

SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING

March 4, 1996
Centennial Building Meeting Room
Cordova, Alaska

VOLUME I

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Roy S. Ewan, Chairman
Lee C. Basnar, Vice-Chairman
Fred John, Jr., Secretary
Ralph Lohse
Benjamin E. Romig
Robert J. Henrichs
Gary V. Oskolkoff

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'll call the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting to order. We'll have roll call.

MR. JOHN: Lee Basnar?

MR. BASNAR: Present.

MR. JOHN: Robert Henrichs?

MR. HENRICHS: Here.

MR. JOHN: Ben Romig?

MR. ROMIG: Here.

MR. JOHN: Roy Ewan?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Here.

MR. JOHN: Gary Oskolkoff?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Here.

MR. JOHN: Ralph Lohse?

MR. LOHSE: Here.

MR. JOHN: Fred John, Jr., here.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right, we have a quorum. I want to welcome everyone here to this meeting. This is the first meeting for the year 1996. I want to have everyone introduce themselves starting, I guess, over here, Taylor, do you want to start it off on that side.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I'm Taylor Brelsford. I work in Anchorage with the Federal Subsistence program primarily with the regional council part of the program.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game, Department of State and Federal Regulations coordinator for the State.

MR. ZEMKE: Steve Zemke, Chugach National Forest Subsistence coordinator.

MR. KUHN: Rod Kuhn, I'm with the Regional Office and Forest Services for Subsistence.

MR. SABON: Phillip Sabon from Copper Center.

MR. GOODLATAW: John Goodlataw.

MR. EWAN: Pete Ewan from Copper Center, Copper Center Council.

MR. GREENWOOD: Bruce Greenwood from National Park Service in Anchorage.

MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell, I'm with Denali National Park.

MR. WILLIS: Robert Willis, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management.

MR. SPRAKER: My name is Ted Spraker. I'm the area biologist of Alaska Department of Fish & Game out of Soldotna.

MS. SPRAKER: My name is Elaina Spraker. I am acting chair of the Kenai Peninsula Outdoor Coalition. I'm from Soldotna, Alaska.

MR. NOWLIN: I'm Roy Nowlin. I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. I'm the area wildlife biologist in Cordova.

MR. DENTON: I'm Jeff Denton, biologist and subsistence specialist with the Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage District.

MR. KALGANITIS: Mike Kalganitis. I work for Impact Assessments, a private contracting firm in Anchorage.

MR. SHOWALTER: James Showalter, Kenaitze Indian Tribe, Kenai.

MS. MONTAGUE: Marina Montague from Kluti-Kaah Village in Copper Center.

MR. GALIPEAU: Russell Galipeau with National Park Service, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

MR. WELLS: My name is Jay Wells, Chief Ranger, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.

MR. HANA: Jim Hana. Park Ranger pilot, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, Glenallen.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I think we missed Helga up here. Helga?

MS. EAKON: Helga Eakon. I serve as the coordinator for this regional advisory council.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Welcome to all of you. The next order of business here is the adoption of our agenda.

MS. EAKON: I will quickly review, Mr. Chair, but maybe for the people if the Council members would like to introduce themselves.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. We'll start over here again, Gary, tell them where you're from.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'm Gary Oskolkoff, Ninilchik, Alaska.

MR. LOHSE: Ralph Lohse, Cordova, Alaska.

MR. JOHN: Fred John, Jr., Mentasta Lake, Alaska.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Roy Ewan, Gulkana.

MR. BASNAR: Lee Basnar, Cantwell area.

MR. ROMIG: Ben Romig, Cooper Landing.

MR. HENRICHS: Bob Henrichs, Cordova.

MS. EAKON: And our Court Reporter is Tina Hile. Agenda 5 will be our next topic and that is the adoption of the minutes of September 1995. Item 6 is opening the floor for public comments and because we are mandated by law to serve as a public forum, the opportunity for public comment stays open right until we adjourn. And we do have some blue forms on the sign-in table; if you want to testify, if you would kindly fill those out. This is for our administrative purposes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: And those are at the table in the back?

MS. EAKON: Yes. And please be sure to sign-in so we have a good clear record of who attended this meeting. There are some sign-in sheets in the back. There's also all kinds of information including the agenda and pretty much information on every agenda item on the table there. Please feel free to help yourselves.

Moving on to Item 7, Old Business. Because National Park Service personnel are going to have to travel back - they have another regional council meeting to go to today, we're going to take up Proposal #17, #18 and #19 immediately after Mr. Ewan opens the floor to public comments. We're going to address those. And when we're done with those we're going to move immediately into the reports and keep going. Item 7(B), regional council proposals, To Declare the Entire Kenai Peninsula as Rural, Mr. Tom Boyd, who is our deputy regional assistant director is going to fly from Anchorage tomorrow to speak to this topic. Because the Federal subsistence board did take action on this proposal and since Tom is the deputy he wanted to make certain to come here, in person, to explain to the regional council members what the Federal subsistence board did with this proposal. Then Item 7(C), (D), (E), (F), are more or less informational items that I will present to you. Item 7(G), Taylor Brelsford, will present the update on those two items there. Please turn the page over, if we have

forgotten to put any other old business items, that's a place to put it right there.

New business, Item 8(A), Customary and Traditional Use Determination Proposals Deferrals, Taylor Brelsford will take that up. The primary focus of our meeting is going to be 8(B), the proposal to change the subsistence regulations. And there is a set procedural pattern that we always use and that's at the steps one, two, three and four. And 8(C), Rachel Mason who is our cultural anthropologist will present Item (C), the backlog of C & T determinations. Ms. Mason will be arriving to this meeting around 4:00 o'clock this afternoon. And then 8(E), the State Proposed Subsistence Solution, Taylor Brelsford will take the lead on that with any help from any state of Alaska employees present. Then Bob Willis, who is our wildlife biologist will take up 8(G). DLP stands for bears taken in defense of life and property, okay. And Items 8(H), now is the time if the regional council members or anyone has an item to place on the agenda, now is the time to put them under 8(H). Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. The item on the agenda right now is the agenda that we're considering. Are there any additions? I'll entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

MR. BASNAR: Move to adopt the agenda.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion to adopt the agenda, is there a second?

MR. JOHN: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. All in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign. Motion carries. Next item is review and adoption of minutes. The minutes are from the September 27th through the 29th meeting.

