103.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could I ask you a question
41 on that one real quick?

42

43 MR. THOMPSON: Sure.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, basically what you'd
46 be doing here is you would actually be doing something that
47 a lot of times we've complained about and that's
48 duplication of effort where people redo projects that have
49 been done in the past. So what you're going to be doing,

50 if I understand right, is you're going to be trying to

00189

1 gather all of the projects that have been done on fisheries
2 issues and put them in one database so they can be accessed
3 as far back as we've got data and that's sitting in old
4 files and stuff like that that haven't been brought and put
5 where they're accessible.

6
7 MR. THOMPSON: Right. And, again, we
8 intend to do this -- at least our plans are to do this on a
9 statewide basis in cooperation with Department of Fish &
10 Game, university, et cetera. Wherever these databases
11 might be so we can all collectively look at the same data
12 and reduce redundancy projects. That particular project,
13 we have \$30,000 earmarked for.

14
15 Project 103, Creel Surveys on Copper River Delta.
16 We believe there are quiet a few rod and reel fisheries
17 taking place on the Copper River Delta under sportfishing
18 regulations, which, in fact, are or may be subsistence --
19 used for subsistence purposes and we want to get a better
20 handle on what part of those fisheries should actually be
21 viewed as a subsistence component of those rod and reel
22 fisheries.

23
24 104, Alaganik Watershed Co-escapement Surveys.
25 That's a stock status project which would identify the
26 production potential of the Alaganik Watershed and whether
27 or not current escapement is meeting what the production
28 potential is of the watershed or whether maybe it's being
29 overharvested.

30
31 Again, 105 addresses Alaganik. That would be to
32 establish a sonar counting station there. Again, to get a
33 better handle on what the production potential is versus
34 allocations for sport and subsistence uses.

35
36 Project 106 is the Miles Lake Sonar Counter.
37 Again, the consultation that we've done with the State
38 would indicate that there may be better technology that
39 they are looking at and with federal participation might be
40 able to improve the sonar counting capabilities there at
41 Miles Lake.

42
43 107, Fish Habitat Relationships. Again, that's
44 another stock status project to address production
45 potential of various systems where we believe there either
46 is or could be federal subsistence fisheries taking place
47 and relate that production potential to allocations.

48
49 108, Nearshore Migration Patterns of Returning

50 Adult Coho Salmon to Copper River Delta Flats. There we

00190

1 want to identify where those fish are migrating in salt
2 water and what interception is taking place on those fish
3 and where and when, so that if there has to be some kind of
4 restrictions made, we'll know where we can most effectively
5 address those restrictions to achieve the upriver
6 escapement to subsistence fisheries or conservation
7 purposes.

8
9 109, we have a couple of projects, 109 and 112,
10 which address Eulachon. There is a -- our biologist
11 characterizes it as a notable subsistence fishery on
12 Eulachon in the Cordova area and I guess a number of
13 systems, but it's not very well documented what the
14 subsistence use is and how much harvest is taking place by
15 a developing commercial fishery. So we want to get a
16 handle on what the subsistence use is, what the intercept
17 is for commercial purposes and how that relates to the
18 potential of those systems to produce Eulachon.

19
20 110 relates to the compilation of existing
21 subsistence data, but here we would propose putting it into
22 a geographical information system format, computerize
23 format so that it would have greater application to land
24 management planning efforts. of course, along with that
25 comes land management planning to address subsistence
26 needs.

27
28 111, Coghill Lake Adult Escapement Weir. Addresses
29 coho production potential in Coghill Lake so we can get a
30 handle on how healthy that population is, how much we may
31 be able to afford to allow additional allocations for any
32 purpose, but certainly what the allocation should be to
33 protect that population and still achieve a subsistence
34 priority.

35
36 113, Creel Surveys of Western Prince William Sound
37 and that is for salmon and that would be a harvest
38 assessment project, would address a variety of systems,
39 getting creel information on several systems.

40
41 114, Western Prince William Sound Ground Surveys.
42 That would address spawning escapement for sockeye and coho
43 and the systems which have been identified as either
44 existing or potential subsistence fisheries. So we'll be
45 in a position to be able to address whether or not
46 subsistence harvest is getting what they need and if
47 conservation objectives are being met in those systems.

48
49 115, Cutthroat Trout Distribution. There is a

50 fairly undocumented we believe to be subsistence harvest of

00191

1 Cutthroat and Copper River Delta and there we'd like to get
2 better documentation of what that is and some assessment of
3 how healthy those populations are compared to what they
4 maybe could be. We just don't have much information on it.
5

6 116, Russian River/Cooper Creek Weir Season
7 Extension, Department of Fish & Game apparently already has
8 weir counting facilities on the Russian and Cooper Creek
9 and this would just propose augmenting those activities so
10 the season for counting could be extended to address the
11 runs, which apparently are more important for subsistence
12 allocations and some of the activities the federal
13 management that will be responsible for.
14

15 117, Resurrection Creek Creel Survey. That is
16 apparently a system where we have very little information
17 available now and we believe the rod and reel fishery under
18 sport regulations encompasses some harvest for subsistence
19 purposes. We'd like to get a handle on what those harvests
20 are and what portion of it is actually for subsistence.
21

22 118 is ADF&G Salmon Escapement Database Transfer
23 and that is simply another proposal that relates to this
24 project. I believe this is what they intended. It relates
25 compiling the fisheries management information where it's
26 more readily accessible.
27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I understand correct
29 when I look at this that basically the Fish & Game uses a
30 different database system on their computers than the
31 Forest Service uses and that what you're going to be doing
32 is changing it from one kind of a database to another kind
33 of a database?
34

35 MR. THOMPSON: I'd say only insofar as the
36 GIS, the geographical information system, and I'm not
37 entirely sure that ours is different than the State's, but
38 the indication I get is that this would make -- the GIS
39 would provide for a format more readily adaptable to like
40 land management planning. The other databases, however --
41 well, the federal system hasn't even developed them for the
42 most part yet and we want to make that more accessible to
43 federal management by pulling them together. It would
44 probably be in the format that the State uses now.
45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But just make sure you
47 have it in your computer so that you can access it.
48

49 MR. THOMPSON: Well, that or we have access

50 to it on way or the other. I don't have as much knowledge

00192

1 about some of these projects as the folks who developed
2 them, but that's my understanding.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And these projects, the
5 reason that so many of them deal with either Cordova or
6 Chugach National Forest, this list of projects was
7 developed by the Forest Service, right?

8

9 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, yes. I might add a
10 little bit more to some of the discussion this morning
11 about management which relates to this as well. Of course,
12 you realize, you know, we're in the Department of
13 Agriculture and some of the constraints that the Department
14 of Interior has we're not under. We already have personnel
15 in place. We have something on the order of 13 fishery
16 biologists in the National Forest system versus here on the
17 Chugach we have fishery biologists located in Cordova,
18 Girdwood and in Seward already. And we have line officers,
19 district rangers located there that would be available and
20 in place with the staff to support in-season management.
21 These people have been here in those locations for some
22 time and they work very closely with the local community
23 and even though they haven't documented what sort of
24 consultation may have taken place within the past three or
25 four weeks, which these projects were developed, I might
26 speculate that there's a great deal of local knowledge and
27 local consultation just working in the local communities
28 about where the subsistence priorities are or should be
29 developing under federal management and that perspective is
30 already integrated into these projects. So where you see
31 on some of these projects they've indicated no consultation
32 or little consultation, that implies no additional targeted
33 information in the past month, you know, to specific groups
34 for this particular purpose. So they're sort of relying on
35 institutional knowledge of where the priority should be and
36 in previous interactions with the tribal community. But,
37 of course, you may want to set us straight if you don't
38 agree with some of these projects, you think they're
39 redundant, there are others more appropriate. We'd
40 certainly welcome that. But we do have these people in
41 place that have already been doing this.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just a question on that
44 now. In the attempt not to duplicate effort and the fact
45 that we're dealing with federal management, to what extent
46 will these biologists and managers that are already in
47 place in the U.S. Forest Service be used in the management
48 of federal fisheries for subsistence purposes by the joint
49 Forest Service, Fish & Wildlife Service. I mean if the

50 memorandum of agreement is between -- is it between the

00193

1 federal agencies or it's between the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
2 Service and the State of Alaska?

3

4 MR. THOMPSON: The MOA you addressed this
5 morning relates to the MOA between the federal agencies and
6 the State.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So all the federal
9 agencies.

10

11 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, all the federal
12 agencies. But there's also another agreement that's being
13 drafted just between the federal agencies they'll work
14 together. I think the more immediate important MOA is the
15 one with the State though because they're the.....

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But we were talking about
18 lack of managers, lack of biologists and things like that.
19 To what degree are we going to make use of the biologists,
20 the managers, the people who have already been in place
21 with the Forest Service that are already on the grounds,
22 already out in the communities?

23

24 MR. THOMPSON: The biologists, the
25 biological expertise definitely. Those are the people we
26 already have in place we will be relying on. We did not
27 have to develop a staffing strategy which involved putting
28 on a whole lot more people simply because we already have
29 them in place. But as far as the line officers and in-
30 season management, that decision hasn't been made yet. If
31 there will be delegated authority, to what extent it will
32 be delegated and all that, but we do have those people in
33 place, too.

34

35 Anyway, let me summarize on these projects. We
36 have a total of the 18 projects. There is \$566,000 that
37 has been identified in southcentral for projects on
38 National Forest System lands, which \$226,000 is for harvest
39 assessment projects, \$330,000 for stocks, status and trend
40 projects, which amounts to 71 percent of the total budget
41 that we're sending to the Chugach. As you read the full
42 description of each one of these projects, we do intend to
43 involve cooperative agreements and contracts with tribes
44 and Native organizations to the extent it's appropriate.
45 We've been focusing on that just as the other agencies
46 have.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody on the
49 council have any questions on these projects? These are

50 projects that are proposed for 2000, but only two have been

00194

1 accepted so far, right?

2

3 MS. McBURNEY: Correct.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So these will be projects
6 that will then be presented to the board and in April
7 they'll decide which of these projects they would fund and
8 which projects go ahead.

9

10 MR. THOMPSON: That's correct. Part of the
11 reason only two have been approved so far is because we
12 have not provided these to the interagency group by the
13 cut-off date to have an adequate review for them to
14 approve. So, that's true. I think they're all good
15 projects, but we would really appreciate your view of
16 whether or not you think they're good or whether there's
17 others that are, in your mind, higher priority.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But, again, that would
20 have to be projects that apply on Forest Service land
21 or.....

22

23 MR. THOMPSON: I think that comment
24 applies.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:for any projects?

27

28 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, I think that applies
29 anywhere.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's what I was
32 trying to get at, is these are basically -- most of these
33 have been presented by the Forest Service because they deal
34 on Forest Service land. There are openings for other
35 projects that aren't on Forest Service land that somebody
36 else has to develop and present.

37

38 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The rest of the council,
41 is there any comments on the projects that we're looking at
42 right here? I guess my problem is they're all good
43 projects, it's just how do you pick the best projects?

44

45 MR. THOMPSON: When I ask our field people
46 to develop these proposals, I said don't just look at
47 existing State sanctioned subsistence fisheries because
48 there aren't many on our lands, but I said look at where
49 there could develop federal subsistence fisheries under

50 federal regulations. For instance, it would seem logical

00195

1 to us that maybe some of the personal use fisheries might
2 transition into a federal fishery if proposals come forward
3 to do so, so we've been targeting on probably more of these
4 addressed potential subsistence fisheries than existing.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess I would have to
7 say is, you know, from the biggest issue that's going to be
8 in our area of southcentral is going to be the Copper
9 River. Anything that can be done to improve the accuracy
10 and the integrity of the counting of salmon that go up the
11 Copper River, anything that can be done in that area is
12 extremely important, you know, for all concerned.

13
14 MR. THOMPSON: It was our hope that maybe
15 the technology was adequate now to differentiate species,
16 but we've been told by some experts that it isn't, so I
17 don't know to what extent this improves on the counts, you
18 know, and what they're proposing. I don't have those
19 details, but we could probably provide that for you if
20 that's important to you.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, because what you're
23 going to be limited to is you're going to be limited to the
24 availability of the technology at this point in time. You
25 know that the technology will be better than 20 years ago.
26 Even if it doesn't do everything that you want it to do, it
27 will be an improvement. Somewhere along the line you'll
28 have to take the next step, the next improvement that comes
29 along. Hopefully not 20 years.

30
31 MR. THOMPSON: Well, I guess what I'm
32 relating to specifically is that some of the consultants so
33 far have said you're wasting your money by putting any more
34 into the technology that's already there. Let's take that
35 money and let's put it upriver with some of the Park
36 Service projects. I think that's a valid question and we
37 need to research that because maybe there's a lot bigger
38 bang for our buck by abandoning hopes of trying to get a
39 better count in the lower river and putting it into some
40 index surveys and whatnot in the upper river.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comment from any
43 members of the council? Would you like to go on, Mary?

44
45 MS. McBURNEY: Yes, thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have we interrupted
48 your.....

49

MS. McBURNEY: No. We're actually going

00196

1 exactly where we need to go and we'll take as much time as
2 necessary as well. One thing I want to stress is that we
3 do realize that the short time frame for the 2000 project
4 process has been less than perfect and it has not allowed
5 for full involvement of the regional councils and the
6 public and we will admit that to you bold face right now.
7 It is our intent to really correct that shortcoming
8 starting today and right now. We believe that with more
9 time we can all do a more complete job of regional
10 consultation and working together with local and regional
11 organizations to develop projects over time and this is
12 going to be an annual process, one that we will be doing
13 every year from here on out.

14
15 Now, the second section of your packet includes a
16 time line for the resource monitoring project selection
17 process for spring 2001 and this is where I'd like to
18 direct your attention right now. The steps outlined on
19 this page represent our best efforts at this point to
20 organize the resource monitoring program. We're going to
21 be learning as we go since this is something that we're
22 creating each step of the way. So some steps may be
23 modified as we learn what works best. But the purpose is
24 to invest in new information to improve management and to
25 work with local organizations to develop expertise and
26 technical capabilities in the regions. The councils have a
27 major role in this process. In fact, the process starts
28 with the regional councils each year.

29
30 During the winter round of meetings, the councils
31 discuss and make recommendations about critical management
32 issues and information needs. These recommendations are
33 necessary inputs for the board to establish research
34 priorities to direct the annual resource monitoring plan,
35 which will be developed each year. After the board adopts
36 priority information needs for each region, those of us on
37 the staff will then work with the tribes, ADF&G, federal
38 field stations and other partners to develop projects to
39 address those needs.

40
41 We will start with a process with brief pre-
42 proposals that are similar to the one-pagers that you just
43 took a look at in your packets. The purpose of these pre-
44 proposals is to ensure that proposals are focused on the
45 right priorities and that they employ the best research
46 methods. Agencies and organizations that submit pre-
47 proposals that pass the initial screening process will then
48 be invited to prepare more detailed project proposals.

49

Now, questions 3, 4 and 5 on the questions and

00197

1 answers sheet, which I think is just on the back side of
2 the resource monitoring selection process, those describe
3 the proposal process and the criteria that will be used to
4 establish or to evaluate rather the project proposals for
5 this coming year.

6
7 By the end of August, all these projects will be
8 included in a statewide package of proposed projects with
9 detailed budgets and this is what's going to become the
10 draft annual resource monitoring plan. So, during your
11 fall meeting, the councils will review the annual draft
12 resource monitoring plan and then offer recommendations so
13 that needed changes could be made before the board makes
14 its final funding decision during their December meeting.

15
16 Then once the annual resource monitoring plan has
17 been approved, then cooperative agreements will be
18 developed with all the partners, whether it be regional
19 organizations, tribes, Alaska Department of Fish & Game,
20 universities, whoever those partners may be, and then we
21 get to work. I'll pause at this point in case there are
22 any questions on how this process is anticipated to work
23 for the coming year.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, basically what you're
26 saying is that in our fall meeting we are going to need to
27 set time aside to review the projects for the coming year
28 and at that point in time, it's going to be up to the
29 council to make, I guess, advisory recommendations or
30 non-recommendations on individual projects.

31
32 MS. McBURNEY: Yes. This is where your
33 input is really valuable because you really are the experts
34 in this area. You know the resource and that kind of
35 feedback from you is going to be very critical for helping
36 to make these resource monitoring plans as strong as
37 possible to make sure they're addressing the right issues.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just out of curiosity, how
40 many projects do you expect to have in your fall draft
41 resource monitoring plan book?

42
43 MS. McBURNEY: Oh, boy. Well, that's going
44 to -- it depends on the variables involved. I remember
45 that Peggy had mentioned, I think, seven million for this
46 coming year. I'm not exactly sure how firm that number may
47 be. So, let's say we're starting with that as a starting
48 point. Then that's going to be divided throughout the
49 state. It's really hard to say how many actual proposals

50 we may end up funding through that, but the intent would

00198

1 certainly be to fund as many as possible and especially
2 those that are addressing the most important issues, those
3 that have been identified by the Regional Advisory
4 Councils.

5
6 I have no idea what the upward limit is going to be
7 of what's going to make a manageable number of projects. I
8 think that's going to be one of those things that we're
9 going to be learning as we go.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was just thinking
12 that if in our fall meeting we're going to be dealing with
13 fisheries proposals, projects and, to me, it looks just out
14 of this -- this is a little short 20 projects right here
15 that came at the spur of the moment we might say. We might
16 be looking at a project book that's got 100 projects in it
17 just as a -- because all projects aren't going to be
18 approved, all projects aren't going to be funded. There
19 are going to be more projects than there are funding for.
20 So there would be -- well, I'm just trying to -- in my
21 mind, I'm just trying to think, if we went through the same
22 process with each project that we go through with each
23 proposal, we're going to need to set aside a fall meeting
24 that deals with nothing except projects.

25
26 MS. McBURNEY: That's conceivable.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm not saying that that's
29 bad.

30
31 MS. McBURNEY: No. And you're correct,
32 that is conceivable that you would require that time.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean if we are going to
35 be looked at to not really make a decision but make a yes
36 or no advisory comment on each project and suggestions for
37 changing each project, that alone is going to be probably
38 more than we've ever done in considering the proposals in
39 one meeting. I mean proposals for change in regulations.
40 You were going to say something?

41
42 MR. THOMPSON: Well, you may have a little
43 more flexibility on projects in terms of how much energy
44 you want to put into it. It's not like regulatory actions.
45 There is -- you have a much more important role, I think,
46 in recommending regulatory changes. I think there's a
47 little more flexibility. That's my opinion. If you decided
48 you wanted to have less involvement in how you recommend or
49 how specific your recommendations are, I think that's

50 certainly your prerogative.

00199

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was just considering
2 some alternatives there that -- that is going to be part
3 now of our fall meeting.

4
5 MS. McBURNEY: Yes.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, consequently, I just
8 wanted the rest of the council to realize that that's going
9 to be a big part of our fall meeting the way it looks to
10 me, you know, simply because there are going to be a lot of
11 projects that are going to come before us for funding. If
12 we're going to have a say in what products are important
13 for funding for the coming year, that's going to be a big
14 part of our fall meeting. That was not a statement of, oh,
15 no, we can't do it or something like that. That was just a
16 statement of that's basically what we're facing.

17
18 MR. THOMPSON: Well, we would -- for
19 example, we had a funding allocation this year of \$3
20 million and indications are we'll have \$5.5 million next
21 year, so we should have something on the order of 30
22 percent more funds available for projects next year.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Yeah. Okay.

25
26 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman?

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes?

29
30 MR. ELVSAAS: I think that will be the
31 major consideration first before you start ranking them is
32 what kind of dollars are we looking at. Some of these
33 aren't that costly, others are. You know, you don't want
34 to take just a bunch of low-cost projects to cover a big
35 area. In turn, you don't want to dump everything on one or
36 two. So I think it's very important that the cost estimate
37 be there as well as the expected funding. That's going to
38 make a big difference in the decision making.

39
40 MR. THOMPSON: Well, the list we provided
41 is fully fundable. We've identified first how much money
42 we have, the Forest Service, for projects and then we
43 develop our list that meets that amount of funding, so
44 there's no question of the availability of funding for
45 National Forest System projects, but I guess Park Service
46 projects in the Upper Copper could use some additional
47 funding if we want to do them all, is that correct?

48
49 MS. McBURNEY: That's correct.

00200

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, now, out of
2 curiosity, and I don't know if I'm out of line in asking
3 this question, if the Forest Service has the funding for
4 the projects that they put forward, could they have done
5 these projects without running them by the board for board
6 approval just as out of the Forest Service?

7
8 MR. THOMPSON: Well, we're in this
9 interagency process along with everybody else.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

12
13 MR. THOMPSON: I'm not saying that maybe
14 our regional forester wouldn't say do you have local
15 support, do everybody you consulted believe it's a good
16 project, then we'll go ahead and do it, even if maybe we
17 missed the timeline for interagency review, but we don't
18 want to get into that any more than is necessary. So I
19 would say maybe that might happen this year, but next year
20 we intend to have positions integrated in the interagency
21 group that will be reviewing these projects, so it will be
22 a much more.....

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It will be much more
25 cohesive.

26
27 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Mary, back
30 to you.

31
32 MS. McBURNEY: Thank you. Well, you've
33 talked a little bit about the fall meeting. Now let me
34 kind of talk a little bit about the front end or the winter
35 meeting that we're attending right now because this
36 discussion here is really intended to be the beginning of
37 the 2001 project development process. We're asking the
38 councils to discuss and identify subsistence fisheries
39 issues in each region and we will be asking you to look
40 closely at the federal waters and to think about federal
41 management issues and which ones are of most critical
42 importance to your region and where new resource data would
43 probably be most useful.

44
45 There is a set of criteria for setting priorities
46 to guide you and these are under question 1 on the question
47 and answer page and these include a direct association with
48 subsistence fishing on federal lands, risks to conservation
49 of healthy fish stocks, as well as risks to conservation

50 unit purposes, risk of failure to provide a priority to

00201

1 non-wasteful subsistence uses or public controversy, risk
2 that inadequate information is available to support sound
3 management and significance of the resource to subsistence
4 harvests.

5
6 Now, it would be helpful to us if the council would
7 also consider information needs in three very broad
8 categories which we also have listed up on the page that's
9 pinned up on the wall over there. And those specifically
10 are fish stocks, status and trends, which is the biological
11 type projects, subsistence harvest monitoring and
12 traditional ecological knowledge.

13
14 Now, to begin this discussion, you may want to
15 identify specific issues and needs that are related to a
16 specific species of population in a particular drainage or
17 tributary. Being as specific as possible really helps us a
18 great deal. For example, say a stock identification of
19 rainbow trout in Cooper Creek would be an example or
20 collecting traditional ecological knowledge about changes
21 in salmon spawning distribution on the upper Copper River.
22 That might be another example.

23
24 There are a number of examples that are at the back
25 of your packet and this has a tendency to look a little bit
26 intimidating, but let me just describe what these pages
27 indicate. These are the results of a rather cursory needs
28 assessment that was conducted last July where staff
29 basically sat down and brain-stormed what they thought were
30 probably some of the more critical issues in the region.
31 And these are broken out by agency, which makes it a little
32 bit confusing.

33
34 You can see that there's several pages that list
35 Fish & Wildlife Services issues on the Kenai River and then
36 the Forest Service's concerns regarding southeast Alaska
37 and Prince William Sound. They kind of jump around a
38 little bit between areas and between agencies, but these
39 are, to our best knowledge and to our best guess, are some
40 of the critical issues that appear to be presenting
41 themselves in the region at this point.

42
43 What we want to know is, are these the right
44 issues? Are we asking the right questions and looking in
45 the right places or are we way off the mark and are we
46 overlooking some other critical issues where management
47 questions that just haven't been apparent to us at this
48 point? So this really is why this whole annual process is
49 going to begin with the regional councils each year at the

50 winter meeting because we really need that input to find

00202

1 out where to look and to get an idea of what questions we
2 should be asking to address the issues that are of greatest
3 importance to the regions.

4
5 So, this might come as a little bit of a surprise
6 to you, Mr. Chairman, but we were hoping that we would be
7 able to begin a dialogue at some level with the council
8 today to get a sense of what these critical needs, what
9 these critical management issues might be. There are
10 several ways that we can do this, you know, begging your
11 indulgence and perhaps your creativity on how we might be
12 able to do this. Other councils have felt more comfortable
13 just sort of discussing it in a round-robin sort of
14 approach and have taken maybe 10 minutes to sort of do a
15 quick scoping. Other councils have felt more comfortable
16 doing it as more of a formal workshop and actually taking
17 an hour or so during the evening or we could make time
18 tomorrow even to make more formal, more deliberative type
19 process.

20
21 And I have also brought along some sheets that are
22 kind of like work sheets that one council preferred to take
23 work sheets with them so that they could actually go back
24 to their communities and talk to people in their region to
25 kind of get a broader sense of what might be most important
26 to people and subsistence users in their area. So, I offer
27 those to you as some options at this point and perhaps the
28 council would like to, you know, let us know what would be
29 most appropriate and how we might be able to help you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mary. So,
32 these work sheets are available for -- no matter which one
33 we use, we can still take the work sheets home.

34
35 MS. MCBURNEY: Absolutely.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And pass them to
38 interested parties. So, even as a council we do either a
39 round-robin or a formal workshop -- I'll just ask the
40 council. This is something that has been put on our table
41 for today or for this meeting and I know most of us haven't
42 put a lot of deep thought into it as to what projects are
43 available. Don't laugh, Fred. But it is something that is
44 the start of the year for next year. We could either make
45 some very general comments as individuals, which is all I
46 would be capable of doing at this point in time, or if we
47 wanted, we could -- I suppose we could meet with Mary and
48 others this evening and have a short session to actually
49 deal with this outside of having everybody else have to sit

50 in. It could be open to everybody else, too, but I mean it

00203

1 wouldn't have to be part of the thing.

2

3 What would be the wish of the rest of the council?
4 Would you like to just respond to her in kind of a general
5 round-robin way at this point in time expressing some of
6 the areas that you feel in your area projects could address
7 some of those concerns that are up there or should we have
8 a formal workshop at some point in time in the next two
9 days and kind of go through some of the projects that have
10 been delineated here? I'll turn it over for suggestions
11 from the rest of the council. Don't everybody speak at
12 once.

13

14 MR. F. JOHN: This has just been sprung on
15 me, so I really don't -- have nothing to say about it yet.

16

17 MS. SWAN: I couldn't do that this evening.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, would you like to
20 spend a little time tomorrow morning on it? I mean that's
21 one thing that we could do, is we could start our meeting a
22 little early or come a little early and that would have
23 given us time to have looked at these projects. Helga, I
24 see your finger kind of waving.

25

26 MS. EAKON: Yeah. I just wanted to
27 apologize, but Taylor Brelsford handed this to me just as I
28 was leaving practically, going out the door.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's no apology needed.

31

32 MS. EAKON: That's how come you haven't
33 seen it earlier, okay? I apologize.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would be acceptable to
36 anything the rest of the council would be willing to do if
37 we feel that we can speak to it on a general basis at this
38 point in time. We can do that or otherwise we can take
39 this home this evening, look at it, we could have a short
40 session with Mary in the morning and anybody else that
41 wishes to sit in on the session. I mean we're not going to
42 say Mary has to sit there by herself.

43

44 MR. F. JOHN: Let's do that.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's do that? Okay.
47 What time do we normally start tomorrow?

48

49 MR. ELVSAAS: 9:00.

00204

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We've got 9:00 on the list
2 tomorrow?

3
4 MS. EAKON: It's your call if you want to
5 start a little bit earlier.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's what I was
8 thinking, that we could do that first thing tomorrow. Why
9 don't we start 8:30. Does that sound good? If we have to,
10 we'll carry it a little ways into our 9:00 o'clock meeting
11 and we'll meet with you in the morning and by that time
12 we'll at least have had a chance to have read through them
13 and do some thinking and talking to each other and to
14 others and see if there are any immediate concerns.

15
16 MS. McBURNEY: Excellent. That will be
17 great.

18
19 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I might
20 suggest, don't feel too disappointed because this year,
21 like Mary says, is a short-cuttred process and you should be
22 provided this kind of information in a much more timely
23 manner and have more opportunity to deliberate, you know,
24 in the future.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, this is a start of a
27 process. As far as the year 2000 is concerned, there
28 really is no need for us to recommend or not recommend on
29 2000 because what's going to happen is going to happen on
30 that. If we can at least possibly give some directions for
31 2001, even if we don't go through it individual project by
32 project and say this is one that we -- we could say this is
33 the kind of project that we feel is applicable and then in
34 October or our fall meeting we'll actually have a draft of
35 projects that are proposed to review as part of our
36 process, so we'll have to set time aside for that. And if
37 we have them in a timely manner, we can have looked at
38 them, talked to our communities and tribes and the people
39 around us ahead of time and maybe have some direct input
40 into them. So, if that's okay with you, we'll meet with
41 you at 8:30 tomorrow morning.

42
43 MS. McBURNEY: That will be just fine.
44 Thank you.

45
46 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, maybe we could
47 have somebody from the community, like a tribe or someone
48 who's interested to come in the morning also and take part.
49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody can -- I'd say

00205

1 this is a workshop that's open to the public and anybody
2 else that wants to be out there and we'll try to do it on
3 an informational thing and go through it as rapidly as we
4 can, but we're not going to make any formal decisions
5 tomorrow on it anyhow.

6
7 MS. MCBURNEY: No. At this point, it's
8 mostly a scoping type session.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Well, that's kind
11 of what I thought, is that we could kind of hit, you know,
12 what kind of projects we think are necessary, what kind of
13 projects we think are viable and what kind of needs we
14 think need to be addressed and kind of leave it go at that.

15
16 MS. SHARP: Devi Sharp, Wrangell-St. Elias.
17 Would there be any advantage to breaking up into watersheds
18 just for the -- I mean we're all interested in each other's
19 watersheds, but for the sake of focusing, would it be
20 easier to break up into the Copper River and to Cook Inlet?

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That might be an idea.
23 That's something we can think about because that would --
24 we only need two for Cook Inlet. I think that's going to
25 have to be done in the future. Thank you. Are you done
26 with your presentation other than tomorrow?

27
28 MS. MCBURNEY: Yes, I am. Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, we will get
31 back to where -- I've tried to jump us three times today
32 and I keep finding that my memory is not so good. I'm
33 really going to have to apologize to somebody that is going
34 to be showing up about the end of the day because I told
35 him we would be handling the issue that he wanted at the
36 end of the day. Do you think we should have a break?

37
38 MS. EAKON: Yes.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's take 10 minutes.

41
42 (Off record)

43 (On record)

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll call this
46 meeting back in session after our break. At this point in
47 time, unless Helga can correct me again -- I've got to give
48 her a rough time. It's her last time she gets to sit there
49 and the last time I get to pick on her.

00206

1 MS. SWAN: No, she's staying. She's
2 staying. She's not going anywhere.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We will now go to
5 proposals and we're going to address Proposal 12, 14, 15,
6 16 has been dropped, 17, 18, 19 and 21. Those are the ones
7 we didn't do. So we're on Proposal 12 and I think George
8 is going to present the Proposal 12 to us. And the page
9 number on Proposal 12, I think, is about 90-something.

10
11 MR. SHERROD: 6.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 96?

14
15 MR. SHERROD: No, 6. Under Tab T.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Page 6?

18
19 MR. SHERROD: Right here.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh. I looked at the wrong
22 one before then. Okay.

23
24 MR. SHERROD: I would request though on
25 Proposal 16, I think we need a letter from the proponent to
26 officially drop it.

27
28 MS. EAKON: That's our usual practice.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, what we can do is,
31 if Ken knows that he dropped it, we'll just defer or
32 basically vote it down, you know, whichever one of the two.
33 We can't defer it again. We've deferred it.

34
35 MS. EAKON: Just reject it.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll have to reject it as
38 it is because what we told him last time is that if he
39 didn't present anything this time, we were going to reject
40 it.

41
42 MS. EAKON: That's correct. That's right.

43
44 MS. SWAN: Which proposal are you talking
45 about?

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 16. Okay. We're on 12
48 right now. Sorry.

49

MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair, council members,

00207

1 Proposal 12 was submitted by George Midvig of Slana and
2 requests residents of Slana and the other residents of Unit
3 13-C be added to the Unit 11 customary and traditional use
4 determinations for black bear, brown bear and goat. The
5 contemporary community of Slana straddles the Unit 13-C
6 Unit 11 boundary. They have distinct historic origins and
7 that the Unit 13-C portion was originally the site of an
8 Ahtna village. Subsequent to that, near the turn of the
9 last century, a trading post, then a roadhouse and sort of
10 headquarters for some of the mining operations that took
11 place there.

12
13 In 1980, the Bureau of Land Management participated
14 on their last homestead program and this gave rise to the
15 Unit 11 portion of Slana. Historically, they have been
16 treated differently in many instances in customary and
17 traditional use determination and other issues. As a
18 result, we have somewhat disparate C&T determinations for
19 members of the same social community. Slana previously has
20 never been the subject of a C&T analysis, even though a
21 number of other Unit 13-C and Unit 11 communities, Copper
22 River Basin communities have been. A large part of this is
23 due to the fact that Slana has never requested to be the
24 subject of an analysis.

25
26 In going through the ticket database and so on and
27 the other previous determinations, it's pretty clear that
28 Slana meets the criteria for being a subsistence community.
29 It has, in fact, C&T determinations for moose and caribou
30 in Unit 11 and when Unit 11, as of a couple years ago, had
31 a no determination for black bear, they also qualified to
32 hunt black bear in Unit 11. They are a residence zone
33 community for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. So,
34 basically, they have the right to participate in
35 subsistence activities not only in the preserve, but in the
36 park.

37
38 In the tradition of many rural Alaska communities,
39 however, there seems to be a pattern of under-reporting
40 game harvest. In a review of the harvest records, we will
41 find that between '86 and '89 there were three goat permits
42 issued to residents of Slana. None of the goat permits
43 were filled in Unit 11. In terms of brown bear between '62
44 and '98, 22 brown bear were reported harvested by the
45 residents of Slana, only one was taken in Unit 11 in 1987.
46 And in respect to black bear between 1979 and 1998, 26
47 black bear were reported as being harvested, none of which
48 were harvested in Unit 11.

49

So while we have a situation where we've got a

00208

1 community that meets most of the criteria, they have not
2 demonstrated use of Unit 11 for harvesting resources other
3 than moose and caribou and it has been the pattern of this
4 body in the past to give that factor considerable weight in
5 making C&T determinations.

6
7 My conclusion is to defer this proposal until which
8 time additional data can be gathered regarding the use of
9 this area by residents of Slana. This is a very emotional
10 issue in Slana. I had asked yesterday that it be postponed
11 because there was somewhat of a promise that we would have
12 local testimony here and at the Interior council meetings
13 and no one has shown up in either of these cases. In an
14 attempt to resolve this this year, I worked with the park
15 and actually produced a questionnaire. The questionnaire
16 was sent out to somewhere in the neighborhood of 30-some to
17 50 families. To date, I've only received five of those
18 questionnaires back, which does not provide, in my mind,
19 the basis for moving forward with a positive C&T on this.

20
21 So, at this point in time, I would recommend that
22 this be deferred until additional information can be
23 gathered. It is my feeling that working with the park by
24 next cycle we should be able to actually commit a short
25 time to field work and collect the information necessary to
26 bring this to closure.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So your recommendation is
29 to defer it until more studies have been done?

30
31 MR. SHERROD: Correct. And we have a
32 representative from the park here that's been working
33 closely on this and I think might be able to add some
34 additional information.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, when we get to the
37 other agency comments. Devi, can I get you after I get the
38 Alaska Department of Fish & Game so that Helga doesn't tell
39 me I'm out of order? I'm going to go through Alaska
40 Department of Fish & Game and then other agency comments.
41 Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

42
43 MR. FALL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jim Fall,
44 Subsistence Division. We had deferred comments on the C&T
45 proposals before you until we had the staff analysis and
46 that's why you don't have our comments in your book. Terry
47 Haines from our division did provide considerable comments
48 on the staff analysis to Fish & Wildlife Service back in
49 January. A lot of these comments were technical in nature,

50 pointing out some additional data sources, for example, and

00209

1 I haven't had a chance to see whether they've had an
2 opportunity to update the analysis with that other
3 information, but I trust that will be done before the
4 federal board meeting.

5
6 A couple things. I don't think that we object to
7 deferring the proposal to get additional information. We
8 encourage that a good record be built specific to the
9 species on the consideration. We did express -- well, it
10 was just a comment that we did make that we thought that
11 the level of scrutiny that was being applied to Slana in
12 this case was more than had been directed to some other
13 communities for the same question, for the same species in
14 the same area and we thought that some of the evidence that
15 had been used for previous C&T determination for Mentasta,
16 Chistochina, Gakona and the residents of Unit 11 along the
17 Nabesna Road could have been used in this case as well.

18
19 In general, it really does point, I think, to the
20 wisdom in a lot of cases to look at C&T determinations on
21 the basis of an area rather than named communities because
22 people do move back and forth and boundaries sometimes are
23 difficult to establish. But the bottom line is, if the
24 council and the board decide to defer this until additional
25 information is available, we would agree that that's a
26 reasonable approach.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any questions?
29 No? Okay. Devi.

30
31 MS. SHARP: Devi Sharp, Wrangell-St. Elias.
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think it's a wise idea to defer.
33 Originally, we thought it was an administrative oversight,
34 but in view of the difficulty in proving the C&T, I think
35 it's worth taking the time to show it. Although I do agree
36 with Jim, that sometimes it's better just to take a big
37 look rather than a small look, but that will be -- the
38 board will decide that.

39
40 The park will make a commitment, as we did in
41 Cordova, to work with Fish & Wildlife to accomplish the
42 mission in a professional manner. It's got to be a lot
43 easier than Cordova. It's a lot closer anyway and there's
44 fewer people.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Devi?
47 Thank you, Devi. Nat, Eastern Interior have anything to
48 say on this one?

49

MR. GOOD: We followed the staff

00210

1 recommendation and deferred it to either for further
2 information or to you, whichever you decide.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Fish & Game
5 Advisory Committee comments. Helga, I think we had some,
6 didn't we?

7

8 MS. EAKON: The Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road
9 Advisory Committee voted to support this and the following
10 residents of Slana, each wrote comments of support: Thelma
11 Schrank, Albert Rizer, Jay Capps, Margie West, Debbie
12 Capps, James Abraham, Harry Bushey, James Christman and
13 Rosie Nelson. We also received comments of support from
14 Gary McMichael, Nabesna, James Answorth, Tok Cutoff Road,
15 James Abraham, Nabesna Road, Dallas Bates, Nabesna Road,
16 Steve McCulloch, Tok Cutoff Road. The Wrangell-St. Elias
17 Subsistence Resource Commission commented that they would
18 defer for further analysis and that concludes the written
19 comments, Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That pretty well --
22 do we have any public testimony on it? Thank you.
23 Eleanor.

24

25 MS. DEMENTI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CRNA
26 does not support the proposal. Customary and traditional
27 should not be given to the community without substantial
28 evidence of species used by the Slana community. Most of
29 the people in Slana have moved to the community after 1980
30 and have not used the Wrangell-St. Elias Park and Preserve
31 prior to 1980 and do not have a prior use to 1980 in the
32 Wrangell-St. Elias Park. Does not support.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Faye, you were
35 down as wishing to speak to this one.

36

37 MS. EWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am
38 not in support of recognizing the citizens of Slana because
39 they migrated to that part of the country in 1980 as a
40 state give-away land and they recognize themselves as a
41 community and I believe that they impose themselves on the
42 Native people of Mentasta and Chistochina residents and I
43 know they don't utilize any of those animals for their own
44 customary traditional use because a lot of them were from
45 the cities. Growing up in that area, I know that these
46 people will never fit under those two criterias,
47 traditional and customary use unless they've been there 100
48 years to prove that they did practice this practice before.
49 Thank you.