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, on Page 5, in Unit 6, Black Bear; in response to question from Council member Lohse, Greg Box stated that the Cordova Fish & Game Advisory Committee did not want the community of Cordova to harvest Black bear and therefore the State Board of Game excluded Cordova from a positive c&t determination for those species. We discussed it at an advisory meeting and never did we say we did not want Cordova to harvest Black bear. We dealt with it when it was under the c&t determination for the State Tier II hunt and at that time we made the determination that, and this is strictly for the State Tier II, was that there was sufficient opportunity to take Black bear, that a different determination didn't need to be made at that time.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: How would you like to correct the minutes?

MS. EAKON: Yeah. This came directly from the transcript. And the transcripts do state Mr. Bos making that statement. But the way it's going to be corrected is when I do the minutes for this meeting, I will so make that notation, okay.

MR. LOHSE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Have you said, well, you want to?

MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Does everybody understand the correction that Ralph wants to make?

MR. LOHSE: And I guess I'm not - what I'm saying is that, while I'm not saying that it was an error on the transcript, but what he said was in error.

MS. EAKON: Okay. What he said was in error, okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other corrections?

MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, if I recall correctly, I believe when all these people testified I asked every one of them, almost every one of them, what they did for a living and I don't see it in here. So these minutes would not be correct if that was on the recording and it wasn't put in here.

MS. EAKON: See those transcripts are like real fat, big fat three volumes, and what I did when I capsulized these was just try to get the essence of what each testifier said. However, if you would like that as a regional council member to be included, to be added, I will so note, okay?

MR. HENRICHS: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Anything else?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion to adopt the minutes.

MR. JOHN: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion and second, any further discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign. Motion's carried.

We have - I guess, now go to Item 6, we'll open up the floor for public comments on Federal subsistence management program. Helga, I guess, you will want to put the National Park Service up at this time, is this my understanding?

MS. EAKON: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The two proposals #17 and #18?

MS. EAKON: And #19.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: And #19, all right. We'll here from National Park Service at this time. Russ.

MR. GALIPEAU: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Hello.

MR. GALIPEAU: Before I start, Mr. Chair, I'd just like to point out that Copper River Native Association is here and they're going to want to testify on behalf of these proposals also, so we want to make sure that that gets done today.

Proposal #17 and 18 both deal with the Mentasta caribou herd. And as you may recall, the Mentasta caribou herd has been closed in game management, well, GMU 11 for the past two years. And this proposal, the one presented by the National Park Service and which I am one and my name is Russell Galipeau, just so we can clear the record here. And the one that National Park Service Wrangell-St. Elias has proposed is to open the season, this Proposal #17 and in your book it's on Page 18. It's to open the season this year based on the Mentasta caribou herd cooperative harvest management plan. And there is a counter proposal, which is Proposal #18 which is to open the Mentasta caribou herd that has been presented by the Copper River Native Association.

Proposal #17, as I said, is based on the Mentasta caribou herd cooperative management plan and that plan was set up so that we would look at the productivity of the herd. And based on certain parameters, if you met those and the Park Service with its cooperators who are the Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the United States Fish & Wildlife Service and several endorsees which would be the local advisory committees, your regional council has endorsed the plan and so has our Wrangell -St. Elias subsistence resource commission endorsed this plan to-date, that was done last week. What that plan calls for is that we met certain parameters in productivity, that the Park Service would forward a proposal to open that hunt. We've met those parameters and the hunt is going to -well, we're suggesting that the hunt be opened. Now, what makes it a little bit difficult is it's recommending 15 caribou be taken, 15 bull caribou based on the plan. Well, 15 bull caribou is not enough caribou to meet the minimum subsistence needs in the Copper River Valley. During past hunts we felt that if there were 30 or more animals, which is also based on the plan available for subsistence users, then we could open the hunt up for just a straight registration permit. But in this particular scenario of only 15 bull caribou, that places us in a Title 804 situation, which we have to now allocate that limited resource to those people based on the three criteria and Title 804 - or Section 804 of ANILCA.

Now, the National Park Service and its cooperators in their plan says that we can take 15 to 20 percent of the productivity of a given year based on some of the parameters. When we take 15 percent of the productivity from 1995, it turns out that we can allocate 15 bull caribou for the '96 season. But there's a range that's outlined in that plan and that plan calls for between 15 and 20 percent can be taken. The National Park Service is recommended that we stay with the 15 percent allocation in that plan because the Mentasta caribou herd continues to decline. In 1994 there was 877 animals and in 1995 there was 851 animals. The adult cow mortality remains high. In 1992/93, the cow mortality was 18 percent. And '93/94 it was 12 percent. And then in '94/95, the cow mortality was 22 percent. The bull/cow ratio in 1995 was also close to the minimum threshold that's been setup by the plan. The plan establishes a threshold of 35 bulls per 100 cows. The two year mean right now is 36.5 bulls per 100 cows. So based on these three reasons, that's the herd still continues to decline the high mortality rate and a low bull/cow ratio, but still above the threshold, the Park Service has recommended and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife staff analysis has concurred that the allocation be 15 bull caribou for this next hunting season.

Now, what that - from there allocating 15 now becomes a more difficult process because it's no longer, can we just open that hunt generally for the public. So the work that's also been done by the Federal subsistence folks is that the sociocultural findings reveal that most communities in the area participate in caribou hunting in Unit 11 and that they have a similar history during recent times. Now, that's recent times we're talking about, keep that in mind. And

that a harvest quota of 15 bulls will not provide a sufficient opportunity for all eligible communities. Therefore, it's recommended that the subsistence resource commission of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park work in consultation with both your group and eastern interior subsistence regional councils to recommend an allocation of this limited resource. And so I'm here today also to tell you that the Wrangell-St. Elias subsistence regional council - I mean subsistence resource commission did such a thing last week. They sat down, they did not adopt either one of the proposals, either CRNAs, Copper River Native Associations or the National Park Services, what the subsistence resource commission asked was, since the range of take in the plan is between 15 and 20 percent, the subsistence resource commission felt that they should go to the 20 percent allocation. So if you applied 20 percent, then 20 bull caribou would be available. So that's the one recommendation the Wrangell-St. Elias subsistence resource commission made. And the second recommendation they made is that seeing that we were in a limited situation, they felt that the evidence presented to them last week favored allocating the caribou, those bull caribou to the Native villages, the Ahtna Native villages. And they're here today to present how they would do that. So that's how our subsistence resource commission ruled on these two proposals. Not to adopt either one of them. CRNA's proposal, Copper River Native Association, their proposal originally was to harvest 28 caribou in two different seasons. Where the National Park Services was to harvest the 15 bull caribou in one season. So I know there's a lot of different things happening there.