00211

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Faye. I think
2 we need to remember something, and it's not a criticism of
3 Faye by a long shot, but that's one thing we have never
4 done to a certain extent, is came down and said -- put a
5 year and date on something, but I do know that one of the
6 things we said for in the park is they had to use the park
7 prior to the park being there in order to have customary
8 and traditional in the park. So, from that standpoint, I
9 think they would have to show -- from my way of thinking,
10 they would have to show use that they used the park prior
11 to the park being there. I know in the past we've
12 discussed what customary and traditional means and we
13 realize that there has to be a different application of
14 customary and traditional to people who have been someplace
15 for 1,000 years than there is to people who have been there
16 for 30, but it can still be customary and traditional for
17 somebody that was there for 30 years. Thank you. Okay.
18 Any other public testimony? Hearing none. A motion to
19 accept or defer this proposal is in order so that we can
20 have discussion -- or a motion to accept these proposals in
21 order so that we can have discussion on it.

22
23 MS. SWAN: I move for a discussion, Mr.
24 Chairman.

25
26 MR. VLASOFF: Second.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's moved to accept this
29 proposal and seconded by Ken. You did second it, didn't
30 you?

31
32 MR. VLASOFF: Uh-huh.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I thought you did. Now
35 it's on the table. What is the wish of the rest of the
36 council at this point in time? Do we go along with the
37 advice to defer or do we feel that we have enough
38 information on which to act?

39
40 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman?

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

43
44 MR. ELVSAAS: First, in looking at the map,
45 and I suspect the drainage there in the area they want to
46 utilize there in Unit 11 is probably a little different
47 than the closed area, which is a little -- I believe a
48 little to the east of that we addressed earlier this
49 morning. But, on the other hand, what keeps coming up in

50 the back of my mind, is we had people from Chenega and

00212

1 Tatitlek that wanted to utilize 6(B) and C units for moose.
2 Even though they had historically hunted there, they don't
3 live in Cordova anymore. They've gone back home. You have
4 to weigh all those factors if you do something like this.
5 We just heard testimony that these are people that just
6 moved into the area and I just don't feel comfortable
7 making an action on the thing.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just a point of
10 clarification right there. That closed area was for
11 caribou only.

12
13 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the rest, what they're
16 looking at is the park, which is right next door to them,
17 and they're looking for customary and traditional for black
18 bear, brown bear, goat. So that's basically what we're
19 dealing. That little line that
20 you see coming from Slana that heads, I guess you'd say,
21 south on the map, that's Nabesna Road. That's the road
22 that goes into the park.

23
24 MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, okay. I thought that was
25 a drainage.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I better.....

28
29 MR. ELVSAAS: More than likely the road is
30 along the drainage, too.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The road is right along
33 the drainage. I think the Nabesna River and the Nabesna
34 Road are.....

35
36 MR. ELVSAAS: I have not been there.

37
38 MS. SHARP: That's the road.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That is the road, right.
41 See, where they're living is right at the bottom of the
42 road that goes into the park. I'm in agreement with you.
43 I don't think we have enough information at this point in
44 time, as does part of the staff. I don't think they've --
45 at least I don't think they've shown customary and
46 traditional use at this point in time. So we can either --
47 you know, we have a motion on the table. We can either
48 vote it down for reasons of lack of information or we can
49 do what the staff recommends and defer it and give them an

50 opportunity, like we've given others, to produce the

00213

1 information. Whether they will or whether they won't is up
2 to them.

3

4 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, I would think that it
5 would be only proper to ask for them to give more
6 supporting information and then make a decision.

7

8 MR. F. JOHN: I make a motion, Mr. Chair,
9 we vote it down.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We already have a motion
12 on the table, Fred, to vote on it. We can either vote yes
13 or no on that one there.

14

15 MR. ELVSAAS: We can recommend.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I don't know what we
18 would do if somebody.....

19

20 MR. F. JOHN: That's my recommendation.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's your
23 recommendation? If we wanted to defer and we have a motion
24 on the table, Helga, what do we have to do at that point in
25 time? Can we do anything?

26

27 MS. EAKON: You can.

28

29 MR. ELVSAAS: You can table it, you can
30 defer it, you can vote it down.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, if we vote it down,
33 it's closed. If we vote it up, it's closed, it's done.
34 What is our other alternative if we want to do anything?

35

36 MS. SWAN: Can I rescind my motion?

37

38 MR. ELVSAAS: Table it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I suppose you can
41 rescind your motion, but.....

42

43 MR. F. JOHN: Or amend it.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or we could amend it.

46

47 MS. SWAN: We could amend it to defer.

48

49 MS. EAKON: Amend the motion to defer.

00214

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's one thing we
2 can do. So we have three choices then; we can vote yes, no
3 or make an amendment to defer. Fred John says vote no and
4 that's a legitimate statement on his part.

5
6 MR. F. JOHN: What I got is that they came
7 in after the park. Unless they can prove to me that
8 they're customary and traditional hunter, I'll vote for not
9 now.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not now. Do you feel like
12 it's worthwhile giving them the chance to try to prove?

13
14 MR. F. JOHN: They could come up with a new
15 proposal.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's true, too.

18
19 MR. F. JOHN: It's up to them. I don't
20 think we should go out there and try to force it on them.

21
22 MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair?

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, George.

25
26 MR. SHERROD: A point of clarification.
27 The new homestead area is actually in Unit 11. They have
28 C&T in Unit 11. It's the old community and there are some
29 new people that are settled in the old community, but it's
30 the old community that's in Unit 13-C and they're the ones
31 that lack C&T in Unit 11.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the new community
34 already has C&T.

35
36 MR. SHERROD: Already because they're in
37 Unit 11.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh.

40
41 MR. SHERROD: And the whole community is a
42 resident zoned community.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the whole community is
45 a resident zoned community.

46
47 MR. SHERROD: Because the Park Service
48 considers it a single community. Historically, it's been
49 treated as two different or single, depending on who's

50 doing it. I would say from a practical standpoint, by

00215

1 deferring it, basically sends a signal for me to take back
2 and say we need to do the research. You vote it up and
3 down and then it's dependant on them to reapply again. But
4 the Park Service may take an initiative to try to collect
5 information, but it would be difficult, I think, for me to
6 argue that I need, in my office, to assist in getting
7 additional information.

8
9 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair?

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes?

12
13 MR. DEMENTI: If you don't receive this
14 other information, then what, it just goes down?

15
16 MR. SHERROD: If I don't receive it?

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We still have to vote on
19 it.

20
21 MR. SHERROD: Well, no. If you deferred
22 it, the plan would be I would try to go out or a
23 representative from my office would attempt to go out and
24 spend three or four days in the field, we're dealing with a
25 small community, and try to actually identify the harvest
26 and use of that area and then that data would be put into
27 the analysis. It would be updated and come before you
28 again. But if you vote it down, basically then it's up to
29 them to resubmit a new proposal. The problem being is
30 there's such a short window between the time the proposals
31 come in and we have to have the analysis done. It's pretty
32 impractical to send someone into the field if you don't
33 have the information there.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do I hear any
36 motions to amend?

37
38 MS. SWAN: I move to vote it down.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can't move to vote it
41 down.

42
43 MS. SWAN: Why can't I?

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can say that you're
46 feeling is to vote it down because the motion is on the
47 table.

48
49 MS. SWAN: Okay. Oh, that's right. My

50 feeling is to vote it down.

00216

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Okay.

2
3 MS. SWAN: Now, having said that, what does
4 that mean?

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, then you can --
7 nothing. If there's no further discussion, the question
8 can be called and there's no further motion for an
9 amendment.

10
11 MS. SWAN: Okay, okay. I'm fine.

12
13 MR. VLASOFF: Question.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
16 called. We have a motion on the table and the motion is to
17 approve Proposal 12. All in favor of approving Proposal 12
18 signify by saying aye.

19
20 (No in favor responses)

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed to approving
23 Proposal 12 signify by saying nay.

24
25 IN UNISON: Nay.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess I forgot to vote,
28 but I can't vote anyhow. So the proposal fails.

29
30 MS. EAKON: You can vote.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, but I didn't when I
33 was supposed to. I don't feel that we had enough
34 affirmation, but that's fine.

35
36 MS. EAKON: Well, I don't either.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll just put that in as
39 that and we'll go from there. Proposal 14.

40
41 MS. EAKON: Page 38.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Proposal 14. This
44 is for an increase in the harvest of goats and we have an
45 introduction on this one by Donna.

46
47 MS. DEWHURST: And this is -- the area 6-D
48 has a bunch of subareas for goats. Goats are managed kind
49 of by family groups in very small areas because goats don't

50 move around a whole lot, so that's why they have it divided

00217

1 into subareas. The subareas are identified on page 39,
2 although 39 doesn't have a page number on it. It's the
3 page after 38. The subareas they're requesting to increase
4 are 243 and 249.

5 243 is presently closed. The population had
6 declined previous years, but speaking to Fish & Game, they
7 feel like the population in the past -- since 1994, the
8 population has increased and they feel it could be opened
9 again, but the present state of it is it's closed. There
10 are no permits being issued at all.

11
12 And 249, there's a combination of a federal and
13 state hunt going on in 249. The present federal hunt
14 allows for two permits to be issued. The state hunt -- I
15 thought I had that number listed, but I think it's like 29
16 permits. There's quite a few permits on the state side.
17 I'll find it in a minute. So it's a combo hunt. The
18 population in 249 appears to be healthy. There's no --
19 and, really, this whole proposal doesn't have a large
20 biological component other than in 243 the issue is can we
21 now open it and the feeling is, yes, the population is
22 healthy to open it.

23
24 So, as far as the request -- the bottom line is, as
25 far as the request on 243 and 249 to up the federal permits
26 to four, in consultation with Fish & Game they felt like it
27 shouldn't be a problem. And in 249 Dave Crowley, the local
28 Fish & Game biologist, felt like it shouldn't be a problem
29 for Fish & Game to give up two of their permits so we could
30 up ours to four and not change the overall harvest cap for
31 that unit. So, the issue of upping it from basically two
32 permits for both those units to eight is not really an
33 issue. It shouldn't be a problem at all, biologically.
34 And, also, just with logistics, Fish & Game agrees with it.
35 They don't have -- at least I hope I'm not speaking out of
36 turn, but that's what Dave had told me, was that he didn't
37 have any problems with it.

38
39 The next issue is a little more complicated and
40 that's this -- that Tatitlek had requested sole use of the
41 subarea. The problem we have with that is currently all
42 rural residents of Unit 6-C and 6-D have C&T for those
43 subareas, which would also include the communities Cordova,
44 Whittier and Chenega Bay.

45
46 The only way we can, under the federal system,
47 restrict it to one village is to do what we call an 804 and
48 that -- we've never done one in the history of the program
49 and we're reluctant to do them. The process in which to do

50 them or to start the process, there has to be a --

00218

1 basically you have to demonstrate the needs aren't being
2 met, number one. You have to say the community's needs
3 aren't being met. And usually the other -- and the reason
4 their needs aren't being met is there's a population
5 shortage, which means that there aren't enough animals to
6 go around for all the villages that want to use them, so
7 now we have to decide among the villages who gets to use
8 them. We've never come to that yet anywhere in the state.
9 We've come close a number of times, but we've usually
10 managed to sort it out without having to basically sit up
11 and say, well, this village has priority use over this
12 village.

13
14 In this case, we didn't feel like the situation is
15 there yet. By increasing the permits to eight within the
16 two units, we're basically increasing the opportunity four-
17 fold and we feel like that should meet the needs of both
18 Tatitlek and the other villages. It shouldn't be a
19 problem.

20
21 MR. VLASOFF: Could I interrupt you?

22
23 MS. DEWHURST: Sure.

24
25 MR. VLASOFF: I think that might have been
26 wrote up -- or misunderstood. I think we wanted -- see,
27 right now we already have a month long season in January
28 when we -- it's pretty much after the -- we hunt with
29 federal permits now.

30
31 MS. DEWHURST: Right.

32
33 MR. VLASOFF: And Gary wanted this number
34 just for Tatitlek, but I think he might have put Tatitlek
35 only on it, but that doesn't mean we wanted the exclusive
36 rights to hunt there.

37
38 MS. DEWHURST: Okay. Well, we called him
39 and we tried to get that clarified and he said that he did
40 want it just.....

41
42 MR. VLASOFF: Actually, I was there when he
43 wrote it. I don't know. I think there's a
44 misinterpretation because Tom shouldn't have got that
45 either today.

46
47 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. Well, if that's not a
48 problem then really, then there isn't an issue as long as
49 we increase the numbers. It sounds like that's really all

50 he wanted. We don't have any problem at this point in

00219

1 increasing the numbers in both units to the request. The
2 only issue we had was trying to say that there was a sole
3 use of the area. But if that's not an issue, then I think
4 everybody is in agreement.

5
6 MR. VLASOFF: Yeah.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What we can do is we can
9 offer an amendment when the proposal comes out.

10
11 MR. VLASOFF: Yeah.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Donna, do you have
14 anything more on it?

15
16 MS. DEWHURST: No.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of Fish
19 & Game? I see that there's no recommendations. Oh, here
20 we've got somebody there.

21
22 MR. MACHIDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
23 the record, my name is Steve Machida. I'm with the
24 Division of Wildlife Conservation for Fish & Game. I'll
25 just provide comments concerning population status of the
26 two areas in consideration, 243 and 249. The area 243, as
27 Donna mentioned, has been closed since 1990 and the reason
28 is because the population previously had been at a high of
29 well over 200 animals and when it had declined to about 120
30 in 1989, the hunt there was closed and it's remained closed
31 since. Last year there was a count done and it was seen
32 that the population had risen from the 120 -- excuse me.
33 It had declined to 62 by 1994, but it has since increased
34 to 154 goats.

35
36 The department or the state, you know, is planning
37 or was planning until now to reopen this hunt similar to
38 the other hunts that are a registration hunt. We still
39 plan on doing that. It just depends on what the federal
40 board does as far as allocation of permits. The one
41 advantage that we do see it being a state hunt is that area
42 243 has approximately 57 percent of the land designated as
43 federal public lands. If a person had a federal permit,
44 they could only hunt on those lands, but if they had a
45 state registration permit, then they could hunt in the
46 entire area. That's an advantage that we would see with
47 having it as a state hunt. However, our area biologist at
48 Cordova would work with the subsistence staff in
49 determining how the hunt is administrated and how many

50 permits the state hunt will have, depending on whether the

00220

1 federal board passes this proposal or not.

2

3 As Donna mentioned, for hunt 249, that area -- the
4 goat population there is in pretty good shape. It's now
5 estimated at close to 500. We have an allowable quota for
6 that area of 25 and if the -- as Donna already mentioned,
7 if there were two more permits that went to the federal
8 system, I mean that shouldn't be a big problem and that
9 sounds like that's already being worked out between Dave
10 Crowley or our Cordova biologist and the federal staff.
11 That ends my comments concerning the two areas. I'm happy
12 to answer questions if you have any.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In area -- I don't
15 remember exactly the number, 243, you said the goats
16 available for taking is 25?

17

18 MR. MACHIDA: No, that's 249.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 249. Okay. What is the
21 normal -- if that's what's available for taking, what is
22 the normal take in a year? Like what was the take last
23 year and the year before if you have it handy?

24

25 MS. DEWHURST: There's a chart, too, on
26 page 41 that shows.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just wanted him to say
29 it out loud.

30

31 MS. DEWHURST: Oh, okay.

32

33 MR. MACHIDA: Okay. Let's see, we don't
34 have the harvest figures fully done.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For last year?

37

38 MR. MACHIDA: I mean for the year that
39 we're in right now. But for last year it was 27 and the
40 year before it was 22.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So it's pretty
43 usually to what the allowable harvest is.

44

45 MR. MACHIDA: Right. See, that hunt is
46 managed by in-season emergency order. So, when the hunt
47 quota -- when the harvest approaches the quota, then the
48 season is closed.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of curiosity, do you

00221

1 have how many out of that 22 or 27 were taken by Tatitlek?

2

3 MR. MACHIDA: I don't have that. I just
4 have the total numbers that were taken.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

7

8 MS. DEWHURST: I have that. On 249 --
9 let's see, the last information we have is from 1996 and
10 two goats were taken.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of 22 or 24, 27,
13 somewhere in that neighborhood?

14

15 MS. DEWHURST: (Nods affirmatively)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So what we'd be
18 doing is increasing the subsistence quota out of that four.
19 Any questions? Thank you. Yeah, so it would have been
20 pretty hard to -- if you've got a 22 or 27, must have been
21 a little misunderstanding. Because if you've got a 22 or a
22 27 goat quota there, to have four goats for Tatitlek only,
23 that would have impacted the other 21 goats.

24

25 MR. VLASOFF: It wasn't meant to be.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Other agency
28 comments. Is there any other agency Forest Service that
29 wishes to speak to them? I won't ask Eastern Interior
30 because it's a long ways away from them. Fish & Game
31 Advisory Committee comments, are there any?

32

33 MS. EAKON: Copper River/Prince William
34 Sound Advisory Committee submitted a written comment
35 opposing Proposal 14, saying that it would disallow
36 residents of Unit 6 that currently have a positive
37 customary and traditional use for goats from participating
38 in goat season in Areas 243 and 249. Chenega and Cordova
39 residents will not be allowed to participate.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And as we talked to Tom
42 this morning from Copper River/Prince William Sound
43 Advisory Committee, they would support the proposal as far
44 as the numbers, but they didn't want to sport the proposal
45 as far as the limitation and I think we've already
46 discussed that. Okay. Any other written public comments?

47

48 MS. EAKON: No, no other written public
49 comments, Mr. Chair.

00222

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any public
2 testimony at this time on it? Hearing none, then the
3 motion to accept Proposal 14 is in order.

4
5 MR. DEMENTI: I move.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved. Do I
8 hear a second?

9
10 MS. SWAN: Second.

11
12 MR. VLASOFF: Second.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
15 seconded. It's open for discussion or amendment.

16
17 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chair?

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

20
21 MR. ELVSAAS: As I understand it, now the
22 motion is just for the numbers.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, the motion is as
25 it's written. We need an amendment to make it just for the
26 numbers.

27
28 MR. VLASOFF: We amend it to say not
29 Tatitlek only.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. You amend it to
32 drop the portion.....

33
34 MR. VLASOFF: Drop the only.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. The portion that
37 says public lands and areas 2G-243 and 2G-249 are closed to
38 taking of votes except by residents of Tatitlek and we'll
39 drop that. Right?

40
41 MR. VLASOFF: Okay.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a second to the
44 amendment?

45
46 MR. ELVSAAS: Second.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor of the
49 amendment signify by saying aye.

00223

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we have a
4 proposal that's amended to allow the increase in goats in
5 Unit 242(sic) and 249. I don't know where I keep coming up
6 with 243. In that case, we have a motion on the table. Do
7 we have any other discussion on it?

8

9 MR. F. JOHN: Question.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
12 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

13

14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
17 saying nay.

18

19 (No opposing responses)

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The motion carries
22 unanimously and that's because, as all of the biological
23 data showed, the heard is capable of taking that kind of
24 increase in opportunity. At this point in time, we'll go
25 on to Proposal 15, page 45 for Unit 11 goat. And we have
26 George Sherrod.

27

28 MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair. Unit 11 goat is a
29 request for individual C&T for Mr. Matt Snyder. Matt is
30 the son of Frank and Sue Entsminger. Last year this board
31 reviewed a request on their behalf for individual C&T's and
32 the board subsequently granted individual C&T's for Frank
33 and Sue. The data contained within this analysis is
34 basically based off of the analysis you had last year
35 focusing on Matt's experiences. As a result of the
36 information provided and past actions by both the councils,
37 Eastern Interior and this council and the board actions, it
38 is recommended that you adopt or you support this proposal
39 and grant an individual C&T to Matt Snyder for goat in Unit
40 11

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Alaska Department
43 of Fish & Game, do we have any comments on this?

44

45 MR. FALL: Mr. Chairman, this is an update
46 to the comment that you see in your book where we said that
47 we would await commenting until we saw the staff analysis.
48 I'll just read the comment that we've provided to the staff
49 back in January. We thought that the eight factor

50 analysis, at best, marginally supported making the

00224

1 individual C&T determination for goats in Unit 11. We saw
2 that Mr. Snyder unquestionably has a history of
3 participating in subsistence activities, but we found very
4 little information in the analysis to support the staff
5 recommendation that he be found to have a C&T use of goats
6 in Unit 11. There really wasn't very much mentioned of
7 goats. There was one mention of his taking a goat, first
8 when he was 10 years old, and that was pretty much it.
9 There was a lot of information about hunting and using the
10 area, but not too much on goats. We thought that there
11 could perhaps be additional information provided in the
12 analysis from the analysis that was prepared for his
13 parents, Frank and Sue Entsminger. They had had a positive
14 finding made and since the family's use pattern of goat
15 hunting met the C&T criteria, that should be part of Mr.
16 Snyder's history and we would have liked to have seen a
17 little bit more of that to beef up the analysis and the
18 support for the individual C&T.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Other agency
21 comments or Eastern Interior. Did Eastern Interior even
22 look at this one?

23
24 MR. GOOD: Just a quick one here. We acted
25 to defer it and we had no problems with the proposal
26 itself. We deferred it to you since it's technically in
27 your area. The only concern that we really had was one
28 that we've had all along. We thought individual C&T's seem
29 like an awkward thing to bring before the council. We felt
30 that there should be a better administrative way to handle
31 it rather than coming to the council. Although we have to
32 also admit that where we first looked at this, you remember
33 we had such a battle with getting Dan O'Connor through, it
34 seemed to take forever. We began to wonder if he would die
35 before he ever got through this thing. But in this
36 particular case, there really hasn't been a big rush of
37 individual C&T's. They've been apparently very rare. But,
38 as I said, the only concern that we discussed was we felt
39 that bringing individual people before the council seemed
40 awkward and that perhaps there should be a better
41 administrative process here. That's the only comments from
42 us.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Nat. I thought
45 we had gone through a better administrative way to do that.
46 I thought that was one of the things that we had worked on
47 in the past, but I see that we have individual proposals in
48 front of us, so that must be part of the process and you
49 have to face it, too.

00225

1 MR. GOOD: Yeah. That was the only concern
2 we had. It seemed difficult to bring individual people in
3 front of us, and in this case basically a kid, and already
4 the family having been approved. But, anyway, it's yours.
5

6 MR. F. JOHN: What did you say? What was
7 the last comment?
8

9 MR. GOOD: I'm referring to the fact that
10 this is the son of Frank and Sue Entsminger.
11

12 MR. F. JOHN: And they've been approved,
13 yeah?
14

15 MR. GOOD: Yeah, right.
16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's awful hard to not
18 approve a child of somebody who is approved. Okay. The
19 next thing we have is Fish & Game Advisory Committee
20 comments. Are there any, Helga?
21

22 MS. EAKON: No. The only written comment
23 we received was from Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
24 Resource Commission, which supports this proposal.
25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Wrangell-St. Elias
27 Regional Subsistence supports it. Okay. We need -- no,
28 public testimony. Do we have some, Eleanor?
29

30 MS. DEMENTI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CRNA
31 supports this proposal for Matthew Snyder to have
32 individual C&T in Unit 11 and at this time CRNA concludes
33 its testimony and would like to thank the council for
34 giving us the opportunity to testify.
35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. Motion
37 to accept Proposal 15 is in order.
38

39 MR. F. JOHN: I make a motion to accept
40 Proposal 15.
41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?
43

44 MR. VLASOFF: Second.
45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
47 seconded to accept Proposal 15, granting individual C&T to
48 Matt Snyder.....
49

00226

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Discussion?

2

3 MR. F. JOHN: I'd like to say that I've
4 known Matt Snyder since he was a little kid and he's for
5 T&C, customary history. He's been all there is, what
6 everybody has been saying about him and I would support
7 this.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
10 comments? You can say what you were going to say.

11

12 MS. SWAN: I wasn't going to say anything.
13 I was going to say question.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I thought you
16 were going to say. The question has been called. All in
17 favor signify by saying aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
22 saying nay.

23

24 (No opposing responses)

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
27 unanimously. Okay. Proposal 16. At this point in time,
28 Proposal 16, if you want -- I suppose we could even have,
29 since we've talked about dropping it, Ken could make a
30 motion to accept this proposal and we could just vote.....

31

32 MR. SHERROD: Vote it down and then.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Vote it down and then
35 go.....

36

37 MR. SHERROD:your justification being
38 lack of any new information.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

41

42 MS. EAKON: And, for the record, Mr. Chair,
43 I did send a certified letter, as you requested, to Mr.
44 Kompkoff and we do have the receipt that he received it,
45 but we have not received any response.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Ken, would you like
48 to make a motion that we accept Proposal 16?

49

MS. SWAN: So moved.

00227

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been so moved. You
2 didn't get a chance to second it.

3
4 MR. VLASOFF: Second.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
7 seconded. We have not received the new information that we
8 were supposed to have, so at this time I don't think we
9 have much choice but to vote the proposal down.

10
11 MR. F. JOHN: Question.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
14 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

15
16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Whoa. Wait a second. Do
19 you understand the motion on the table?

20
21 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I understand the
22 motion. I may not understand the procedure. I'm sorry.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The motion is to accept
25 the proposal. So, if you wish to vote it down, you have to
26 vote on the other side.

27
28 MR. ELVSAAS: That's right.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, I'm sorry that
31 I didn't make that clearer before I called the question, so
32 I'll start over.

33
34 MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, I understood it. I was
35 just jumping the gun.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor signify by
38 saying aye.

39
40 (No in favor responses)

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
43 saying nay.

44
45 IN UNISON: Nay.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails. Okay. We
48 are now on Proposal 17. Request establishment of a moose
49 season in 6-B and C.

00228

1 MS. DEWHURST: Page 76.

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Page 76. Okay. That's
4 Donna, right? Donna, would you.....

5
6 MS. DEWHURST: This was proposed by the
7 Native Village of Eyak Traditional Council and it was to
8 establish a federal subsistence moose harvest for 10 bulls
9 and each in Units 6-B and 6-C. The present system that
10 moose harvest is being managed in Cordova is in the 1990s
11 there was a large cooperative effort made between ADF&G,
12 the local residents and the Copper River/Prince William
13 Sound Advisory Committee to develop a cooperative moose
14 management plan.

15
16 I wasn't involved, but from what I was told from a
17 couple of different individuals it went through a lot of
18 growing pains and they finally produced something they felt
19 was a pretty good document and that's how moose are
20 currently -- the harvest is currently being managed under
21 that guidance.

22
23 Currently, the system is managed primarily by the
24 state as far as the harvest goes. The moose, themselves,
25 in the area, of course, were an introduction. Moose
26 haven't been in that area for at least recent recorded
27 history and were reintroduced into the area and are doing
28 quite well. Except for 9-B, as was mentioned by Tom
29 yesterday, there are some problems in the 9-B area -- I'm
30 sorry, 6-B, that is placing some concern and the state is
31 looking closely at that and interested in surveys this
32 winter as far as getting an update on that.

33
34 The way the current system -- it's kind of
35 complicated, but I'll try to keep it as simple as I can,
36 but it's a complicated hunt that they have down there.
37 First of all, 6-C, and we're mainly talking the residents
38 of Cordova and if you look on the map, the page following
39 76, you can kind of see the area. Unfortunately, this map
40 doesn't have the road on it. I realize that and I made a
41 note that we'll try to get the map for the board to have
42 the road on it because I think it would clarify things.
43 There is a road that kind of goes horizontally down from
44 Cordova into 6-B and then curves upward.

45
46 Basically, from my understanding in the area, 6-C
47 is a drawing permit through the state and that's what most
48 of the residents, at least the Cordova residents, try for
49 first because that way they can get their moose in their

50 back yard basically. Drawing permits, of course there is

00229

1 no priority given to local residents for drawing permits,
2 so anybody could potentially get a drawing permit.
3 Although Cordova residents historically have done quite
4 well with the drawing permits. Since 1994, they've
5 averaged 76 percent, but the range has gone up to 91
6 percent as far as getting the drawing permits. Even though
7 there's no priority given to them, luck of the draw,
8 they've done quite well. Probably just they're putting in
9 more for it than other people.

10
11 So that's the way the moose in 6-C have been
12 managed and the drawing permit is currently for both bulls
13 and cows, but the cows is limited, I believe, to five, as
14 far as the drawing permits issued. 6-B is kind of the
15 reserve animals. From my understanding, people that don't
16 get drawing permits then go get a registration permit from
17 the state for 6-B and there's some stipulations in 6-B that
18 have been worked out over the years as far as
19 transportation restrictions. Motorized vehicles -- the
20 very first part of the season, August 27 through the 31st -
21 - I'm sorry, I have to back up.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's right.

24
25 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, August 27th through
26 the 31st, they can't use motorized vehicles, so it's
27 basically a walk-in hunt. And then after that they can use
28 motorized vehicles, but the same day use of airboats is
29 prohibited. So they've evidently been having problems in
30 the past with airboat use and they wanted to have a
31 priority given to walk-in hunters the first part of the
32 season since there is that road that provides ready access.

33
34 So there's this complicated system in place right
35 now that was developed through an area cooperative effort.
36 It wasn't like it just magically came into place. What the
37 Eyak Traditional Council was asking us to do was to further
38 complicate it, basically, and add a federal hunt system on
39 top of that. The only real advantage that would provide
40 is, of course, with the federal system, we give rural
41 preference. So Cordova residents would get all the permits
42 under the federal system.

43
44 With what they're requesting with the 10 bulls in
45 each unit though, that doesn't really give them much more
46 than they have right now based on the average percentages
47 of what they're drawing out of the drawing permits and the
48 registration system. For example, under the drawing
49 system, we place 10 in. The way we figure, that would

50 increase Cordova's percentage of permits to 84 permits or

00230

1 84 percent. Basically, they're not gaining that much with
2 this system.

3
4 There's a number of problems, too, with instituting
5 a federal system, especially for both 6-B and 6-C. For 6-
6 C, if you go back to the map, a large chunk of 6-C there's
7 no federal lands and, of course, federal permits are only
8 good on federal lands. To further complicate it, most of
9 the road system is off of federal lands, which is where a
10 lot of the folks like to hunt from, the road system. So,
11 under the federal system, where residents would not be able
12 to hunt under the Copper River Highway, the Sheridan
13 Glacier Road and other roads north of the airport. Since
14 1996, approximately 39 percent of the moose killed in that
15 unit were taken on non-federal lands and most of those were
16 taken by that early season walk-in hunters, which were
17 still accessing from the road, but then walking in.

18
19 In 6-B, it's kind of a whole different situation.
20 As we mentioned, the population isn't doing all that well.
21 Primarily a problem with the calves. And it's an open
22 registration hunt with no limit, but then they set an upper
23 limit cap on when they close the hunt and there are the
24 restrictions, the transportation restrictions, but because
25 it's basically anybody who wants a permit can get a permit,
26 anybody from Cordova could get a permit already under the
27 state system to hunt in 6-B. So, having a federal system
28 that provided guaranteed permits to Cordova residents, they
29 aren't gaining anything because already anybody that wants
30 one can get a state permit. So it's kind of hard to
31 understand how the federal system would benefit Cordova
32 hunters in 6-B.

33
34 I spent a long time on the phone talking with the
35 Forest Service representative down in Cordova and with Dave
36 Crowley with the state and we were all kind of scratching
37 our heads trying to figure out a way to maybe provide more
38 opportunity but yet not mess up the system that's in place
39 seems to be working fairly well right now. And the only
40 thing we could come up with at all, after a lot of
41 brain-storming, was we looked back to 6-C, which is the
42 preference hunt, and said, well, there's those five cow
43 permits that are issued under drawing and we knew
44 subsistence hunters often prefer cows because the meat
45 tends to be a little bit better and we thought, well, if we
46 took those five cow permits and put them under the federal
47 system, we could guarantee that those five cow permits
48 always go to Cordova residents. And we thought, well,
49 maybe that would provide some additional opportunity

50 without really setting up a whole other tier of this

00231

1 federal hunt system on top of what is already somewhat of a
2 complicated state hunt system.

3
4 So that's what we kind of talked about and we
5 thought that might be a middle ground. It would provide
6 additional opportunity by ensuring the cow permits always
7 go to Cordova residents. Where with this 10 bulls in each
8 unit, it doesn't seem that it would really add anything as
9 far as an advantage to Cordova residents from what we can
10 tell.

11
12 And the biology of the moose in 6-C, as Tom
13 mentioned yesterday, the population seems to be doing quite
14 well and it's anticipated under their management plan that
15 they will be upping the harvest quotas soon in the near
16 future. What they're looking for is a post-hunting
17 population of 400 moose. If they get that, then they'll
18 probably up the quotas. They're anticipating getting that
19 sometime in the near future. So, if that happens, we could
20 adjust that five cows if let's say down the road they say
21 now it will support eight cows or whatever, we could adjust
22 that possibly to increase it to the future, but right now
23 it's a five cow permit.

24
25 This is really kind of convoluted, but the bottom
26 line is that was the best we could come up with right now.
27 We really tried to look at the situation and say what could
28 we really give to Cordova with the federal system. In the
29 way our federal system works, what could we offer them as
30 additional opportunity and we didn't feel like the 10 bulls
31 that they were requesting would really give them any
32 additional opportunity, where we thought if we go back and
33 say, well, the five cows under the 6-C hunt, we thought
34 that actually might.

35
36 The other option would be to, of course, reject
37 this proposal totally and just leave this system that has
38 been developed under a large cooperative effort in place.
39 We considered that, too. There were a lot of things we
40 considered and put on the table. But the bottom line was
41 that -- at least our initial staff recommendation is to go
42 with the five cow drawing permit in 6-C and make that under
43 the federal system and leave everything else as is. Any
44 questions?

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donna, if you put those
47 five cows under the federal drawing system, then basically
48 they're taken out of the state drawing system?

49

MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. The state wouldn't

00232

1 issue five cow permits anymore.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They have the facilities
4 in place to run a drawing system in Cordova right now
5 because they do it for goats.

6

7 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. From talking with
8 them, it shouldn't be a problem. We actually issue the
9 permits out of our office and just send them down to there
10 and then they give them out.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the ability to handle
13 it is no problem.

14

15 MS. DEWHURST: Shouldn't be a problem.

16

17 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair?

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

20

21 MR. DEMENTI: Why five cows?

22

23 MS. DEWHURST: That's under their
24 agreement. There's only five cows being allowed to be
25 taken annually.

26

27 MR. DEMENTI: Wouldn't that -- the
28 productive -- I mean reproducing.....

29

30 MS. DEWHURST: Well, evidently, that's what
31 they decided could be taken.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's part of the plan
34 for down there. We have a limited moose range, a very
35 limited moose range. It's just between certain areas. And
36 they have a plan to maintain it at a certain level. In the
37 past, when we had a larger herd, we usually took -- I think
38 we took as high as 20 cows, but we've always had a cow
39 season down there because you can't have them over-populate
40 the range. Right now the herd dropped and a plan was
41 instituted so the cow quota was cut, but they didn't, as a
42 community, want to give up the cows completely, so they
43 dropped it to five. When the herd goes up to a certain
44 level, the cow quota increases until it's back to where
45 it's at a maintenance level.

46

47 MR. DEMENTI: Okay.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's basically why the

50 cows are in there. It has to be reinstated -- see,

00233

1 that's the question I was going to ask you. An antler-less
2 moose season has to be reinstated by the Board of Game
3 every year. In fact, it's one of the proposals before.....
4

5 MS. DEWHURST: We wouldn't have to do that
6 under us.
7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You would not have to do
9 that under federal?
10

11 MS. DEWHURST: No. Not if we put it under
12 federal regulations, no. Once it's in the books, it's
13 there permanently. Special actions, if something is
14 instituted as a special action, has to be either redone
15 every year or dropped. But, no, we're talking about
16 permanent regulations.
17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because the cow season is
19 a special action by the state board for emergency.
20

21 MS. DEWHURST: Right. Where if we
22 established it under ours, it wouldn't be. It would be
23 under permanent regulation.
24

25 MR. F. JOHN: Mr. Chair?
26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.
28

29 MR. F. JOHN: I have a question. I see
30 Eyak brought this up. This five cow -- it said everybody
31 in Cordova, didn't it?
32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.
34

35 MS. DEWHURST: But it would ensure that
36 they always go to Cordova residents. That all those five
37 would go to Cordova resident, where right now it's not a
38 guarantee.
39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's the luck of the draw.
41 Any other questions for Donna? Alaska Department of Fish &
42 Game comments.
43

44 MR. MACHIDA: For the record, my name is
45 Steve Machida with Fish & Game. Donna has already provided
46 an overview of the hunt administration in 6-B and C, so I
47 won't go into that. I will just make a few comments
48 concerning the population status of both 6-B and 6-C and
49 comment on the staff recommendation.

00234

1 As you heard in earlier testimony, the moose
2 population in 6-B isn't doing all that well right now. The
3 management goal that was developed in the cooperative
4 management plan that was mentioned earlier is about 350
5 moose. Since it was done last November, we found a
6 population of 250. The alarming thing about this
7 population is that the percentage of calves in the
8 population has not come up. It's still at about 4 percent,
9 so it's a population that's lower than what the goal is and
10 the number of calves surviving to adulthood is still low.
11 So we're anticipating that harvest will remain at about 20
12 to 25 bulls as it's been for the last few years in 6-B.

13
14 In 6-C, the population is doing quite a bit better.
15 There was a census done two years ago and 334 moose were
16 counted in that census in 6-B, you know, with a cap
17 percentage of 24 percent, which is fairly good. One of
18 these stipulations in the management plan is when the moose
19 population reaches 400, then the quotas will be re-examined
20 and with increases in both bull and cow quotas with the
21 objective of maintaining the population rather than having
22 a goal of an increasing population.

23
24 We believe that we're close to that now and we just
25 need to get the proper weather conditions and such to do a
26 census again. We had one planned this year. It hasn't
27 been pulled off yet, but there's still a little bit of time
28 that this can get done.

29
30 Just a brief comment on the proposal by the federal
31 staff to have a federal drawing out of five cows. I guess
32 the one problem that we see with this arrangement is that,
33 you know, under this proposal all the cow permits would go
34 to Cordova. One of the problems that we see is that about
35 16 percent of the land on 6-C is managed by the federal
36 government. The remained is managed by the state and just
37 about all the areas along the road system aren't in federal
38 land jurisdiction. Under the current system, if an
39 individual draws a state permit for a cow, they can hunt
40 virtually anywhere in 6-B, including along the road. If
41 they had a federal permit, then that would be more
42 difficult because there's relatively little federal land
43 that's right near the road. I'm just not sure how much
44 would be gained because right now most of the cow permits
45 go to Cordova residents and this is probably just because
46 they're the majority of the people that apply and
47 relatively few people from other parts of the state apply.

48

49

Cordova residents may see a gain of a cow every

00235

1 year in their harvest quota, but you'd have to balance that
2 against the more difficult access that you'd have with
3 trying to find federal land that you can access along the
4 road system. That concludes my comments.

5

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions?

6

MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chair?

7

8

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

9

10

MR. DEMENTI: How many of these animals go
12 to predation, do you know?

11

12

13

14

MR. MACHIDA: You're talking about 6-B?

15

16

17

MR. DEMENTI: Yeah.

18

19

MR. MACHIDA: Well, that's something that
20 we don't have a good handle on. We do know that in 6-B, as
21 in other parts of the state, bear numbers and wolf numbers
22 are relatively high. Probably higher than they've been in
23 a long time. We suspect that a large percentage of the
24 calves do get lost to predators and we don't have radio
25 collar information to say that, but that's the best
26 estimate that we have from our Cordova biologist.

27

28

MR. VLASOFF: Mr. Chair?

29

30

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ken.

31

32

MR. VLASOFF: In 6-B, will this do anything
33 to the registration hunt?

34

35

MR. MACHIDA: Pardon me?

36

37

MR. VLASOFF: Will the lower percentage in
38 moose in 6-B, will this affect the registration hunt?

39

40

MR. MACHIDA: What that does is it affects
41 the size of the quota that's allowed. Like if the
42 population is at its goal of 350, then you can have a much
43 higher quota of 35 or more animals being taken, as well as
44 some cows. But right now the quota is lower because the
45 population is at a lower number with the small cap
46 percentage.

47

48

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

49

MR. ELVSAAS: First of all, you have 25

00236

1 bulls in 6-B. What about 6-C?