The National Park Service, remember, still feels very strong since this is the first year that the hunt is going to be open for the last two years of it being closed that we take a conservative approach and we rule on the lower end in the 15 percent. Now, you're not going to hear that today from CRNA and you're not going to hear that from the subsistence resource commission meeting, which two fellas are here today, Mr. Roy Ewan and Mr. Fred John are on the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission. And I believe I reiterated what you folks decided last week straight. So again, just a final reiteration, you've got two proposals in front of you, Proposal #17 by the National Park Service and Proposal #18 by the Copper River Delta - Copper River Native Association. The National Park Service is asking that you take a conservative approach in allocating these caribou, so only allocating 15 and that you would work with the subsistence resource commission of the National Park Service to allocate that limited resource.

And I can answer any questions if you'd like at this time.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any questions? Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned the cow mortality rate and what is the norm?

MR. GALIPEAU: I couldn't tell you that right now. I think it's in the lower part of the teens. We have up there is the Mentasta caribou herd, the cows are quite old, so we're starting to see them both die naturally and by predators. So we were concerned and you saw in the proposal that the cow mortality exceeded, I think it was 35 percent, then you would consider closing the hunt down even this next year, we have not seen that this year. So we feel like that's stabled off. So if we feel it would be lower than 20 percent, the norm.

MR. BASNAR: And you feel that 20 bulls is too high? I know you feel that 28 bulls was too high, but it wasn't clear to me that the 20 percent was also too high?

MR. GALIPEAU: Right. Again, the National Park Service's position is, keeping in mind this would be the first time the hunt's been open for a while is that the herd still continues to decline. Okay, we had 877 animals in '94, then 851 in '95. You have your adult cow mortality, it's been high and then your bull/cow ratio is right at the threshold that's identified in the plan. That a bull/cow ratio today is 36.5 bulls per 100 cows and the trigger in the plan is 35 bulls per 100 cows. That's why the Park Service is asking to take a conservative look. But the Park Service also recognizes that that plan that was signed by the cooperators had a range. And they want you to understand that the Park Service is making a recommendation based on some of the biology that's out there but we understand that there's a range in place and we have all agreed to that range.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: So what you're saying is that 20 is within that range?

MR. GALIPEAU: It is within that range, that's correct.

MR. LOHSE: It's just at the top end?

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Does the Park Service have an idea of what they would recommend for a distribution?

MR. GALIPEAU: The Park Service, in the proposal had asked that that would be a strong role for our subsistence resource commission, since they are there to work out hunt plans for the people subsistence users at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. So we asked the subsistence resource commission to look into that and they did last week and their recommendation as I said, based on the evidence they heard was to present to your body here that those limited resource, whether it's 15 or 20 bull caribou be allocated to the seven Ahtna villages.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Mr. Basnar.

MR. BASNAR: Is there any Federal land outside the National Park that we're discussing? In other words, could some caribou be taken on Federal land, not within the Park and if that's the case, how is the SRC come in on total caribou take?

MR. GALIPEAU: That's a good question, Mr. Basnar, Unit 11 is principally all within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. There's just a small piece at this end of that management unit, but that's way outside the caribou migration routes or their home range. There is GMU 13 which is adjacent to it and there is some Federal land, Bureau of Land Management land there which there is a Federal season and I believe it's two caribou. The subsistence resource commission cannot make any rulings outside of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, they can only concentrate on resources inside the boundary of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and made recommendations on it.

MR. BASNAR: I understand that, but I am still unclear if this proposal has anything to do - it says the Mentasta herd?

MR. GALIPEAU: Right.

MR. BASNAR: The Mentasta herd doesn't necessarily follow the Park boundary. Are we talking about taking, for example, 20 caribou or 28 caribou in the Park and then some additional caribou outside the Park?

MR. GALIPEAU: No. No, we're not. We're talking about taking them within the Park in the Mentasta - during the early part of fall in October, the Nelchina caribou herd will come through, adjoin, they'll go up into Unit 12 and that's where it's discussed also part of the Mentasta plan is how we manage that winter hunt to minimize any take or actually to try and have no take on Mentasta herd in the winter. So it's really targeted at Mentasta's weather in Game Management Unit 11. Now, the other thing that we're prepared to do is if, the allocation is either 15 or 20, whichever is ruled by the Federal subsistence board, the seasons become immaterial according to the National Park Service. If 15 permits are given out or 20 permits for Mentasta caribou in Unit 11, National Park Service does not care how long the season is as long as we have that many permits issued. But if we open it up and say let 100 people apply, then we're going to ask that the season be that August/September season and not maybe year-round.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other questions? I would like to make a comment for Lee's benefit and that is, you know, when they mix up in Unit 12 there, that Russ is talking about, I guess the record shows that there is very few Mentasta herd taken during that time, right?

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So we believe, I don't know, the Park believes, too, that the take would be in Unit 11 mainly.

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct, Mr. Ewan. Past evidence, Mr. Basnar, shows that with working with Fish & Game we like to make sure there's a good mixing ratio between Nelchina's and Mentasta's so it would minimize any take. And actually our objective is to take no Mentasta's in Unit 12, so we'd like to see a big mix occur so that the State can have their sport season and there's a Federal season up there, too, on Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge land. But the idea is not to target Mentasta.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you. Okay, thank you Mr. Galipeau, if there are no other questions. Do you have a question?

MR. LOHSE: Now, you say there is a mix that takes place up there, is it just because the proportions are so one sided, Nelchina to Mentasta that the odds of taking a Mentasta - I mean there hasn't been any real tagging programs or anything like that, has there?

MR. GALIPEAU: Yes, there has. What we do is we sit down with Fish & Game and we fly radio collars before the winter hunt. And we figure out - if there's random mixing, now, you know, this is part of the big guessing in the sky sometimes, but that we assume there's random mixing and based on what one collar would represent with Nelchina caribou versus one collar with Mentasta caribou, we come up with a ratio. In the past it's been somewhere around 33 Mentasta - 33 Nelchina caribou for every one Mentasta and it's been as high as 100 Nelchinas to one Mentasta. So we feel like the chances of shooting a Mentasta are very, very low. And we've been working very cooperatively with Fish & Game in managing that winter hunt.

MR. LOHSE: Do you feel a decline is still basically old cows and predators?

MR. GALIPEAU: Old cows and you also are - old cows we're very concerned about because of productivity, but it's also calf mortality. But this past year and this is what triggers this plan to be open is we had high calf survival and that's what a lot of what's triggered the opening for this. So last year we've done really quite good. The caribou are probably lower numbers are finding better hiding places.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Anybody else? Okay, thank you very much. Oh, does somebody back there have a comment, Jay?

MR. WELLS: Roy, can I say something? Good morning, my name's Jay Wells. I'm the chief ranger and subsistence coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias and I work with Russell Galipeau in the subsistence management program up there. Russell kind of glossed over the 804 process, which is one thing that I think the Council here is going to be very concerned about. And last week at the subsistence resource commission meeting that Roy and Fred were a part of, the 804 process took up a good part of that time and it really hasn't been applied yet. I mean it has in a couple of areas in the State, but I think they addressed it very well. I just wanted to make a few points about the 804. As you know, and Bruce, hand out this regs for the 804 process, there isn't any process per se in place now for applying that priority setting but the subsistence resource commission addressed it. And the three criteria are the customary and direct dependents on the resources are a mainstay of livelihood and then the localness and then the availability of alternative resources. And I believe it's fair to say that the commission felt insofar as the ability for the Park Service or the Federal board to determine a priority based on the last two factor, the localness and alternative resources that it was pretty much equal without being so intrusive into people's lives. And that they really focused their efforts on setting a priority on the first one there which is customary and direct dependence on the resource. And there was testimony at that meeting from some of the people in some of the villages that I think was very convincing and that is that in applying that process, the customary and direct dependence, it was clear that residents of those Native villages, traditional villages, had a very long standing customary and direct dependence on that population. And so the SRC chose to apply the 804 primarily on that Number 1 criteria which is customary and direct dependence. And based on that, recommended all of the allocation, 15 or 20, whatever the Federal board decides would go to those villages and that Park Service, at least Wrangell-St. Elias National Park was supportive of that and felt that the 804 process was complied with and that we agreed to work with Copper River Native Association or all those villages and the councils in issuing those permits and allocating the harvest to those elders in cooperation with Copper River Native Association.

And, Roy, I think that's fairly accurate. Did I get it right?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just want to add one thing and that is, we thought about the alternative for resources that's mentioned somewhere in the regulations. There's - Unit 13 or Nelchina herd, the hunt in Unit 13, that's available to most of the people in that area and Unit 12 that Russ mentioned earlier. Those people can hunt from a very healthy heard there, the Nelchina herd. So we're not, I don't think, depriving anyone of the ability to take the caribou in that particular area. We had to make a decision on how to allocate and I think this is a good solution that we arrived at because of the low number that's going to be allowed to be taken, 20 is not going to go around very far. Even among the

seven villages that we narrowed it down from the 18 resident zone communities that's listed, I think - is it 18?

MR. WELLS: Eighteen, yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. WELLS: So anyway, I just wanted to make sure that you know that Park Service was supportive of that 804 allocation process and we believe that it was applied correctly and within the sideboards of the law. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you, Jay.

MR. BASNAR: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee?

MR. BASNAR: It's my understanding that the Park Service wants no more than 20, but the SRC said 28, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No.

MR. BASNAR: Twenty.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let me clarify that for you. The original proposal from CRNA was for 28.

MR. BASNAR: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: They came back after discussion with the Park Service about this range that Russ was talking about. The Park Service came out with a range of 15 to 20 percent. The Park Service wanted to be conservative, went along - recommended 15 percent. CRNA's coming back here with a proposal for 20 percent - or 20 bulls, you know, 20 percent comes to less than 20 bulls of the herd, but they round it off to the next number, I guess, 20 - 20 bulls.

MR. GALIPEAU: Mr. Chairman, let me try and clear that up. Mr. Basnar, when you - the Park Service's proposal was to use the lower end of the plan which was 15 percent. So when you applied that it came out to like 13.8 bulls and they rounded it up to the nearest five bulls so it came out to 15. CRNA's original proposal was for 28 bull caribou. Both the National Park Service and the staff committee for the Fish & Wildlife subsistence group do not support the taking of 28 animals. And one of the reasons is it's not within the cooperative plan that was agreed upon by the three agencies, Fish & Wildlife Service, Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the National Park Service and another is they didn't feel at this time that 28 could be sustained. So CRNA has since modified their proposal, you do not see it in your package there. They came - that's why, this will help - they came to the subsistence resource commission meeting prepared to compromise and come within the constraints of the plan and they're here today to talk about that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MR. GALIPEAU: Yeah, sorry, if we didn't get that clear to you. So what they're recommending to cite this subsistence resource commission of the Park, is that the higher allocation be applied at the 20 percent level so rounded off that

would allow for 20 bulls to be taken. And their new recommendation is within the constraints of the management plan. Thank you.

MR. BASNAR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you, Russ. The public hearing is still open, is there anybody else that wants to speak on this?

MS. EAKON: Before you do that, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MS. EAKON: Following the procedure on Page 2 of our agenda, the program received only one written public comment on this proposal and that was from Alaska Department of Fish & Game who supports the Proposal #17. The program received one written public comment on Proposal #18 and that was also from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, who said that if the board finds that the Mentasta herd can sustain a limited harvest, the hunt will need to be administered using the three criteria in ANILCA, Section 804.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you very much, Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: My name's Gloria Stickwan. I work for Copper River Native Association. And we met with the village, like the National Park Service did, and we changed our proposal. We went with the 20 percent. There's a copy for you of our proposal. We propose that 20 caribou be taken by Ahtna elders in the seven villages of Mentasta, Chistochina, Gakona, Gulkana, Tazlina, Copper Center and Chitna. That the National Park issue the 20 permits to the elders and that the village council shall determine how many permits shall be allocated to each village and which elder shall get the permit. And the elder may designate another person to be a proxy hunter for him or her. We went with the higher 20 percent so that we could have a 20 bull permit. Our original one was, like they said, was 28 bulls. We met with the villages on January 31st and they agreed to bring the number back down to 20. So this is our proposal which is what is in the management plan.

I have some maps here that we have used this area, this is done through that c&t study CRNA did. I have some elders here who would like to speak about using the Mentasta caribou herd and Steve Langdon who's helped me work on this c&t study could answer any questions you have on these maps.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Who?