2

3 MR. MACHIDA: Currently, the quota is 20
4 bulls and five cows.

5

6 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay.

7

8 MR. MACHIDA: Once the population hits 400,
9 then that will be re-evaluated and there will be increases
10 in both.

11

12 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay. Now, also in looking
13 at the map we have before us without the road showing, but
14 still you can -- I think we all understand where the road
15 goes through the private lands and state lands. There's
16 still a fair amount of federal lands to hunt near the road,
17 as you get out past the airport. So it's not totally
18 blocked off for this concept.

19

20 And the other thing I wanted to mention was if the
21 herd is building, as apparently that seems to be the
22 thinking here, what can we do to assure the local people
23 that they can have an increase also? For instance, we've
24 got five -- say we go for five cows now. Will we go six,
25 seven, on up? I don't think that's a question for you, but
26 it is for us. I think for now, we're looking at something
27 realistic for five cows.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?

30 Thank you.

31

32 MS. DEWHURST: That number could be
33 adjusted either if it was out of sequence, if it happened
34 in the summer and you wanted it for that immediate coming
35 season, it could be a special action or, if the timing was
36 right, you could just put a new proposal in to up the
37 number of cow permits in the following year. So it could
38 be adjusted. You don't have to live with five forever.

39

40 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Other agency
43 comments? I'm not going to ask Nat on this one. You've
44 got a comment on this one, Nat?

45

46 MR. GOOD: I have a question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. You've been there.

49 You understand the area.

00237

1 MR. GOOD: Yeah. My question is this. If
2 you have registration permits, there's no limitation to the
3 number of people that can sign up, at least not in the
4 hunts as I know them. You could have 30 or 40 people sign
5 up for permits. The moose are really quite vulnerable in
6 this area. How do you prevent this hunt from taking more
7 than five cows, for instance, on opening day?

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think anybody was
10 talking about registration permits for the cows.

11
12 MS. DEWHURST: Well, what we'd be talking
13 about, they are -- all our permits are called registration
14 permits. Now, we have the option of issuing -- we run
15 hunts in two different ways. For example, the Seward
16 Peninsula with muskox, we only issue limited numbers of
17 registration permits. So if we're taking 10 muskox in a
18 sub-unit, we issue 10 permits. We have other hunts where
19 we have a harvest quota, like Nelchina caribou, but we
20 issue unlimited registration permits and then we depend on
21 the quota to cut it off. I think in this case we'd only be
22 talking about issuing five permits, so it would probably be
23 done -- it would be up to the local residents how it's
24 done, but generally there's a drawing, but only Cordova
25 residents would be eligible to put in for the drawing, but
26 it would still be a drawing only among Cordova residents.

27
28 MR. GOOD: Okay.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nat asked a very
31 appropriate question because I think the way the hunt has
32 been run out in 6-B with registration, I think there's only
33 been one or two years since I've been there that they
34 overshot their mark and that's one of the reasons that the
35 airboats were put on limitations. You have to listen to
36 the radio, you have to report your moose and.....

37
38 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, that's the other
39 option. You could actually do it either way and that would
40 be up to the council. It could be done either way. That
41 way puts a lot of pressure on the Forest Service to keep on
42 top of it.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, the community turned
45 that down in 6-C as a community a number of years ago
46 because that's how the hunt out there was first operated.
47 It just basically became dangerous. So, instead, what the
48 community opted for was -- I mean it was the community's
49 choice to opt for a drawing hunt because then if you got

50 drawn you had a month or a month and a half to go get your

00238

1 moose, you could do it leisurely and you could do it
2 without having everybody piled on top of you. Like I said,
3 everybody helps everybody get their moose down there. If
4 you see a moose, you run into town and find somebody that's
5 got a permit and tell them there's a moose available. I
6 really think that you'd find that the community -- and, you
7 see, even by this proposal -- this proposal calls for a
8 drawing. It does not call for an open registration hunt.
9 I mean even as the Native Village of Eyak, they called for
10 a drawing because of the fact that as a community we
11 recognize it's a limited amount of space and a lot of
12 people. If you have an open hunt in Unit C or even Unit B,
13 you could have the potential for accidents.

14
15 Okay. We have Fish & Game Advisory Committee
16 comments. We have the written ones and then we have the
17 ones that Tom called in this morning.

18
19 MS. EAKON: The Copper River/Prince William
20 Sound Advisory Committee opposed because it would make this
21 drawing hunt exclusive for the residents of Cordova. These
22 hunts would have to be co-managed, there would be confusion
23 as to the areas available for access and it would eliminate
24 many points of the moose management plan. The Wrangell-St.
25 Elias Subsistence Resource Commission took no action for
26 lack of familiarity with the situation.

27
28 And we received a fax the other day from Robert
29 Henrichs, president of Native Village of Eyak Traditional
30 Council, the originator of the proposal. He wrote,
31 Chairman Lohse, the Native Village of Eyak is located at
32 Cordova, Alaska, with 528 members. We are the largest
33 tribe on the Copper River, Prince William Sound, the
34 Chugach National Forest and the Chugach Region. We are
35 recognized by the United States and have a government to
36 government relationship with them. We are in the process
37 of negotiating the same position with the State of Alaska.
38 Our traditional lands and waters stretch from Icy Bay on
39 the east to where they met with Tatitlek's traditional
40 lands on the west. The tribes in the Chugach Region have
41 claimed aboriginal rights on the Outer Continental Shelf
42 200 miles to the south.

43
44 We have two proposals before you, Number 17 and
45 Number 18. We want to make it very clear that the Copper
46 River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee does not
47 represent the Native Village of Eyak. Because of the
48 expense for travel, as a result of the appeal of the Katie
49 John decision, the Native Village of Eyak cannot afford to

50 attend this meeting.

00239

1 If the United States government has funded travel
2 to this meeting for people opposing our proposals, then
3 they are taking sides on these issues. Good luck with your
4 meetings. Sincerely yours, Bob Henrichs. End of comments,
5 Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly. That's
8 all the written comments?

9
10 MS. EAKON: Yes.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any public
13 testimony on this one? Hearing none, a motion to accept
14 this proposal in order so we can discuss or amend.

15
16 MR. DEMENTI: So moved.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved. Do I
19 hear a second?

20
21 MR. VLASOFF: Second.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
24 seconded. The proposal is on the table. Proposal 17.
25 Okay. Discussion.

26
27 MR. VLASOFF: I think we should leave it
28 alone.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we've heard a lot of
31 different options that we could do. We've heard that
32 currently anywhere from 76 to 91 percent of the moose are
33 already taken by Cordova, yet some people feel that this
34 would be nice to have people in the local area be
35 guaranteed a certain percentage.

36
37 MS. SWAN: What happens if we just let it
38 be, leave it as it is? What's the result of that?

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You mean what would happen
41 if we would vote it in the way it is?

42
43 MR. ELVSAAS: It would be 10 bulls.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Huh?

46
47 MR. ELVSAAS: It would be 10 bulls.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It would be 10 bulls and

50 10 bulls in Unit B and Unit C. Currently, units -- like we

00240

1 were told Unit B is a registration hunt, but it would take
2 10 of those bulls and put them on a drawing hunt. There
3 would be 10 bulls out of Unit C out of the 20 bulls that
4 would be put on a drawing hunt for Cordova residents only
5 and that would be 10 bulls and five cows for a drawing hunt
6 for the rest of the state, including other Cordova --
7 including Cordova residents. Now, this is a question in my
8 mind. What would happen if Cordova residents applied for
9 both drawings and doubled their chances?

10
11 MS. DEWHURST: The way we dealt with -- we
12 had that same situation with muskox on Seward Pen. and what
13 was decided up there was you had to basically decide which
14 one you were going to hunt under. You could have a state -
15 - you could have a state -- they're in a different
16 situation because their federal lands are closed, but
17 basically you couldn't get two muskox.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

20
21 MS. DEWHURST: You either hunted one under
22 the state or hunted one under the federal

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you could apply for
25 both permits.

26
27 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

30
31 MS. DEWHURST: I don't know what you would
32 gain by having both -- well, I guess the thing you would
33 gain is you could off of federal lands if you.....

34
35 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Opportunity.

36
37 MS. DEWHURST:had the state permit.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the other suggestion
40 was an amendment like Donna talked about where we could
41 amend it to the cows. And that could even be tied to all
42 cows, if it -- you know, to all available cows if it -- you
43 know, to all available cows if a person wanted to do that.
44 That way you wouldn't have to do any increasing or
45 decreasing in the future. Or the proposal can be voted in
46 as it is, or vote it down as it is. So it's up to the wish
47 of the council.

48
49 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman?

00241

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Fred?

2

3 MR. ELVSAAS: I believe that if we amend
4 this to do the five cows in 6(C), I think we're doing the
5 right thing here. We're establishing the subsistence hunt
6 for the people that qualify for it, and, you know, we're
7 faced with a possibility if the rest of the state was to
8 apply for a permit, and the local people didn't get even a
9 fair shake say at the permits, then they have lost
10 something they've worked for years to build. Those people
11 over there built that herd. And in my mind, it's their
12 herd. But I would recommend that we amend this proposal to
13 say five cows in 6(C). But as.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.....

16

17 MR. F. JOHN: I second.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: or discussion?

20

21 MR. F. JOHN: I second.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been seconded by Fred
24 John, Jr., to amend this proposal to change it from one
25 bull to ten bulls.

26

27 MR. ELVSAAS: No, ten bulls.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: From ten bulls in each
30 unit to just five cows in Unit (C).

31

32 MR. ELVSAAS: Right.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And is that because you --
35 I mean, Do you have any overriding reason for that, like
36 the fact that the cows are more of a subsistence animal, or
37 anything like that or.....

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: Well.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:just that you think
42 that it's more easy to manage or.....

43

44 MR. ELVSAAS: I think there -- you know,
45 there's an allowable cow hunt there. I think that we could
46 amend this at some future date, and possibly could even
47 amend it at this point to say the allowable cows. But I
48 think to start this and to establish this subsistence hunt,
49 and to assure the people of the area that utilize the

50 animals and had built this herd, that they have at least a

00242

1 fair chance at their animals I would say with my amended
2 motion.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Ken?

5
6 MR. VLASOFF: How would it be with five
7 cows and five bulls in 6(A)?

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That can be offered as an
10 amendment.

11
12 MR. VLASOFF: What does Donna think of that
13 one?

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Huh?

16
17 MS. DEWHURST: Huh?

18
19 MR. VLASOFF: What do you think of that?

20
21 MS. DEWHURST: Well, we talked about that.
22 What we were trying to avoid was dividing up the bull
23 harvest, because the bull harvest right now is managed by
24 the state, and we've just thought that might get
25 complicated to have the number -- the bull har -- the bull
26 permit split between the state and federal system. That's
27 why we looked at it and we said, well, if we just do the
28 cows, it's kind of a cleaner cut. So the feds have the
29 cows, the state has the bulls, and it was kind of a clean
30 cut that way. We weren't mixing the systems.

31
32 MS. SWAN: But then that would keep the
33 state-run bull harvest intact and.....

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

36
37 MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The only problem that I
40 can see is that currently bull harvest operates on state,
41 federal, and private land, and the cow harvest operates on
42 state, private and federal land.

43
44 MR. VLASOFF: Currently.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Currently. And this would
47 limit the cow hunt to nothing but federal land, most of
48 which is a little harder accessible than some of the state
49 land, and the average Cordovan likes to take their moose

50 within two seine lengths from the road so that they can --

00243

1 so that they can tow them out with a seine rope. And
2 that's just -- I'm just I just threw that in. But.....

3
4 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is
5 a fair amount of.....

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Federal land?

8
9 MR. ELVSAAS:federal lands along the
10 highway.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right, there is.

13
14 MR. ELVSAAS:once you get past the
15 airport.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It would be interesting to
18 -- It would be interesting to see. I think that that's
19 probably sufficient. An awful of the moose are taken
20 between town and the airport, but.....

21
22 MR. ELVSAAS: Uh-huh.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:I think that's
25 sufficient. And if that's the amendment, that's, you know,
26 whatever -- however the council feels on it.....

27
28 MR. F. JOHN: Call the question on the
29 amendment

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah?

32
33 MR. F. JOHN: Question.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, you're calling the
36 question on the amendment?

37
38 MR. F. JOHN: Yeah.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's no further
41 discussion on the amendment. The question's been called.
42 All in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye?

43
44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
47 saying nay?

48
49 (No opposing votes.)

00244

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The amendment carries.

2
3 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman?

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

6
7 MR. ELVSAAS: On the main motion, you know,
8 I think it needs to have a year and maybe they'll come back
9 and not want this, you know. If that is fact that the bulk
10 of those cows are taken in that short area from town to the
11 -- well, what the heck, that's 13 miles. That's not a
12 short area, but.....

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's 13 out of 26.....

15
16 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:it's half.

19
20 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah. And so anyway, you
21 know, they may decide this is not what they really prefer,
22 so.....

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

25
26 MR. ELVSAAS: But it sure will be tougher
27 to get those ten bulls if they followed the same
28 guidelines.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So we have an
31 amended motion on the floor. This is Unit 6, one cow by
32 drawing permit.....

33
34 MS. DEWHURST: I thought it was five.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Huh?

37
38 MS. DEWHURST: Five cows?

39
40 MR. ELVSAAS: Five.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, one cow by drawing
43 permit. The drawing would be open to residents of Unit
44 6(B) and (C), and the season will be closed when the unit
45 has six cows harvested.

46
47 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five cows.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Five cows. Five cows.....

00245

1 MS. DEWHURST: I thought.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:harvested. Five
4 cows.

5

6 MS. DEWHURST: Well, excuse me. I thought
7 you said you didn't want to go.....

8

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you in the same
10 meeting?

11

12 MS. DEWHURST:that way. I guess I'm
13 misunderstanding. I thought you said you didn't want to go
14 with the open registration and the quota, that you.....

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't.

17

18 MS. DEWHURST:preferred to go.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't.

21

22 MS. DEWHURST:with the five?

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Listen. Unit 6(C) one cow
25 by drawing permit.

26

27 MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what it says right
30 there. That's the -- that's how they have it written. One
31 -- they have one bull by drawing permit. We've.....

32

33 MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:amended it to we're
36 going to take five cows, right?

37

38 MS. DEWHURST: You might -- well, another
39 option would be to look on page 79 on the staff
40 recommendation.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That doesn't say anything
43 by drawing.

44

45 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, I could add that. I
46 put in a note in there, I could say issued by an annual
47 drawing on the end there.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 'Cause see, the conclusion

50 is federal registration permit harvest for five cows in

00246

1 Unit.....

2

3 MS. DEWHURST: Right.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:6(C), so I was trying
6 to come up with one that matched or mirrored the proposal
7 in front of us, which would be one cow by drawing permit.
8 Drawing would be opened to residents of Unit 6(B) and (C).
9 The season would be closed when five cows are harvested
10 in.....

11

12 MS. DEWHURST: Under that we would.....

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:Unit 6(C).

15

16 MS. DEWHURST:issue unlimited
17 permits.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, you couldn't. It's a
20 drawing. One cow by drawing permit is what theirs called
21 for.

22

23 MS. DEWHURST: Then why would you even have
24 a quota if you're only issuing five? You would just have a
25 season they could use the five permits.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that is funny,
28 because that's how they wrote it. I just was.....

29

30 MS. DEWHURST: I know, I was.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

33

34 MS. DEWHURST:I see what it saying,
35 the logic.....

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. What you could say
38 is just six cows by drawing permits.....

39

40 MS. DEWHURST: Five.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:in Unit 6(C).

43

44 MR. F. JOHN: Five cows.

45

46 MS. DEWHURST: Five cows.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Five cows. Five cows by
49 drawing permit in -- boy, it's just late.

00247

1 MR. F. JOHN: (Indiscernible - simultaneous
2 speech) one more.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Five cows by drawing
5 permit in Unit 6(C). Is that what you were basically
6 amending?

7
8 MR. ELVSAAS: That was the intent, yes.

9
10 MS. DEWHURST: And then the season we were
11 proposing was the same season as the state, which was
12 September 1 through August 31st, to parallel the state
13 season.

14
15 MR. VLASOFF: September 1 through August
16 31st?

17
18 MS. DEWHURST: October 31st. September 1
19 through October 31st.

20
21 MR. ELVSAAS: The irony in their proposal
22 is that if they got the ten bulls, the season closes
23 according to them, but it's closed anyway.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

26
27 MR. ELVSAAS: You know, there's no more
28 eligible hunters.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. So that part
31 didn't need to be in there.

32
33 MS. DEWHURST: Right.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So as amended, what
36 you amended it to is Unit 6(C), five cows by drawing
37 permit, and we can stop right there. September 1 through
38 October 31st, which is at the same time.....

39
40 MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:that the state season
43 is going on.

44
45 MS. DEWHURST: And just to let you know
46 that when it comes out in federal regulation, we don't have
47 drawing permits, and we're careful about using that
48 language, because that's a special system the state has.
49 So when it comes out in federal -- under actual in

50 regulation, it will say by federal registration permit,

00248

1 because that's what our permits are called. It's the same
2 thing, it's just we don't have drawing permits. It's
3 confusing. That's why I was suggesting the other language,
4 and just saying issued by an annual drawing. It just
5 clarifies it, because it's a touchy situation. People
6 could get confused with the state's drawing, which is an
7 open drawing to everybody. That's why we're careful about
8 using that same language. I originally had that language
9 and it could pounced on, that's why I mention that.
10 Somebody said, oh, people are going to get confused.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So the two parts to
13 the amendment -- or the two parts that we need to keep in
14 is that it's six cows, it's open.....

15
16 MS. DEWHURST: Five.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:only to residents of
19 Units 6(B) and (C).

20
21 MR. F. JOHN: Five cows.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Five cows. It's open only
24 to residents of Unit 6(B) and (C). Okay. That's the
25 amendment that we voted on. That's the amendment we voted
26 on as you understood it?

27
28 MR. ELVSAAS: (Nods affirmative)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We did not amend
31 the dates. We either need a motion to amend the dates on
32 this proposal, or we can leave the dates as they stand. If
33 we vote on it as the motion sits right now, we will be
34 voting that there will be five cows by drawing permits in
35 Unit 6(C) to open to residents of Unit 6(B) and (C) from
36 August 15th through December 31st. Any further discussion?

37
38
39 MR. ELVSAAS: What is the.....

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none.....

42
43 MR. ELVSAAS:current.....

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:the question's in
46 order. What?

47
48 MR. ELVSAAS: What is the current -- I
49 see.....

00249

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The current season.....

2

3 MR. ELVSAAS:the amended.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The current season is
6 September 1 through October 31.

7

8 MS. SWAN: In the proposed, it's August
9 15th through December 31?

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

12

13 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I, for
14 what it's worth, would think that those amended dates,
15 they're in the motion right now, and if for some reason
16 they only got four within the regular season dates, there's
17 somebody has a chance to get the other moose. It's not
18 like we're going to have.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

21

22 MR. ELVSAAS:50 hunters running
23 around out there.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. I don't -- personally
26 I don't think the dates have much of an effect on it. What
27 we're talking about is five cows.

28

29 MR. F. JOHN: Yeah, I get the feeling they
30 get these moose early in the season.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. George?

33

34 MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair? Yes. Currently we
35 have a c&t determination that includes residents of 6(A),
36 but there's no one there. If you limit it to (B) and (C),
37 you've created an 804 situation. So you should just
38 say.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Unit 6.

41

42 MR. SHERROD: Unit -- well, you just say
43 Unit 6.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: (A), (B) and (C)?

46

47 MR. SHERROD: No. Well, or just Unit 6 and
48 let the c&t determination then handle the rest of it.

49

MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, it's Unit 6.

00250

1 MS. DEWHURST: You don't actually need to
2 say anything, because it's already predetermined who can
3 apply.

4
5 MR. SHERROD: Who can apply.

6
7 MS. DEWHURST: So you don't have to say
8 anything.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But we have -- do
11 we need to go back then and amend?

12
13 MR. ELVSAAS: No.

14
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The intention of
18 the person that offered the amendment was that this would
19 be limited to the intention of the person that wrote the
20 proposal, but limit it to five cows, am I correct?

21
22 MR. ELVSAAS: That's right.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So at that point in
25 time, how would staff write this proposal to meet those
26 objectives?