MS. STICKWAN: Steve Langdon, he's with the University of Alaska.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you want him up here, too?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes. He'll come up later. And I just want the elders now to come up and say what they have to say about using the Mentasta caribou herd.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are there any questions of Gloria - or have those elders come up. All right, no questions. Who do you want up here? Okay, we have Phillip Sabon, welcome Phillip.

MR. SABON: Phillip.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: State your name for the record there.

MR. SABON:Sabon. Copper Center. I used to hunt up Nabesna Road in Unit 11 and I used to get moose, caribou and since it closed I never went back up there a couple years. It's - I used to hunt all the time up that way, up Nabesna Road. Down below there's too many people move into it, that's why I mostly - I never went down towards, about six mile up from Nabesna Road, up 16 miles, that's where the caribou used to go across. We used to - I used to hunt around there all the time, caribou for home use.

And long ago we used to divide up meat, too, all the people. When camp back - we used to give the meat too, so it's just.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you would like to see this proposal move forward?

MR. SABON: Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you Phillip.

MR. SABON: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Hi John.

MR. : I'm John *** from Tazlina village and the CRNA board and village council for the past eight years. We been up hunting around Nabesna area for a long time and we'd like to see this go forward with - this proposal to continue our caribou hunt up there. That's where Copper River Basin - Copper River people use all the time, Unit 13, 11, 12, just like to continue with our hunting up there. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you, John.

MS. MONTAGUE: Hi.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Welcome Marina. State your name for the record, please.

MS. MONTAGUE: My name is Marina Montague from Kluti-Kaah village in Copper Center. I was a member for the Kluti-Kaah council for last eight years. I'm not on the board now but I still like to put my two cents in. Like 20 caribou - Mentasta caribou permit for elders in seven villages such as Chistochina, Chitna, Gakona, Gulkana, Mentasta, Tazlina and Copper Center. We used to go hunting on the Nabesna Road. The last time I went up there was after '80s. I quit going up that way because there was too many traffic and hunters everywhere. I'm sure that's the only reason why nobody wants hunts up that way now.

When we get caribou we use the meat for our meals. Hide, we tan it and use it for moccasin, jacket, slipper, gloves, shoelace, snowshoes, it also makes pretty purse when you put beads on it. We do not throw heads, liver, heart or stomach away. We use every bit of it, even the - even the hoofs. But lately the caribous are like hunters, they all go a different direction.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you, Marina.

MR. EWAN: My name is Peter Ewan from Copper Center. We come down for our subsistence use of Alaska. Wherever there are trail and why we used to trap all

those - it was all our subsistence. Because it's a right we had years ago. But today it's all taken away from us. But we're still there to fight it for our use, meat, caribou, moose, sheep and fish. But the way it is now, you want to change us to a different way, but we're the Indian. We cannot be changed from Indian to other people. We're trying to hold our tradition as hard as we can. We're teaching our children, our grandchildren how we used to eat years ago and how we used to care for meat, how we used to care for fish, whatever we get to eat, we don't throw it away, we use it. Sometimes when we go out we hang it up and dry it and smoke it and we keep it that way. We didn't have no freezer or refrigerator years ago. The way we keep it cold and we take ground - and we (indiscernible) ice and that's why we keep it cold, with a pack overnight. What we get we dry it or wintertime, keep that way.

Now, today they got the caribou herd, they call Nelchina herd and Mentasta herd, well, years back we didn't have no - we had it all together in Alaska. All the villages everywhere, Mentasta to Chitna, everyone hunt. On Paxton and up on the Nabesna Road. That's where they used to get from Chitna, they don't have caribous down that way. They go a long way to get - get caribou in the fall. That's how they get meat. Today they try taking our Indian rights away from us, but we're still going to be there and fight it so we can hold it as long as we can.

Like now, 11 - 11th has 15 caribou in seven village, how many of them seven village people - how many hundred of them in seven village? Does anybody know how many families in each village? And 15 caribou is good enough for whole seven village? No, it isn't. We got to have more than that that's why we're putting in 20 caribou, it's not enough, that's why we put in 20 on the National Park. Whatever - wherever Federal land is. We try to hold - we try to get for the village from the National Park and that's why we put in last time and show that's what we're here for. And up on the highway where Federal land (indiscernible) we didn't care for no Federal land. On the last fall - last season was all full - we get - Federal - Federal permit from Federal office there, some of them didn't get no permits I know - don't know what happened. And the state of Alaska, when they come up from - the State - they come up to the state of Alaska show their Alaska driver's license, that's all they need to go out and hunt. I don't think that is right to call one's State, it isn't right to just show driver's license and get permit for hunting. That isn't right (indiscernible) and that's what I told him, he said that's right, that's what they told me, one the State Fish & Game. I don't think it's right the State's Fish & Game to do things like that, just give them their driver's license and get permit - hunting permit, they just go out hunting. And many come up today, you go right there to the State's office - Trooper's office and get driver's license and they go hunt the next day, that isn't right. The people come up and hunting.

And another thing I want to talk about, the guides and sport hunting and fishing. I wonder why they have them same time as subsistence hunting, the guides and sports hunting. Last year I went to Fairbanks to the hunting season. I see two big loads of people out to village and they had about 10/15 caribou horn and probably about 10 moose horn, a lot of them, (indiscernible), how much do they bring, they don't bring one hindquarter, they don't bother to (indiscernible) vehicle. I don't think they - well, I really don't think they supposed to have subsistence hunting season open to sport man and hunt and leave a bunch of meat up there, at least, they should bring it out to give it to whoever can use it, not just to leave it out there and rot and throw it away.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you Pete. Do you have another person? Is that it Gloria?

MR. STICKWAN: No, that's it. You didn't have any questions for Mr. Langdon?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right, Steve, did you have comment on the maps?

MR. LANGDON: I could make a brief comment, sure.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum.

MR. LANGDON: My name is Steve Langdon, I'm from the University of Alaska Anchorage. And along with Jack Kruse, we've been working on a project with CRNA with the support of BLM and Park Service for about two years now. And what we're - one of our major activities has been to collate the historical data base of Ahtna subsistence use into a GIS system, geographic information system. And this process is still going on, so recognize that there are some corrections that have to be made, but we are incorporating as much of the data that is based upon, both ADF&G information as well as interviews that have been conducted with various Ahtna elders over time. So what you're seeing today is an interim product aimed towards - and we've developed these also for sheep and moose which you'll be getting an opportunity see later on. So I just wanted to let you know a little bit about that if you have any questions about it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you, Steve. Gloria, did you have additional comment?

MS. STICKWAN: I just wonder if we could give our c&t.....

COURT REPORTER: Wait, wait, can you come up to the mike, please?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You've got to come up.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering if we could give our c&t sheep testimonies today, because of the cost of staying here, you know, we'd like to leave tomorrow if we could?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Can we fit them in the schedule?

MS. STICKWAN: This afternoon?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: This is for sheep?

MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, we have a proposal, Unit 13 sheep c&t, trying to get for.

MS. EAKON: What we could do, Gloria, is go ahead and add it right after Park Service is done with 19, we'll move immediately to that proposal. What number is it, please, does anyone know what proposal number it is?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you know Gloria?

MS. STICKWAN: No.

MS. EAKON: Number 20 - okay, we'll move into Proposal #20 right after 19, okay?

MS. STICKWAN: Well, I was kind of wondering if I could get with the elders before that, go back over them, talk to them?

MS. EAKON: Sure. You will have an opportunity because by the time - before we get to 20, we're going to have lunch break, okay?

MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Anybody else want to testify on these proposals that we heard about this morning, Proposal #17 and #18? If not, I think I would - it would be an appropriate time for me to make comment since I serve on the subsistence resource commission for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, so does Fred John here, to my right.

We as a subsistence commission support CRNA's proposal all the way. That means we want the high end of the plan of 20 caribou taken. My own personal reason for supporting that number is that I don't think there's any guarantee that there'll be 20 taken. I've - maybe we'll get lower than 15, but anyway that - I don't see no harm in having that high number and if they were successful, I think they would go to the very individuals that meet the criteria of the - the first criteria here in 804 of customary and direct dependence upon the resource as a mainstay of one's livelihood. We had a few more elders at our subsistence resource commission meeting. That really brought home the fact that these people - some of these people, like Pete Ewan's age of 80 and over really rely almost 99 percent of the time when, say from the time they were one to 50 years old. These are the people that lived off the land, but they no longer do that and I think they meet that criteria. And these are the people that are losing their way of life. We feel that this allocation that they recommend will meet this need for the elders and I don't think we'll have any problem in the villages with the allocation process, I really don't see any problem. I've grown up in the Copper River basin, I know all the villages that are listed here under the CRNA plan and I've worked with them for many years and I've always seen where the elders have cooperated with one another, they also share with those that do not get any caribou; I'm sure that they'll share.

Before I turn this over to Fred and let him say something about this proposal, since he also serves on the resource development - subsistence resource commission - I get mixed up between these two organizations, I want to point out one thing on Page 19 in your proposal, you know, where it talks about Proposal #17, they list communities in the table there. Table 1 says, Chistochina, Copper Center, Gakona, Glenallen, Mentasta, Northway, Slana, Tok, a lot of times when you get permits, they list these communities and leave out some communities the reason being that these are the communities that probably have a post office. Like there's no Gulkana listed, I know that we have a - we get our mail at Gakona, so you have a high number at Gakona. Gakona and Gulkana are only about five miles apart and that's probably true for other communities, like the low number for Chistochina, Chistochina probably gets as many per capita as the other communities of this Mentasta herd we're talking about because they're closer to the Unit 12 up in that end and they do go across the river to hunt in Unit 11. I just wanted to point that out. I just wanted to give you a clear picture of the communities that participate in that hunt.

Fred, do you have any comment?

MR. JOHN: Yeah. After hearing the elders talk from the CRNA area and Glenallen, I support the CRNA proposal. I don't think it would hurt anybody and I don't - I think there's enough allocation to this seven village that goes to

the customary and direct dependence upon the population of the - and livelihood. And I appreciate the National Park Service for working with the CRNA for this here. And I listened to Pete Ewan talk a couple of times now and what I hear from him is, I think what the elders are trying to tell us, there's a really a talk about for cultural existence, you know, because the state of Alaska don't recognize tribes, they don't recognize Native American in Alaska. And I believe what they're saying is, hey, look, we're around, look at us. And I'm for that CRNA proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other questions, comments?

MR. GALIPEAU: Mr. Ewan, just before you pickup these two proposals, I want to remind you because there's - there's some confusion, I've been trying to both the proposal for the Park and also the staff analysis. I think it would be good to - just to make sure that you know where Fish & Wildlife's staff analysis for Federal subsistence is that we have Robert Willis come up, you know, and verify, you know, that, because I know it's kind of confusing having the agency who made a proposal also do a staff analysis. What we're asking you to do are two things, is one, you know, look at the bag limit that's got to be approved and then, two, then the allocation of that resource. So you got two very important decisions to make here today, okay, so keep that in mind.

So I'm going to have Robert Willis come up and make sure you understand the staff committee's position on this, not just the National Park Services.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph, do you have a comment or question?

MR. LOHSE: Yeah. I was going to ask, when we get down to the point that if we look at the proposals as they're written, it doesn't set anything in place for how you get those permits in the hands of individual elders. I mean it basically has a general thing that says 20 for seven villages. There's no, you know, at what point in time does - who does the deciding who gets what permit?

MR. GALIPEAU: Yeah, Mr. Lohse, I think what we're - what the National Park Service will be relying on is once the season and bag limit has been set and if there's agreement with CRNA's approach on having the elders get them, there's still the burden on the National Park Service to make sure they meet eligibility requirements. So we'll have to make sure that they're eligible under the National Park Service system, the Federal subsistence system and then the National Park Service will issue the permits to the elders within those villages. That's how we see it being done.

MR. LOHSE: To individual elders?

MR. GALIPEAU: To individuals, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just want to add that the communities that are listed are the old established Native communities, they were there long before, say, Tok, Glenallen, Slana and those communities.

And I also want to make one other comment and I know you probably get tired of me taking about the wolves all the time, but last year I was kind of mad when they closed this subsistence hunt - or hunt on the Mentasta herd altogether and the wolves kept killing the herd. And it really made people, I guess human beings suffer, while the wolves had a free for alls and the bears and all. I just wanted to say that. I think we ought to open it to human beings as well as to the animals.

Yes, Robert.

MR. WILLIS: Robert Willis, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management. Russ, pretty well covered the biological situation up there, so I don't want to go into that but mostly what I'd like to do is to state our position, the Fish & Wildlife Service staff and the reasons for it. First of all, when the hunt was closed initially all the agencies were in agreement that we wanted to reopen it as soon as possible. It's always been the thrust of managing that herd to let it recover to the point where the subsistence harvest would once again be available. And the plan was developed with that in mind and we were - all the agencies are committed to that.