27
28 MS. DEWHURST: Basically what's on page 79,
29 but only with an issued by an annual drawing and we'd have
30 to put your other dates in there. We'd tag on on the end
31 of that statement, we'd say issued by an annual drawing,
32 and then we'd correct the dates to the dates you're
33 recommending.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. If you did this,
36 modify the proposal to provide a limited federal
37 registration permit harvest for five cows in Unit 6(C),
38 August 15th through December 31st, with permits distributed
39 by the U.S. Forest Service office in Cordova through an
40 annual drawing.....

41
42 MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:does that limit it
45 to.....

46
47 MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

48
49 MR. SHERROD: Residents of 6(A), (B), (C).

00251

1 MS. DEWHURST: Automatically.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By default it limits it to
4 residents of 6(A), (B) and (C).

5

6 MS. DEWHURST: Which is really only
7 Cordova.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Which is Cordova. Okay.
10 Does that accomplish what the amender intended?

11

12 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And what the second
15 intended?

16

17 MR. F. JOHN: Yes.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Okay. So we have an
20 amended motion as it was just read. If there's no further
21 discussion, the question is in order.

22

23 MR. DEMENTI: Question.

24

25 MR. ELVSAAS: Question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
28 called. We've already voted on the amendment, and so now
29 we need to vote on the amended motion. All in favor of the
30 motion as amended, signify by saying aye?

31

32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify saying
35 nay?

36

37 (No opposing votes.)

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. I hope
40 that accomplishes what they were intending to accomplish.

41

42 MR. ELVSAAS: Somewhat.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Somewhat. Okay. Proposal

45 18. Donna?

46

47 MS. DEWHURST: No.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George?

00252

1 MR. SHERROD: Well, Proposal 18, and I was
2 wondering if you wanted to move around a minute and get
3 some oxygen to the brain?

4
5 MS. SWAN: Yes.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, let's take Proposal
8 18, then move around and get some oxygen to the brain.

9
10 MR. SHERROD: Oh, 18 might take a while.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, let's move around
13 first is what I've been told.

14
15 (Off record)

16
17 (On record)

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll call this session
20 back in order. One of our members had to run on a short
21 errand. He'll be back in five, ten minutes, and so what I
22 would like to do, if it's with the consent of everybody
23 else, we'd like to finish these last three proposals today,
24 but I would like him here for that. And Hollis has got to
25 be gone tomorrow. I don't even see Hollis today now. He
26 was just here.

27
28 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He was just here.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And if -- with the consent
31 of everybody else, with consent of the rest of the council,
32 I'd like to give him five or ten minutes to present his --
33 what he's got to give to us while we're waiting for Fred
34 John, Jr., to come back.

35
36 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman?

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes?

39
40 MR. ELVSAAS: You know, that takes some
41 real in-depth consideration to do this, and I think we
42 should have about a 15-minute period before we decide
43 whether to let him have time off.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, for one thing, I
46 don't see him here right now, so.....

47
48 (Off record conversation.)

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There we go. Hollis,

00253

1 we're going to, while we're waiting for Fred John to come
2 back, we're going to let you give your report since you
3 won't be able to be here tomorrow.

4
5 MR. TWITCHELL: Okay. Thank you. Hollis
6 Twitchell with Denali National Park. I'm going to be gone
7 tomorrow to meet with a subsistence user on the north side
8 of Denali who is very remote and does not have access to
9 telephone or even radio phone, so that's the reason why I
10 asked to talk today.

11
12 I don't have any action that -- or anything that
13 requires an action on behalf of this council. The
14 information I have is just that for your information.

15
16 An update in terms of your next meeting, there will
17 be a need to consider one of your appointments to the
18 Denali Subsistence Resource Commission. So next fall
19 that's something we'll need to be on the agenda at that
20 time. And that would be dealing with Vern Carlson's
21 position to Denali's SRC. You'll recall at the last
22 meeting you reappointed Gilbert to the Commission.

23
24 The next item I was going to mention is at the last
25 subsistence resource commission meeting, they passed two
26 motions. I believe the material is in your packets that
27 Helga provided. One of them talked about support for the
28 Kantishna fish wheel, a recapture wheel on the north side
29 of Denali, and that's the individual that I'll be going to
30 meet with tomorrow.

31
32 The second portion of that letter dealt with what
33 the commission felt was a need in Denali area regarding
34 fisheries, and they identified the need to gather
35 historical information from the elders for the Denali area
36 regarding fisheries, what streams were utilized, the time
37 of year, general traditional knowledge in terms of
38 fisheries resources in the area. They felt that that was a
39 great need in Denali in addition to just the biological
40 information, and that that information should be
41 incorporated into the record. Documented and incorporated
42 so as they deliberate on future proposals that that
43 information will be accessible to them. So you might
44 consider that in your discussions tomorrow regarding
45 potential proposals for 2001.

46
47 The next item I was going to mention was that the
48 NPS received some funding this year to revisit the
49 community use profile studies that were done in the early

50 80s for four of the villages around Denali: Cantwell, Lake

00254

1 Minchumina, Nikolai and Telida. We plan to do that work in
2 conjunction with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
3 Subsistence Division, since they have been the lead agency
4 in doing the past studies. We want to expand and update
5 those profile uses to gather information that we now use in
6 the federal arena, particularly the information towards the
7 eight factors that we use in the c&t determinations, as
8 well as updating the use areas.

9
10 Past studies looked at a period of time that was
11 generally about 15 to 20 years in terms of capturing that
12 community use at that time. We're particularly interested
13 in more life histories, what has been the use areas and
14 species used for the individuals for the community over
15 their lifetime? And we think that will better represent
16 traditional use areas and traditional use of species. And
17 so that will be a focus of updating those profiles.

18
19 In response to the Denali's Commission's
20 identification that we need to gather and document
21 information from elders regarding fisheries and uses and
22 use areas, we're going to ask that when they revisit these
23 communities that we will try to gather that information
24 through updating of harvest monitoring information as well.
25 So we'll try to incorporate aspects of that into that work
26 as well.

27
28 We're coming to closure on a couple of studies that
29 have been going on for the last several years. One is the
30 ethnographic overview and assessment. We're expecting the
31 final report from that this summer. A component of that
32 work was going to four of our communities and providing an
33 opportunity for the tribal councils in those communities to
34 prepare their own community or village histories where they
35 write up the information that they feel is important
36 regarding their communities and their areas in terms of
37 what we as managers should know about the area. A
38 component of that overview and assessment will incorporate
39 those village histories that were prepared.

40
41 We've also just completed a native place name
42 mapping project for the Denali area, and we're very happy
43 that the basic information has been expanded fairly
44 significantly working with the tribal councils and the
45 elders in the different communities and villages around the
46 Denali area. And that work has been able to document 1650
47 native place names associated with the Denali region, and
48 that would incorporate the five native groups surrounding
49 the Alaska Range and the Denali area.

00255

1 With that, I'll just close, and if you have any
2 questions, I'll try to answer them.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any
5 questions for Hollis? It sounds like you have a lot of
6 projects going.

7
8 MR. TWITCHELL: It's been really
9 interesting and it's been really fun. In keeping with the
10 interest, the tribes will utilize local individuals as much
11 as possible. We will be utilizing local people, both for
12 working in the communities on the profile updates on the
13 Kantishna fish wheel recapture project. And we're also
14 interested in working with the communities, hiring local
15 people to help us do community harvest monitoring. So it's
16 been very interesting, and I think we're finally making
17 some good progress.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you going to be using
20 the place name overview or map as part of your public
21 display at the park, or part of your brochures or something
22 to that effect?

23
24 MR. TWITCHELL: Yes, there's two areas
25 where we plan to use that. One, the Denali Subsistence
26 Resource Commission was concerned that we get information
27 about Alaska native peoples, the cultural use and the
28 subsistence use in the Denali area out to the visiting
29 public. And we're working on a brochure right now that
30 would incorporate some of the information, place name
31 material, and cultural material in a similar type of
32 brochure that visitors get when they travel into to the
33 park.

34
35 We're also interested in doing a native place name
36 map for Denali, a very large topographical map much like
37 what's on the wall there that would have all the native
38 place name features listed for the Denali area with the
39 back of the map being an annotation of each of those names
40 and how they're pronounced and their meaning. So that map
41 is planned to be developed in a couple years from now. So
42 it will be incorporated that way.

43
44 We've also moved our subsistence user guide that we
45 handed out to you last time onto Denali's web page, so now
46 people can access information. That's in that user guide
47 through the web page for Denali. So there will be a number
48 of avenues that we hope to use that information in.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'll probably eventually

00256

1 put the place names and everything in the web page, too?

2

3 MR. TWITCHELL: That's our hope. Right now
4 what's -- we're waiting on the digitization of the maps,
5 which would allow us to do that. And we're also wanting to
6 go out this spring once the vegetation greens up and take
7 some images, some aerial images of some of the key place
8 name features, and that will be incorporated into the
9 report. So the final report will not only have the text,
10 but also will have those components included.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
13 questions for Hollis? Okay. With that we'll go on to our
14 proposals. Thank you, have a good trip home, and I hope
15 you're able to meet with the person you're supposed to meet
16 with.

17

18 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We're -- at this
21 point in time, that should have given Fred a little time to
22 complete his stuff. He'll probably be back by the time we
23 do 19 and 21. We can look at Proposal 18 at this point in
24 time. George I think?

25

26 MR. SHERROD: Yep. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
27 Proposal 18 is a request from the Native Village of Eyak to
28 take one bull moose off of federal lands for an annual
29 memorial-slash- sobriety day potlatch. Before I get into
30 the analysis, I'd like to answer some of the questions that
31 Mr. Carpenter brought up I guess it was yesterday.
32 Everything's sort of blending together, and.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This morning.

35

36 MR. SHERROD: Oh, this morning. Good. My
37 mind's not as bad as I thought it was. And alleviate some
38 of his concerns. He posed a question about, how shall we
39 say, the allocation of different uses to individuals
40 holding the same c&t. C&T determinations basically
41 establish that a human group in a area or something uses an
42 animal population, and that that use or uses basically
43 comply with what we envision
44 subsistence uses to be. It does not require that all
45 individuals use the resource in the same manner. He
46 himself basically I think recognized the utility of
47 distinguishing between qualified c&t users and his
48 recommendation on the proposals we will deal with after
49 this one, 19 and 21, suggesting that all of Cordova be

50 granted c&t for Unit 11 while recognizing that only the

00257

1 individuals holding 13.44 permits would actually be able to
2 take advantage of that c&t determination. And I would add
3 administratively that's a lot easier than doing 50
4 individual c&t's.

5
6 We must also remember that even the language of
7 ANILCA separates out different uses, identifying culture to
8 native populations, and social uses to nonnative
9 populations. And certainly language in 804 allows the
10 differentiation of uses by people holding a positive c&t
11 for an area.

12
13 Additionally, even the state in their provisions
14 have established a number of different provisions, some of
15 which while one might argue are not exclusively native
16 certainly lean that way, and that would be memorial
17 potlatches, the stick dance, and Nuchalawoyya, are
18 basically native ceremonies.

19
20 The other question he poses was one about could
21 Pioneers of Alaska or someone else make such a request, and
22 this is somewhat hypothetical, because we've yet to receive
23 such a request. Certainly the state had provisions under
24 their educational provision and so on to allow that.
25 Within the federal program, we have never not analyzed a
26 proposal that falls within the scope of this -- you know,
27 the federal program. We don't summarily dismiss them
28 because we don't like them. We go through a full analysis.
29 And I think it's true that if in the course of the analysis
30 it was demonstrated that whatever the activity was was in
31 the sort of concepts of subsistence, and contributed to
32 social well being and so on, that the analysis would
33 conclude that a communal harvest or use of a resource would
34 be granted. And I think it's important to realize that in
35 the communal taking of a resource and through its
36 processing and distribution, that many of the eight factors
37 that we use in determining whether or not a community has
38 c&t are met, that is sharing, transmission of knowledge,
39 social solidarity and so on.

40
41 So I wanted just to try to lay to rest some of his
42 concerns, and these things are scary to some individuals,
43 but I think he need not be that concerned about it.

44
45 You have addressed this issue before, and at that
46 time, it was a couple years ago, and it dealt with the
47 request modified for a one-time taking of a moose for a
48 memorial potlatch. The board, Federal Subsistence Board,
49 has moved fairly slowly and cautiously in adopting

50 regulations dealing with ceremonial take. Nevertheless,

00258

1 there has been a progression of these, and if we look on
2 page 87, at the bottom, through page 88, we'll see that
3 there are a number of incidences where the federal board
4 has allocated the taking of resources for a number of
5 gatherings, not simply potlatches, memorial or funerary
6 potlatches, but other gatherings, including just the
7 gathering of TCC, an elders potlatch. In -- for this area,
8 the Mount Sanford Tribal Consortium has gone through an
9 annual process of replying -- applying annually rather than
10 one sort of blanket proposal, and this would be a blanket
11 proposal.

12
13 Frequently the literature that documents the
14 practices of communal consumption or feasting focuses on
15 the potlatches as a somewhat religious ceremony. However,
16 scrutiny of the literature discloses that there are many
17 cases amongst Alaska natives where feasting itself was a
18 cultural practice, and you didn't need to have someone die
19 or memorialize someone dying to actually celebrate in a
20 communal fashion. The analysis provides a number of
21 examples throughout the state, and several particular to
22 the Eyak.

23
24 The conclusion is to support this activity and to
25 allow them to take one moose for an annual-slash-memorial
26 -- or a memorial-slash-sobriety potlatch. And the
27 justification being that while maybe the term sobriety and
28 memorial and potlatch don't neatly mesh with some of our
29 concepts, in the spirit of this activity is definitely well
30 grounded in native culture and patterns throughout the
31 state, not necessarily to Eyak, but also to the people of
32 the Native Village of Eyak.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George. Okay.
35 At this time the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

36
37 MR. FALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again
38 these are supplemental comments, based upon our later
39 receipt of the staff analysis. And we didn't take a
40 position on this one, but we did provide some comments that
41 asked for additional information to be included in the
42 staff analysis. And I think George has addressed some of
43 the questions that we raised, and some of our questions
44 were similar to the ones that Tom Carpenter brought up this
45 morning.

46
47 We note that the staff analysis attempts to link
48 the sobriety day potlatch, which is a fairly new event in
49 Cordova with a broad range of what are called in the

50 analysis secular Alaska native feasting traditions. What

00259

1 isn't stated very clearly in the staff analysis is that
2 usually the term potlatch, at least within Athabaskan, Eyak
3 and Tlingit culture is linked to the distribution of gifts
4 other than food and a meal, and that that could have been
5 brought out a bit more. So we certainly know that
6 potlatches aren't always associated with funerals or with
7 memorial feasts for the deceased, but usually the
8 distribution of gifts is involved. So the analysis of
9 traditions associated with a particular ceremony might
10 bring that out.

11
12 We also thought that the analysis and your
13 discussion could look at why a specific permit is needed
14 for this particular ceremony, and why the moose or the
15 other resources that will be used in the ceremony can't be
16 obtained during regular open seasons. We thought that it
17 might be good to get some more detail on the event itself.
18 And I think that would help the public who are looking at
19 the actions here better understand the basis for a special
20 provision in this case.

21
22 And we raised a question, and I think it was
23 similar to the one that Tom asked about this morning, and
24 George has addressed this a bit, how does the sobriety day
25 potlatch differ from annual events among nonnative groups
26 that also, and quoting here, provide a setting for the
27 public affirmation and transmission of cultural values and
28 traditions? There's certainly other events that a variety
29 of cultural groups hold that have that as a goal.

30
31 And we are concerned that a standard in the
32 justification is so broad that a wide range of gatherings
33 might be claimed to be a setting for the transmission of
34 cultural values. So we're basically asking for -- just for
35 more information and discussion on those points. Thanks.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Have you got.....

38
39 MR. FALL: Oh, we have some more.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yep.

42
43 MR. MACHIDA: Mr. Chair, I'll just take a
44 few minutes and just expand on some of the other
45 alternatives concerning this kind of regulation that are
46 available under the state system, and that are currently in
47 place. Right now there are two regulatory provisions in
48 the state system that could be applied to this situation.

49

One is the -- what's called the funerary potlatch

00260

1 regulation. And under this regulation basically a permit
2 isn't required for a memorial or funerary type of potlatch.
3 What would need to be done is that every area biologist in
4 the state has areas that are set -- they're required to set
5 aside areas where they deem a harvest of this type can be
6 -- a limited harvest of this type can be taken, and the
7 organization would basically need to contact the area
8 biologist, who in this case would be Dave Crowley at
9 Cordova, and give him -- give to him their request, and
10 then he -- and they would work with him as far as figuring
11 out an area to harvest an animal.

12
13 The second type of permit that this would come
14 under is what's called a cultural permit, and in the same
15 situation, you know, the appropriate organization would
16 work with the area biologist to come up with the proposal
17 of the area they want, and they work together to work on
18 developing the permit. The advantage of working within the
19 state system is that you wouldn't be restricted to federal
20 land. I mean, if Eyak wanted to take the moose right
21 outside of the city limits, I mean, they can do that. So,
22 I mean, there are other alternatives other than what's
23 being proposed here.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other -- any questions
26 for him? I have question.

27
28 MR. MACHIDA: Yes. Uh-huh.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, are -- is the state
31 required to issue that permit for a cultural one or for a
32 funerary one?

33
34 MR. MACHIDA: For the funerary one, I mean
35 that's a little bit different situation, because in that
36 case, if it's for the purpose that's being defined here, a
37 memorial or a funerary potlatch, you know, for an Alaskan
38 native celebration then I mean it's -- it's not whether the
39 state's required. I mean, it's there in regulation that
40 they -- that the organization can do that. They just need
41 to work with the area biologist to find a place,
42 appropriate place where an animal can be taken. And then
43 they just need to provide the biologist with the location
44 and place of where the animal was taken.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now for a moose for the
47 purpose that's discussed here, would there be any problem
48 with them going and taking that moose then under that
49 current system?

00261

1 MR. MACHIDA: I guess I would need to see,
2 or he would need to see exactly what it's being for,
3 whether it -- whether the memorial or funerary potlatch
4 condition or criteria that are established in regulation
5 would apply, so, I mean, I can't answer that specifically
6 right now, but, I mean, it's done in many other places, so,
7 I mean, it's not like it has no precedent or that it's
8 unknown. The cultural permit, that's issued out of Juneau.
9 That's a little it different arrangement, but normally if
10 the organization works with the area biologist, and he
11 gives a positive recommendation, then, I mean, it's
12 difficult to see why that would be a problem.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions? Ken?

15
16 MR. VLASOFF: I wonder why they didn't know
17 this down in Cordova?

18
19 MR. MACHIDA: Well, this regulation's been
20 in effect I believe for about five or six years. I think
21 part of the problem is that the department publishes
22 regulations under, you know, a number of publications. The
23 one that most people are familiar with are the hunting and
24 trapping regulations, but we also publish a regulation book
25 called miscellaneous regulations, and this covers
26 regulations that are probably less well known. I mean,
27 they deal with falconry and bear viewing at McNeal River,
28 and Walrus Island Refuge. The management of state game
29 refuges. I mean, just -- all the regulations that aren't
30 specifically related to hunting or trapping. So, I mean,
31 that could be why, but, I mean, the regulation isn't
32 unknown, because, you know, I see these permits cross my
33 desk fairly frequently.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's an alternative
36 in other words?

37
38 MR. MACHIDA: Yes. Uh-huh.

39
40 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman?

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Clare?

43
44 MS. SWAN: I guess I -- since I'm a
45 Kenaitze who lives here, and I don't feel comfortable
46 deciding for the Eyaks, but sine I'm also a council member
47 here and we're discussing this, I have to -- there's a
48 practical side to this, too. I always wonder, I know that
49 Kenaitze has worked with the biologists to get moose for

50 potlatches here, but the other thing is, if you -- I just

00262

1 question, you know, getting -- can you make plans to get a
2 moose say for something that controlled, it's not so easy
3 for a funeral, you'd be able to work within the season and
4 put meat in the freezer for these kinds of things. It just
5 seems like if you have to consider the whole thing, I mean,
6 you know, there - it seems to me it would become an
7 allocation thing. You just -- and it would indeed open the
8 door to a lot of other things that are much important,
9 especially when you say sobriety. But I personally don't
10 feel that it's -- where another tribe is involved, it's not
11 my decision to make about what kind of a memorial they
12 have, or a potlatch, but it's -- I'm just talking about the
13 amount of meat, you know, and how you would handle that,
14 the actual taking of the animal itself.

15
16 MR. MACHIDA: Well, as far as the actual
17 timing of when you take it, I mean, you know, most of the
18 time it's taken in advance of the event. I mean, it's
19 planned in advance. I mean, it's taken when it's
20 convenient for the permit holder in anticipation of when
21 the gathering would occur. So I mean it's -- and that's
22 --- normally hasn't been a problem with other permits in
23 the past.

24
25 MR. DEMENTI: Can I ask a question?

26
27 MR. MACHIDA: Sure. Uh-huh.

28
29 MR. DEMENTI: How much time do you have --
30 I mean, now long does like a memorial potlatch or
31 something, how much time do you need? Or.....

32
33 MR. MACHIDA: You mean to take the moose?

34
35 MR. DEMENTI: To take the moose.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How much ahead of time do
38 they need to be told?

39
40 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah.

41
42 MR. MACHIDA: I think that's negotiable. I
43 believe in regulation it's one year, but I don't have that
44 very particular section of the regulation before me, so I
45 can't say or sure, but I believe it's one year.

46
47 MR. SHERROD: Actually I have those
48 regulations.

49

MR. DEMENTI: The funeral one would be a

00263

1 different.....

2

3 MR. MACHIDA: That would be different. Uh-

4 huh.

5

6 MR. DEMENTI: It's a different situation.

7

8 MR. MACHIDA: Right.

9

10 MR. DEMENTI: Okay.

11

12 MR. ELVSAAS: Say that again?

13

14 MR. DEMENTI: The funeral potlatch would be
15 a different situation.

16

17 MR. MACHIDA: That one you wouldn't need a
18 permit for.

19

20 MR. DEMENTI: You would not need a permit
21 for?

22

23 MR. MACHIDA: You would just need to work
24 with the area biologist. Area biologists would define an
25 area that has a sustainable moose population where you can
26 take an animal out of it, and you would just work with him
27 as far as taking the moose out of the area and then
28 reporting to him where you took it.

29

30 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman?

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Fred?

33

34 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah. You know, it could
35 well be if in the ordinary course of business, this is not
36 a funeral potlatch, it's a sobriety potlatch, memorial
37 potlatch. If they've got to apply a year ahead of time, it
38 could be that they may want to have this through the
39 federal subsistence program, although I agree that they
40 won't have the handy access to the moose, because of the
41 long stretch of nonfederal lands along the highway there.
42 But on the other hand then possibly they'll be applying for
43 a state permit, too, so they may have more than one
44 potlatch in mind.

45

46 MR. SHERROD: I've got those regulations.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

49

MR. SHERROD: In terms of the taking for

00264

1 certain religious ceremonies, under which the potlatch
2 would fall, basically it says the Department will publish a
3 list of population areas where they may have been taken. A
4 permit is not required, but the individual after taking the
5 animal for a potlatch, and we're talking about funeral or
6 mortuary, has 20 days to submit a report to the area
7 biologist listing the ceremony, the name of the deceased,
8 sex, you know, and animal taken and location and dates of
9 taking. So in this case for -- you -- it's an after the
10 fact, after the animal is taken, then the report is given.

11
12 For the cultural purposes, taking game for cultural
13 purposes, which would be, I think more appropriate for what
14 the Eyak are asking, the commissioner in Juneau has to
15 actually issue -- well, he doesn't have to actually, but
16 the request has to go to the commissioner in Juneau, and
17 then the commissioner can decide to issue the permit or not
18 issue the permit.

19
20 MS. DEWHURST: No time state is stated
21 though?

22
23 MR. SHERROD: There's no time stated.

24
25 MR. MACHIDA: But in actual practice, even
26 though it says it's issued by the commissioner, I mean,
27 it's done through the area office. They're the ones that
28 send the recommendation and all that to the headquarters.

29
30 MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman?

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Clare?

33
34 MS. SWAN: Just as a -- it's kind of
35 interesting. You know, we tend to think of it with -- in
36 funeral potlatches sometimes traditionally it happens that
37 if someone is not at home or they're out of state or
38 they're far away when an important person in their lives
39 dies, and they're a family member, and they may even as
40 long as a year later decide to come back home and make a
41 potlatch for this person. That's cultural and traditional
42 that it's happened -- I mean, that's in ancient times, and
43 is what people can do, so that for a funeral potlatch, I
44 mean, in the sense that we think about having a funeral
45 immediately for a person, it's not exactly the same thing
46 as far as traditional potlatches go.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I think that's why
49 it's called a funerary potlatch.

00265

1 MS. SWAN: Funerary?

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It doesn't mean that it
4 has be.....

5

6 MS. SWAN: Okay.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:at the funeral. I
9 think it's in memory of.

10

11 MS. SWAN: Well, I was just saying that in
12 light of what Fred said, because you could under the
13 existing circumstances, you could have two permit requests
14 going for whatever kind of potlatch you wanted, so you
15 actually only need the one -- you'd only need one
16 regulation that would cover both. I mean, I -- it seems to
17 me anyway. It's just.....

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ken first, and then you
20 Fred.

21

22 MR. VLASOFF: I attended, I was invited to
23 the last sobriety potlatch they had, and there was a lot of
24 people from all over, not just in Cordova, natives and non
25 natives. A lot of people. And there was a memorial for
26 many of the past dead that were named, you know, not just
27 one in particular.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh. Fred?

30

31 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah. In the proposal on the
32 issues, it would allow the Native Village of Eyak to take
33 one bull moose from Unit 6(B) for (C) for their annual
34 memorial sobriety day potlatch. Now, see, this would be
35 targeted to that function. And if they had funeral
36 potlatches other than that, and, you know, we're not too
37 far off now. Summer's coming on, and you're going to see,
38 I'm sure, potlatches for Morrie Thompson and things of that
39 nature up north. And I think that as that happens in the
40 Eyak country, they're going to be looking at this also. So
41 this is not for funeral potlatches. It's for their
42 memorial, which is for those that have one on probably
43 through the year since the last potlatch. I think this is
44 a good idea on their part. That leaves them the option for
45 the other potlatch moose, too.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any more
48 questions for Fish and Game? Thank you muchly for that
49 information. Other agency comments? Oh, what I would like

50 -- George, some of the questions that he brought up, some

00266

1 of them I noticed were answered in what you had here, but I
2 lost two of the questions that he asked right towards the
3 end. I was just wondering if possibly you could answer a
4 couple of them?

5
6 MR. SHERROD: Well, I think one of them was
7 specific to the potlatch in question, and I think Kenneth
8 has basically -- I have not personally been there. I know
9 that it has gone on for a number of years, and as I say, I
10 think part of what happens is like so many times I've heard
11 people say, you know, you guys invented subsistence. It's
12 a word you invented, we didn't invent. Well, potlatch is
13 to some degree the same thing. And in the analysis I tried
14 to point out that feasting was much -- as much a part of
15 communal feasting of native culture as is potlatches. And
16 that was another question that Jim pointed out, that in
17 potlatches you generally had the distribution of gifts. In
18 feasting ceremonies, you did not, but there are a number of
19 named feast ceremonies, particularly amongst the Haida and
20 some other groups that are basically institutionalized
21 feasting, much in the same way Thanksgiving is for us, or
22 Christmas dinner or something. I mean, it's a con- -- it's
23 a reoccurring event. And I think that's where some of the
24 different interpretations as to whether or not this is a
25 traditional potlatch, or is it something else? And I would
26 have to say in my mind it's probably a hybrid of both. It
27 is a traditional potlatch sort of in the experience of
28 Nuchalawoyya or stick dance is in which you are honoring
29 the people that have gone before, but maybe all of the
30 ancestors as opposed to a specific individual. And it also
31 is a time which people come together, share native food, or
32 food in general, and they do, they -- you know, you're
33 reaffirming the transmission of values. One could argue
34 that honoring sobriety can be seen as honoring the passage
35 from one stage of life to another, from a sense of
36 adolescence to a sense of responsibility. That passage or
37 rite of passage is honored in almost every native culture
38 across Alaska. It can also be seen as the returning of an
39 individual back to the social group, someone that has been
40 outside of the social group because of their actions, and
41 has now come back to the village. That is an event that
42 was honored by feasting throughout most of Alaska native
43 groups, the Eyak and the Ahtna in particular off the top of
44 my head. So it's -- I think we have to look beyond the
45 syntax which is basically what produces laws, it's the
46 words on paper, to the spirit of this. And if -- I
47 apologize if my analysis did not clearly put that message
48 forward. I don't know if that answered your question,
49 Ralph, or not, but.....

00267

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I think it did. It
2 answers some of the -- I think it answers some of the
3 questions that were brought up. And your contact to -- of
4 tying sobriety back to somebody returning or growing up, I
5 think that's recognized in native culture. That's
6 recognized in cultures all over the world, and it's usually
7 accompanied by -- I mean, I can think of stories, I'll use
8 it right out of the Bible where exactly that happens. The
9 prodigal son returns, you kill the fatted calf and you have
10 a feast for the -- because the son that was living -- was
11 dead is now living, you know. And so, I mean, that's not
12 -- that's a cultural theme that extends over many, many
13 cultures. So from that standpoint, I have no problem with
14 the memorial sobriety type part of this at all.

15
16 MR. F. JOHN: Mr. Chair, in Mentasta, in
17 our culture, we have, you know, like when people die, we
18 have a funeral potlatch, and there's a memorial potlatch
19 probably a year, two years after that. Then we have a big
20 feast when our daughter becomes of age, and our son like
21 when he kills his first moose or something. And we're
22 going to have another big feast this spring on May 14 when
23 my daughter graduate from college. And that's a big
24 celebration in our village, because it affects everybody,
25 you know. I mean like, you know, one succeed, we all
26 celebrate in the same way. So there's a lot of different
27 ways we do celebrate, and it's mostly with feasts. Funeral
28 is mostly give it away. You know, we give away blankets,
29 cups (ph), and stuff like memorial potlatch, but the other
30 time mostly we just -- have just -- eat moose meat and
31 enjoy ourselves and make speeches and have fun.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Other agency
34 comments. Eastern Interior?

35
36 MR. GOOD: (Shakes head no)

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No comment. Fish and game
39 advisory committee comments, we've had Tom's this morning
40 on the phone, and do we have written comments?

41
42 MS. EAKON: Yes, Copper River/Prince
43 William Sound Advisory Committee opposed. These moose
44 aren't indigenous. These moose are planted by the
45 residents of Cordova in the 1950s. The federal board has
46 found that all residents of Cordova have a positive c&t use
47 for moose in 6(B) and (C). Six-(C). Granting a specific
48 group within a community a special privilege for harvest
49 divides a community. There are many indigenous animals

50 with higher allocative harvest levels that could be used at

00268

1 a potlatch.

2

3 The Wrangell/St. Elias Subsistence Resource
4 Commission supports Proposal 18. And I already read you
5 the letter from Bob Henrichs in support of Proposal 18.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
8 public testimony? Hearing none, a motion is in order to
9 accept Proposal 18 for discussion.

10

11 MR. ELVSAAS: I'll move.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So moved by Fred.....

14

15 MR. VLASOFF: Second.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:seconded by Ken.
18 Okay. The motion is on the table to accept Proposal 18.
19 The proposal can be voted up, down, or amended.
20 Discussion.

21

22 Ken, I think you brought out something, and that
23 was the fact that this memorial/sobriety day potlatch is
24 attended by a real cross section of the members of the
25 community, and members of Prince William Sound.

26

27 MR. VLASOFF: Uh-huh.

28

29 MR. F. JOHN: Could I ask a question? How
30 come if that moose is not indigenous to the area, how come
31 this one -- this fellow that made the testimony wouldn't
32 share with their own people in Cordova and Eyak?

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good question.

35

36 MR. F. JOHN: I mean, it just goes to the
37 white people or.....

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, it goes to everybody
40 in the community. See, that's the one thing, I think what
41 he's objecting to is the fact that at this point in time it
42 goes to everybody in the community. But everybody in the
43 community takes part in the potlatch, too.

44

45 MR. VLASOFF: Yeah.

46

47 MR. F. JOHN: That's what I thought.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So.....

00269

1 MR. F. JOHN: Just brought it up. I mean,
2 I kind of wondered about that.

3
4 MS. SWAN: Call the question.

5
6 MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair?

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, George?

9
10 MR. SHERROD: Based on the information
11 presented earlier regarding the moose harvest, that the
12 population in 6(B) was not doing so well, you might
13 consider amending this to apply currently to only 6(C).
14 It's just a suggestion.

15
16 MR. ELVSAAS: Naw, let it go.

17
18 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

19
20 MR. ELVSAAS: You want to go way out there
21 and get one? They aren't going to pass one along the way
22 I'm sure.

23
24 MR. VLASOFF: Question.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
27 called. All in favor signify by saying aye?

28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
32 saying nay?

33
34 (No opposing votes.)

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Now we
37 have Proposal 19 and 21. They're lumped together. George,
38 you're doing these, aren't you?

39
40 MR. SHERROD: Yes, I am.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we would like to
43 finish these two before we quit for tonight?

44
45 MR. SHERROD: I'll try to make it quick.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, we would. I think
48 we've pretty well come down. We've had kind of a consensus
49 reached between both parties on this, so.....

00270

1 MS. SWAN: You want to finish them tonight,
2 correct?

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So I don't even know --
5 we've heard the consensus from both parties. I suppose we
6 should go through and have -- go through the process and
7 have.....

8
9 MR. SHERROD: I'll do it really quick. You
10 dealt with this last year.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

13
14 MR. SHERROD: At that time the analysis was
15 not to grant Cordova residents c&t. Based on Mr.
16 Carpenter's testimony, I believe it was Mr. Carpenter at
17 your meeting last year, and work conducted by the Park
18 Service and our office, 50 individuals minimally were found
19 living in Cordova that had a documented use of resources in
20 Unit 11. Based on those individuals, the recommendation is
21 to grant c&t to Cordova.

22
23 Now, in the past you -- this body has been far more
24 conservative in handing out c&t. As I mentioned earlier,
25 one of the advantages of granting c&t to all of the unit is
26 the fact that you wouldn't have to deal with 50 individual
27 c&t proposals stringing in along the way, because these
28 individuals will still need to have a 13.44 permit, so
29 there is a gate there that keeps it from going crazy. And
30 with that, I guess I'll end my analysis, unless there's
31 other questions.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George, I have a couple
34 questions for you. Out of those 50 individuals, if I
35 remember right, quite a few of them were elderly to the
36 point that they probably will never apply for a 13.44. In
37 fact, the vast majority of them were.

38
39 MR. SHERROD: That's probably true. I'm
40 sure.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So.....

43
44 MR. SHERROD: I think Ms. Hunter could.....

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we'll -- can we get
47 to (indiscernible - simultaneous speech).....

48
49 MR. SHERROD:or Ms. Sharp can.....

00271

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll get to you
2 after -- I have to go -- I'll go through the Fish and Game
3 first, but if you don't -- can't answer that, Devi probably
4 can?

5
6 MR. SHERROD: Right.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So your
9 recommendation basically is to grant c&t, because it will
10 still be limited to those with individual 13.44, and that's
11 what we heard from Gloria, and that's.....

12
13 MR. SHERROD: Yes.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:what we've heard
16 from.....

17
18 MR. SHERROD: Well, I think Gloria proposed
19 that you do individual c&t's. Now, that is another option.
20 I'm just saying that.....

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, Okay.

23
24 MR. SHERROD:you're looking at maybe
25 -- probably not 50 individual c&t proposals like we just
26 went through with Matt, but.....

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fifteen?

29
30 MR. SHERROD: Fifteen or 20 or whatever.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ten.

33
34 MR. SHERROD: Ten.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Alaska
37 Department of Fish and Game?

38
39 MR. FALL: Mr. Chair, I'll try to make this
40 quick, too, because I think we've commented on this on in
41 the past as well. And, of course, when we're reviewing the
42 c&t analysis, our general approach is to try to discern a
43 community-wide pattern of long term and consistent pattern
44 of use and so forth. And we still felt that the analysis
45 as written had some short comings. One of them, and I
46 think this was -- well, one of them has to do with a point
47 that was also made by CRNA the other day, and it has to
48 with pre-Cordova use of the upper Copper River Area, and
49 the analysis did not cite the primary source on the Eyaks,

50 which pretty clearly states that the Eyak people did not

00272

1 travel up river and CRNA had pointed out that trade tok
2 place, but there really isn't any evidence of actual
3 hunting or fishing in -- outside of their own territory.
4 That was clearly Ahtna territory.

5
6 We thought that the information for some of the
7 factors was quite general, and it -- sometimes it didn't
8 actually relate to Cordova residents use of that particular
9 resource population. An example is for moose, in factor
10 two, which is timing. The current season is cited there,
11 and it would have been nice to have something about the
12 timing of moose hunting by Cordova people in Unit 11. I
13 suspect some of that information was collected, it just
14 wasn't in the analysis. And again our goal here is to
15 build a good public record so that everybody really
16 understands why the council and the board is taking the
17 action that it is.

18
19 Another example is under factor three for sheep.
20 The pattern that's described there is the Ahtna pattern,
21 not the pattern by the Eyak, for example, or any more
22 recent Cordova patterns.

23
24 Regarding sheep, too, a comment that I had is that
25 much of the evidence regarding uses of this area by Cordova
26 seem to be linked to guiding, and with aircraft as the
27 primary means of access. And we thought that the analysis
28 could have broken this out a little bit more. Was all the
29 original use of that area related to guiding? Some of it?
30 And so forth. That could be relevant to establishing
31 whether it's a subsistence use pattern or a commercial use
32 with some supplementary use of that resources for food.

33
34 And I think that's it.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George, can you comment on
37 the things that he's brought out?

38
39 MR. SHERROD: I didn't write this analysis.
40 Rachel was supposed to be here. I think that.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Maybe Devi can answer some
43 of them?

44
45 MR. SHERROD:Devi may be able to
46 answer some of these questions.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I think you
49 brought up some very valid questions. Devi?

00273

1 MS. SHARP: Thank you. Devi Sharp,
2 Wrangell/St. Elias. I continue to have some concerns about
3 Proposals 19 and 20. I recognize that the parameters for
4 the federal c&t are quite different than the resident zone
5 parameters for the Park Service. However, I think the
6 current access situation needs to be included in the
7 analysis. The railroad is no longer available, and neither
8 is the mail plane which, granted, were very important
9 access methods into the park. There's been significant
10 changes in the community and the lifestyle and the way the
11 income is earned. And the available resources. There is a
12 moose population that wasn't there in those days, and
13 there's a very healthy deer population in Hinchbrook Island
14 that seems to be a very good source of subsistence food.

15
16 These two proposals would give over 2,000 residents
17 of Cordova c&t for the benefit of less than one dozen
18 people who are eligible for 13.44 permits, and we recognize
19 there are some people who are very eligible for 13.44
20 permits. And as soon as this dust settles, anybody who is
21 eligible will get one. And there are already some who have
22 them.

23
24 I understand the awkwardness with individual c&t,
25 but I'm more comfortable with it, because I think it would
26 -- it's really better for the user, because the
27 suggestion's been made to give c&t south of the Chitina
28 River, and we clearly know that there are a lot of
29 residents of the Long Lake area who have a shared residency
30 between Long Lake and Cordova who use parts of the park
31 that are north of the Chitina River, and if we gave
32 individuals c&t based on their own individual status, I
33 think we would be keeping much better to the intent of
34 federal subsistence than if we just said, okay, 2,000
35 residents have c&t. Now let's see who's eligible for
36 13.44s. We've done the homework for 13.44s, and a lot of
37 that homework will include the uses -- you know, we'll go
38 back and check. We'll make sure that everything is
39 completed. But I'm a lot more comfortable with that.

40
41 And then when you look at talking about how many
42 people are in Slana? A few dozen? You know, we could
43 spend a long time deciding whether that community has c&t
44 in their back yard. I think we need to keep it in
45 perspective. Cordova's a big community.