When the draft plan was developed, I had the opportunity to comment on it several years ago before it was put into place. And at that time one weakness that I saw and it was the use of an average of only two years of calf production as one of the determining factors in reopening the hunt. My concern was that you could have one high year of production, production could then drop back to a low level and yet you would still meet the minimum criteria for a hunt on a declining herd. It's just coincidence that that's what's happened the first year we had the - we had one high year of production and then it dropped again. The herd is still in a decline and yet it qualifies under the minimum criteria for a hunt. For that reason we think that this hunt is marginal to begin with and should be kept at a minimum. We're all signatory to the plan, we all agree that this is the way we want to proceed, so our position is let's go ahead with the hunt, but we feel it should be restricted to the minimum of caribou, rather than a higher number, whatever that higher number might be. Although five caribou or five bulls might not seem to be a great deal, as I say, we feel like we're borderline to be hunting this herd anyway since it's still in a decline. And there's also a concern that if you take too many bulls this year, that next year we won't meet the minimum bull/cow ratio no matter what the production is. And the hunt will have to be shut down again. We would really rather see a hunt every year once we start back, if we could do that rather than taking 20 or more this year and then maybe having to shut it down next year.

As Russ said, at that level we're really not concerned about the season length. You could issue the permits and have the entire year to harvest if you chose to do so. I think that's all the comments I have to add, Roy, unless you have some questions.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Anybody have any questions? Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: One question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead.

MR. LOHSE: Do you feel that - now, you said that you had a high year of calf survival and the last year was lower?

MR. WILLIS: I'd have to look at the sheet again, but I think that's how it worked out. I'll ask Russ.....

MR. LOHSE: Because I had the impression the last year was the highest?

MR. WILLIS: It may have been the other way around.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

MR. WILLIS: We were low and we had one high year.

MR. LOHSE: Last year was the highest one, wasn't it?

MR. GALIPEAU: Yes.

MR. WILLIS: Okay, I stand corrected on that.

MR. LOHSE: So.....

MR. WILLIS: The concern was that one high year could do that, you know, and you don't really know if that's a trend or not. But that - now, that was my concern three years ago when I commented on the draft and it still is a concern. The concern being that you could qualify for a hunt while the population was still in decline.

MR. LOHSE: One more question?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead, yes.

MR. LOHSE: Well, with that herd basically in a decline, if - from the way I understood it, if too many are taken this year you could still have sufficient calf production next year but would have to close the herd because the ratio was wrong?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct. You have to meet all the criteria.

MR. LOHSE: You have to meet all the criteria?

MR. WILLIS: You have to have a minimum bull/cow ratio, 35 to 100. Right now it's 36.5.

MR. LOHSE: So if it was - if you had the smaller end of the hunt, then the odds of having a hunt next year would be higher?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is that it? Okay, thank you very much. I do want to make just one other comment about that and nobody talked about it, I don't think, addressed it and, that is, access. Russ, do you have a map that could show how much of Unit 11 can be accessed by highway? It's so small an area compared to the big Unit 11 we're talking about and there's the Copper River to cross to get to that, you either got to fly in or - to access the bulls when they're way up in the mountains - up near the mountain, so they're not right down by the river?

MR. GALIPEAU: This is Russell Galipeau again. This is Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve and I'm not going to even attempt to tell you what color that is because I don't know, all right, so there's one road that comes into Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve that's around the Mentasta caribou and that's Nabesna Road. And there is no road accessibility along the Glenn Highway or the Richardson Highway, the Glenn Highway's here, Richardson Highway and Tok cutoff, the only road that penetrates in at this northern part is Nabesna Road. The other thing to keep in mind is you cannot access the Park with use of aircraft, that's not allowed. So you do only have one road. You could try and cross the river, but that, as we've heard from many people, that

causes some difficulties, but the Mentasta caribou herd is sitting up in this area here. You've got one road of access and you can cross the river in places if you want to take that chance.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That is why I pointed out there is no guarantee of 20 - the take of 20 if we allocated 20. It probably could be a lower number. It would be great if we had a success of 20 - 20 bull taking, but that's not very likely I don't think. Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Is there a time period when that Mentasta herd crosses that Nabesna Road? I mean does that Mentasta herd entirely cross the Nabesna Road on its way to its wintering route?

MR. GALIPEAU: Yeah, Mr. Lohse it does. When the Nelchina's come through, they'll come through the upper part of the Park and a lot of times they'll cross the Nabesna Road or parallel the Nabesna Road on their way to Unit 12. That usually occurs in early October, so your - the first part of your hunting season you have just Mentasta caribou around and then the latter part you start to get that mixing. But they could be there a day or they could be there for weeks. Now, sometimes the Mentasta caribou herd will also winter in the Park like they did this year, but the last say about 10 years they've been wintering primarily up in game management Unit 12, south of Tok, around the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. LOHSE: Would it be possible then that some of what was thought as Mentasta caribou would actually end up being Nelchina caribou that would be taken?

MR. GALIPEAU: If they're hunted at that time that the migration occurs that could occur. But you just don't, you know, really know. Traditionally the hunt's been closed, both State and Federal subsistence seasons when the migration occurs.

Now, one of the other things to keep in mind is we try and do our bull/cow ratio work right before they mix, too. So the thing that you need to keep in mind when you have year-round seasons is that there's going to be times when management's in there trying to do the biology on the herd, either putting some more collars on or doing some bull/cow counts using helicopters which can impact hunts, but we all feel that that's an essential tool in keeping track of these herds. Now, Nelchina, you know, not the whole herd comes running through the Park, but pieces of them do.

MR. LOHSE: Well, the question I had, I guess, basically what I was asking is if you go to a year round hunt, in other words, you issue the permits and you don't have any closed season, then there's even a possibility that out of that 15 or 20 caribou, some of those caribou will be taken when they're accessible to the Nabesna Road and they could just as easy by Nelchina caribou as Mentasta caribou unless you would limit your time block that the hunt could take place?

MR. GALIPEAU: I agree with you, that's very possible. While you're thinking along those lines, I would like to just caution that you not think of a higher take because a lot of times Mentasta's are in the lead and we don't want to be allocating more take and fear that, what if they are the only ones around the Nabesna Road at the time. That they're not the only targeted group.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's no - Smiling Ralph, I thought you were going to ask him to paint all the Mentastas.