46
47 Are there any questions that came up in the last --
48 the last go -- in the last few minutes that I didn't
49 answer? Or is there anything that I can answer?

00274

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, there was -- there's
2 one question I have, Devi, if.....

3
4 MS. SHARP: Yeah.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:the lower part of
7 Unit 11, where it borders Unit 6, is in the Forest
8 Service.....

9
10 MS. SHARP: Uh-huh.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:not in the park, and
13 it's below Wood's Canyon, it's down the river away from
14 Unit 11 and Chitina, and actually is much more, you might
15 say, in the Eyak area.....

16
17 MS. SHARP: Uh-huh.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:and I think that
20 takes -- and also the mouth of the Bremner River down
21 there?

22
23 MS. SHARP: Yeah.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One of the things that c&t
26 for Cordova would have done, would have given them access
27 to those moose populations down there, which are a spill
28 off from the moose that they planted on the.....

29
30 MS. SHARP: Right.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:on the Delta down
33 there. What is the current status on that right now as far
34 as them hunting that area?

35
36 MS. SHARP: I don't know. It's national
37 forest, so I really don't know the answer to that.

38
39 MR. SHERROD: I'll tell him.

40
41 MS. SHARP: Oh, okay. We didn't.....

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, do they even need
44 c&t to hunt that area is what I -- I think at this point in
45 time.....

46
47 MS. SHARP: I think the answer is no, but
48 I'm not sure. Also.....

49

MR. SHERROD: No, they do not have c&t to

00275

1 hunt that area.....

2

3 MS. SHARP: Oh, they don't.

4

5 MR. SHERROD:so they are precluded
6 from hunting that portion.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They are precluded from
9 hunting that area, which -- and did you have reports in
10 your thing -- because I know that they access that area by
11 boat.....

12

13 MS. SHARP: And by.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:the lower end.

16

17 MS. SHARP:snow machine.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By boat and by snow
20 machine, right.

21

22 MS. SHARP: Right. No, we didn't. The
23 patterns fell into groups. There was a group that centered
24 around Hanagita -- flying into Hanagita Lake. There was a
25 group that centered around Long Lake and the residents who
26 have a shared occupancy between Long Lake and Cordova. And
27 then there were -- the group in Hanagita Lake were more the
28 outfitters/guides, and so -- and they spread out a little
29 bit. There were some that were north of the river, a
30 little bit into the Crystalline Hills area, and I think in
31 one occasion up to Chitistone. And then there were the two
32 individuals who kind of went on their vision quest as young
33 men and did some amazing journey for summer living off the
34 land, and they went up Hanagita. So I don't recall
35 anybody, and I did read all the interviews, I don't recall
36 anybody using the Forest Service land south of the Bremner.
37 Well, it's actually -- the Bremner is the cut-off between
38 park and preserve.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

41

42 MS. SHARP:so it's quite a bit south
43 of this map -- I mean, I've got to think about it.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
46 thinking. The mouth of the.....

47

48 MS. SHARP: It's pretty far south.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE:the mouth of the

00276

1 Bremner is currently off limits to them, even if they are
2 the only ones that have access to it by any means other
3 than airplane.....

4
5 MS. SHARP: Yeah.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:you know, and that's
8 what I was kind of wondering, because I think that's park
9 and preserve land right down at the mouth of the Bremner.
10 And doesn't.....

11
12 MS. SHARP: It's the boundary.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:park and preserve
15 meet right there?

16
17 MS. SHARP: Yeah. It does.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So.....

20
21 MS. SHARP: And it's also right now native
22 -- it's been selected, so it's native corporation land.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Eyak or Chugach?

25
26 MS. SHARP: Chugach.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chugach. Okay. So
29 basically it still is a -- it still is a Cordova/Prince
30 William Sound selection?

31
32 MS. SHARP: Yeah, I think so.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Yeah, I was just
35 thinking -- I was just trying to figure out how -- whether
36 or not they would have access to the -- you know.....

37
38 MS. SHARP: Well.....

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:because that's going
41 to be under a moo- -- that's going to be under Unit 11
42 regulations.....

43
44 MS. SHARP: Right.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:not Unit (C)
47 regulations.....

48
49 MS. SHARP: Well, reviewing.....

00277

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:Unit 6.

2
3 MS. SHARP:the 13.44s that I know of,
4 I don't recall anybody saying that that was hunting area.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It's possible that
7 they just never even think of that as not being Unit 6,
8 too.

9
10 MS. SHARP: That's possible.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

13
14 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chairman?

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes?

17
18 MR. DEMENTI: Can I ask a question? Is
19 there any fly-in going on now? Do you know?

20
21 MS. SHARP: Certainly there is in the
22 preserve. And there's a good chunk of preserve around the
23 Chitina River, but again, for the park, it's not permitted
24 for hunting -- for subsistence hunting.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or any hunting, is it?

27
28 MS. SHARP: Or any -- well, yeah. You have
29 to be a subsistence user to hunt in the hard park, and you
30 cannot fly in to do it. And there are -- there are people
31 who live in the park and have to fly in to get to their
32 front door step, and we recognize that, and they have
33 certain regulations.

34
35 MR. DEMENTI: How about with boats?

36
37 MS. SHARP: Boats are fine.

38
39 MR. DEMENTI: Boats are fine.

40
41 MS. SHARP: Boats are fine, snow.....

42
43 MR. DEMENTI: Air boats?

44
45 MS. SHARP:machines are fine.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Air boats and jet boats.

48
49 MS. SHARP: Yeah. There is a decibel level

50 on air boats that will at some point be more enforced, but

00278

1 air boats are fine. Yes, actually there -- we know, well,
2 there's someone who goes way up the Chitina into the park
3 that's -- you know, all the way up the Chitina, way up in
4 the glacial area, to hunt sheep as a subsistence user.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With a boat.

7
8 MS. SHARP: With a boat.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay.

11
12 MS. SHARP: Any other questions?

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any more
15 questions for Devi? Okay. With that, thank you, Devi,
16 thank you for the information. Okay. Other agencies.
17 Eastern Interior, any comments from Eastern Interior?

18
19 MR. GOOD: No comments

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Fish and game
22 advisory comments?

23
24 MS. EAKON: No written, but Peter Johnson,
25 Bureau of Land Management, opposes. He disagrees. He
26 says, there's no reason to extend sheep hunting to the
27 residents of Cordova. Many Alaska residents hunted in the
28 park prior to ANILCA and no longer qualify to hunt there.
29 To continue to extend areas of qualification is a mistake
30 in my opinion. The entire issue of federal subsistence
31 hunting has divided the hunters of the state. This
32 proposal appears to be a sport hunt in disguise.

33
34 The Wrangell/St. Elias Subsistence Resource
35 Commission offered identical written comments for Proposals
36 19 and 21. They said, modify proposals to change -- to
37 read south of Chitina River with individual 13.44 permits
38 to be issued by the park. End of written comments.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Did you ever find
41 out who Peter Johnson was?

42
43 MS. EAKON: No, I have not. Have you,
44 Elijah?

45
46 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I haven't.

47
48 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

49

MS. EAKON: Oh, you did?

00279

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have that. I
2 thought you laid it on my desk.

3
4 MS. EAKON: No, I did not receive.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Speak into the mike now.

7
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) hiding
9 on me. I don't know if it's here in my (indiscernible).
10 He is a ranger. Curt Wilson said that the best he could
11 find out, because he was leaving for some place -- it's
12 right here. I'm on my way to D.C., so this is the best I
13 can do. This is from Curt Wilson. It says, Peter Johnson
14 is the BLM chief ranger. I have no idea why he's
15 commenting on proposals.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that answers that
18 question.

19
20 MS. EAKON: Okay.

21
22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I apologize. I
23 thought you put it on my desk.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. That's no problem.
26 Thank you much, Steve. It was just out of curiosity.
27 Okay. So let's see, that's all the written. Do we have
28 any public testimony? Did CRNA wish to speak to this one
29 again?

30
31 MS. DEMENTI: No, we have testified
32 already.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I thought you had.
35 Thank you muchly. Okay. In that case a motion to accept
36 Proposal -- and I think we can combine 19 and 21 together
37 as they've been done that way in the analysis. A motion to
38 accept Proposal 19 and 21 is in order. If we don't make
39 the motion, we can't vote it down, we can't amend it. We'd
40 just leave it set.

41
42 MS. SWAN: So moved.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So move.

45
46 MS. SWAN: Okay.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. A motion has been
49 made. Is there a second?

00280

1 MR. F. JOHN: Second

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been seconded by Fred
4 John, Jr. Okay. At this point in time we can vote it up,
5 vote it down, offer an amendment.

6

7 MR. ELVSAAS: What's the recommendation of
8 the council. (Indiscernible) recommendation. What would
9 you like?

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, it's -- I kind of
12 like the recommendation of the SRC myself.

13

14 MR. DEMENTI: CRA.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or -- and CRNA.

17

18 MR. DEMENTI: CRNA.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They both cov -- they're
21 both the same. I mean, that's basically applies in this
22 case I think. And I realize what George is saying, that it
23 would be a lot simpler to blanket them in. Each person
24 would still have to get an individual 13.44, but that's up
25 to the wishes of this council. Or we can just vote on it
26 as it's written and vote it either up or vote down.

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, quite frankly that's
29 why I'm asking, because I'm -- I really don't have a
30 preference one way or the other. I can see two ways to go
31 here, and I'd like of like to know what the guys closest to
32 the problem would prefer. That's.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, it affects CRNA, and
35 Fred and myself and the people of Cordova, and it would be
36 nice to come to some kind of compromise that meets the
37 needs of all of us. I think that like the analysis that
38 Devi pointed out, there were quite a number of people who
39 did use the area back when access was there. Most of those
40 are fairly -- in fact I think some of them basically
41 testified from the other side pretty much.....

42

43 MS. SHARP: That is true, Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:you know. Fred?

46

47 MR. F. JOHN: Mr. Chair, I like that
48 recommendation with 13.44 on the south down below Chitina
49 River I believe. That's what CRNA recommend.

00281

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a Devi on that?

2

3 MS. SHARP: (Indiscernible)

4

5 MR. F. JOHN: And I never finish yet. And
6 I'd like to say Cordova is not very inclusive, you know,
7 they -- with their own native people. They say no to
8 Tatitlek, they say no to the different ones. They say no.
9 I'm a giving person, I think.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd like to say yes to
12 them, but limit them.

13

14 MR. F. JOHN: Put that on record.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd like to say yes to
17 them, but limit them, correct?

18

19 MR. F. JOHN: Yeah.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Devi.

22

23 MS. SHARP: Yes, sir?

24

25 MR. F. JOHN: But they haven't have any --
26 I don't see any customary, I don't see any traditional way
27 of hunting. Most of them that are hunting up there are
28 from either airplane or -- it's sport hunting. But there's
29 -- what I heard from -- you know, what I heard in testimony
30 is that they do some -- have some subsistence t&c hunter
31 down there that -- and we should not exclude them.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Devi, if -- I'm just
34 wondering, what this basically says is individual c&t and
35 south of the Chitina River, but an individual c&t will
36 apply to wherever that individual has c&t, right?

37

38 MS. SHARP: Right. The wording is bad. It
39 should read 13.44 permits -- wait, is that on -- well, go
40 back and tell me what you're reading?

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What I had down here was I
43 had south of the Chitina River, individual c&t is what I
44 had written down, but what are the -- what was the SRC's
45 recommendation?

46

47 MS. EAKON: They said, modify to read --
48 proposal to read south of Chitina River with individual
49 13.44 permits.....

00282

1 MS. SHARP: That's right.

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Individual 13.44.

4
5 MS. EAKON:to be issued by the park.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Individual 13.44s.

8
9 MS. SHARP: Right. So that's just a 13.44
10 permit, and giving Cordova c&t for south of the Chitina
11 River, and then you -- and then.....

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh.

14
15 MS. SHARP:qualified 13.44.....

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So it's.....

18
19 MS. SHARP:applicants.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:Cordova c&t south of
22 the Chitina River, individual 13.44s.

23
24 MS. SHARP: Yeah.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

27
28 MS. SHARP: Yes, Mr. Chair, that.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

31
32 MS. SHARP:is confusing.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because I couldn't -- it
35 was confusing to me, because the individual 13.44 goes to
36 where the individual's been.....

37
38 MS. SHARP: That's correct.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:Right? Okay.

41
42 MS. SHARP: And all 13.44, individual or
43 family.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Is that basically
46 what the amendment was, Fred?

47
48 MR. F. JOHN: Yeah.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

00283

1 MR. F. JOHN: I think that's what it was.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

4

5 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, I've got the amendment
6 right here. I mean, it's individual c&t, 13.44 permits to
7 be issued south of Chitina River for sheep and moose in
8 Unit 11.

9

10 MS. SHARP: Is that what Gloria said

11

12 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. well, that.....

15

16 MS. SHARP: That sounds more like what I
17 was proposing of 13.44 permits plus individual c&t as
18 opposed to community c&t.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now, indi -- read
21 that again?

22

23 MR. DEMENTI: Individual c&t with 13.44
24 permits to be issued south of Chitina River for sheep and
25 moose in Unit 11. Is that it?

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that means that
28 individuals can apply for c&t south of the river, but it
29 takes a 13.44 in the park, and 13.44 covers whatever area
30 they've used in the park, right? I mean, you can't limit
31 somebody with a 13.44 to south of the Chitina River.

32

33 MR. SHERROD: There's -- Clarence has got
34 his hand up. Hollis has got his hand up.

35

36 MS. SHARP: Yeah, there you go. Hollis. I
37 knew I brought my lawyer along for some reason.

38

39 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell, I'm with
40 Denali National Park. The 13.44 permit is simply an
41 eligibility permit recognizing the individual and that
42 household as being subsistence users. What species they
43 use and where they use it reverts back to this advisory
44 council and the Federal Subsistence Board identifying what
45 species and where c&t is. So the 13.44 permit is nothing
46 more than recognizing the individual's customary and
47 traditional use of park area resources.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So they still need

50 a c&t that.....

00284

1 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. What we do
2 is we -- in the permit we assimilate as a condition to the
3 permit that they have to hunt under the federal board's c&t
4 determinations for species. So again the eligibility
5 permit is recognizing that individual and that household's
6 past traditional use. Which species they use then is
7 guided by the federal board's c&t determinations.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

10
11 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chair, doesn't the 13.44
12 then imply c&t?

13
14 MR. TWITCHELL: It does. We look at a
15 variety of indicators for that, not just fish and wildlife
16 species, but also use of plants and other resources as
17 well, so it looks at the full body and breadth of the
18 individual's traditional use. And showing that, then the
19 permit says, yes, we recognize that you are a traditional
20 user of the park area.

21
22 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George?

25
26 MR. SHERROD: Yes, I think -- and I'm not
27 championing the analysis here. I think the cleanest way to
28 do this is probably, in my mind, to reject the proposal,
29 and then send a message back that, in letter form, that
30 holders of 13.44 permits should apply for individual c&t's.
31 And at that time you can decide which area to grant them
32 c&t. I'm a little bit uncomfortable with only south of the
33 Chitina River given that the maps, I believe they're on
34 page 110 and 111, indicate uses north of the river, but
35 this body then could deal with those areas on an individual
36 by individual basis. It will be more work for you, but it
37 would be cleaner, and it would be more in line with the
38 actions that you guys have taken in the past concerning c&t
39 than a blanket Cordova.

40
41 MR. F. JOHN: Sounds good to me.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we have an
44 amendment before us. We can vote the amendment up, we can
45 vote it down. We can put it -- we can amend the thing, and
46 then we can vote it up or vote it done, or vote a different
47 amendment onto it. So the amendment that's before us is to
48 modify it to individual 13.44s south of the Chitina River,
49 right? That was what your amendment was?

00285

1 MR. F. JOHN: Yeah.

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And.....

4
5 MR. F. JOHN: Did I make that amendment? I
6 don't remember.

7
8 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair?

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah?

11
12 MR. DEMENTI: Can the amender withdraw his
13 amendment?

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, the amender can
16 withdraw his amendment.

17
18 MR. DEMENTI: And then we could vote on
19 the.....

20
21 MR. F. JOHN: On the main thing.

22
23 MR. DEMENTI:on the main proposal.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's also an
26 option.

27
28 MR. F. JOHN: Did I amend it? Did anybody
29 note it?

30
31 MR. KOLASINSKI: I believe so.

32
33 MR. F. JOHN: Oh, okay. I withdraw my
34 amendment.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does the second withdraw
37 their amendment? That was Clare.

38
39 MR. F. JOHN: Did you second?

40
41 MS. SWAN: Did I second it? Okay. Yes, I
42 do.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The amendment is
45 withdrawn. So we have the motion as it's written set in
46 front of us. Any further discussion?

47
48 MR. F. JOHN: Question.

49

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's called.

00286

1 All in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye?

2

3 MS. SWAN: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed, signify by
6 saying Nay.

7

8 MS. SWAN: Oops.

9

10 IN UNISON: Nay.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails.

13

14 MS. EAKON: Clare, you voted yes?

15

16 MR. ELVSAAS: She pulled a Fred.

17

18 MS. SWAN: I did not.

19

20 MR. ELVSAAS: That's okay. It doesn't --
21 no effect. That.....

22

23 MS. SWAN: I didn't mean to.

24

25 MR. ELVSAAS:makes good sense, too.
26 Mr. Chairman, I.....

27

28 MS. SWAN: No, it's hard to.....

29

30 MR. ELVSAAS:just want to comment,
31 you know, had we gone with the amendment, there would be
32 13.44 eligible people north of the river, too, that
33 wouldn't have the same as those south of the river.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know. You're looking at
36 one of them.

37

38 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, you are. Yeah, that's
39 right. Yeah.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And.....

42

43 MS. SWAN: So what real difference did we
44 make?

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically what we did as a
47 council is we voted down this proposal. They have the
48 right to reapply the proposal.....

49

MS. SWAN: They can come back.

00287

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:or modify the
2 proposal.

3
4 MS. SWAN: Okay.

5
6 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah.

7
8 MR. DEMENTI: Bring it back in a better
9 form.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or bring it back in a
12 better form.....

13
14 MS. SWAN: Or make.....

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:or bring it back with
17 more individual, or they have the right to apply as
18 individuals for 13.44s and describe the area. But what we
19 haven't got is we haven't got any customary and traditional
20 then for those as individuals. They will have to apply for
21 customary and traditional on their own.

22
23 Okay. With that, I think we've completed the
24 proposals. It's 6:00 in the evening. We have a meeting
25 starting at 8:30 tomorrow morning for a workshop, after
26 which we will take the agency reports, and the new
27 business. George?

28
29 MR. SHERROD: Yes, Mr. Chair, I was hoping
30 to head north, but if there were individuals who felt
31 strongly about these proposals, I would be willing to wait
32 until tomorrow, because I know it's late, and take your
33 comments. If there are not individ -- if there aren't any
34 proposals here that anyone feels strongly about, I'd like
35 to head towards the Board of Game meeting in Fairbanks.

36
37 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Take off.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Some of the proposals that
40 you put down don't -- that you listed didn't really
41 directly apply to us in a way that affected subsistence, so
42 -- I read through them last night. I didn't see any
43 burning issues.

44
45 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And did you see -- did you
48 read through them?

49

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

00288

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So from that
2 standpoint.....

3
4 MR. F. JOHN: They didn't have nothing to
5 do with us.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: From that standpoint, I
8 don't see where we need to comment on them.

9
10 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if you wish to take
13 off, that's fine.

14
15 MR. SHERROD: It's been a pleasure working
16 with you again. Hopefully.....

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If you wish to stay in the
19 morning, we'll give you 15 minutes.

20
21 MR. SHERROD: No.

22
23 MR. F. JOHN: Maybe.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hey, come on now.

26
27 (Off record)

28
29 (END OF DAY'S PROCEEDINGS)

00289

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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 134 through 288 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of VOLUME II, SOUTHCENTRAL SUBSISTENCE FEDERAL REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC MEETING, taken electronically by me on the 2nd day of March, 2000, beginning at the hour of 10:00 o'clock a.m. at the Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association, Kenai, 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 15th day of March 2000.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/00