MR. LOHSE: No, I was just thinking that if you had a year round herd and we stuck with a conservative limit, there would always be the possibility that some of that conservative limit would actually even come out of a healthy herd instead out of Mentasta herd. I mean that wouldn't be a reason to allocate more, but it would be a reason that you could say is, as long as you're sticking with a conservative limit. Because from what I remember from being up there, at one point in time you have that - the Nelchina herd, not a fair portion, but a number of the Nelchina herd being accessible to the Nabesna Road, which would modify the amount of Mentasta - I mean, because that's the logical time to be up there.

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, then that you know that about when the herd crosses, that's about the time the Nelchina's crossing elsewhere, too, right, on Lake Louise Road or is there other areas that these people have an opportunity to hunt just as well? There's Lake Louise, Richardson Highway and the Tok Highway that the Nelchina herd crosses, three ways to access that herd. Russ, just pointed out earlier that the Nabesna Road's the only way to get to Unit 11 up there.

Anything else? You want to take a break?

MR. BASNAR: No, let's act on these and then go eat lunch.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Okay, anybody else want to talk on these proposals that we're considering here? Ted.

MR. SPRAKER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Ted Spraker, I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. And the Department of Fish & Game has already gone on record supporting this harvest. And as a game biologist I can certainly understand that an allowable harvest of 15 or 20, it really doesn't make a great deal of difference, would not be detrimental to the herd overall. What I am concerned with from a biologist's standpoint is the long term effect and how things have progressed and changed over time in this herd.

In the middle '70s I worked in the Glenallen office and my responsibility was to count the Mentasta herd and I did that for four years before I moved to the Kenai Peninsula. And during those times we were counting 2,000 plus caribou, harvest were several hundred or so caribou and although it was a fairly small herd, it was a good huntable herd and people derived a lot of meat and so forth hunting this Mentasta herd and that's gone. And it's been gone for quite a few years. And my concern as a game biologist is that this Council should take a very careful look and make some recommendations as to why this herd is declining. Chairman Ewan has mentioned predation, I think it's pretty clear that predation is a major impact on this herd's viability. You're looking at maybe harvesting 15, 20 bulls only this year, next year we're going to be back talking about 10 to 12 bulls only, the next year it's going to be six or eight bulls only and this herd is going to continue to decline unless we address some of the problems. Now, it was mentioned earlier about the predation - or the mortality of adult females, I would suggest that the mortality of adult females cannot be much different than the acceptable mortality for moose, for cow moose, and that's about three percent. And you can model a population of moose and once that population starts losing about three percent of the adult females it starts to decline. And with the Mentasta herd we're looking at a mortality of adult females in the upper-teens and last year, I guess was 22 percent. So there's obviously some - some very sharp precipitous decline going on in this

population and the Council may want to take a look at making some sort of recommendation to turn this around so that you will have caribou to hunt in the future.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I do have a question of either Russ or Ted or anybody about caribou, when they mix? I know that the dominate bulls have a harem around them - surrounding them. Could a more dominant bull, say from Unit 13 take over some of the cows from the other herd, could that happen? I suppose it could, but I just wondered if anybody saw that as one of the reasons why there might be leave in that area.

MR. GALIPEAU: Okay, if I understand your question right, Mr. Ewan, it's sort of - is that the bulls are pulling in more cows for breeding purposes, are any of the cows leaving the Mentasta range and going over to the Nelchina?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum.

MR. GALIPEAU: We've - primarily why we collar cows is not only to look at the productivity, that's how we've defined where their calving grounds are and what herds they are. Today we haven't had collared cows going over into the Nelchina calving grounds or vice versa. Now, it could be that maybe we're unlucky in collaring, but we seem to think that they feel a real strong site preference to coming back to those same areas. Now, the question does rise with bulls though, you know, when they're on the move and they go into the rut and they're mating, do those bulls - are they interchanging the genetic pool between the Nelchinas and the Mentastas. We seem to think that if that's happening, that's good. But are those bulls all going back to Nelchina area or are they coming and staying in the Mentasta area, those are some big questions that need to be asked. But we feel the cows that are collared represent the cows in the Mentasta herd and they are staying home in Unit 11 in that calving area.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess I'm just wondering if there's more dominate bulls on the other side, maybe that could be the reason - just in the back of my mind I was thinking maybe some of the cows could - the more dominate bulls over there, that's what I was thinking, but maybe.....

MR. GALIPEAU: Yeah. Right now we don't have any evidence that that's happening. I mean they could be being serviced by those dominate bulls, but they're having the calves still in Unit 11.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I see. Yes, Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah, I have a question. Ted Spraker brought up a good point on the predation. There is no way to have a predator controlled program initiated in a national park, is that correct?

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct.

MR. BASNAR: So any predator controlled program would have to be initiated by the state of Alaska in the peripheral areas outside the Mentasta's herds home range?

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct. Or on State lands or - although it's still questionable on some of the other Federal lands on how they can approach

predator management, but in the National Park Service there is no managing one species in favor of another.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you. Helga.

MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair, Taylor Brelsford has some suggestions for the Council as you deliberate the allocation question in another issue.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This would be just a procedural suggestion and that is that the Council consider in one motion the allocation level item and then separately discuss and provide on the record your rationale for any recommendation you would make in regard to distribution of the permits. I noted the care with which Russ described the discussion by the subsistence resource commission and the information that was provided in the meeting on the public record regarding histories of use and those three factors, those three criteria in ANILCA Section 804. Some of that same information ought to be part of your considerations today and I think it may facilitate that if you were to deal with the two items in separate motions. So that in the second step, in discussing and making a recommendation on how permits ought to be distributed, you could refer to the information on which you base your recommendation and any linkages to the criteria. The three factors in Section 804 would strengthen the record and the foundation for the Board to make use of your recommendation later on. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Any other comments on the proposal? Yes, Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I really like this situation that we're in here. It's a difficult thing to wrestle with, but I like it because I see the system beginning to work. And I see a request from the local people on the one hand for a certain number of caribou, I see the conservative position from the biologists and the governmental agencies on the other hand and I see the SRC getting involved. And I think this is exactly the way the system is supposed to work. And from my prospective, the signatories have said we can range between 15 and 20 percent, I'm pretty conservative when it comes to game management programs. Probably at the outset I would say, well, let's go for the 15 percent, but everyone has agreed to go 15 to 20 and if the locals are comfortable that they're not going to overharvest with 20 percent, then I can support that. Because we do have the mechanism in place that next year if this harvest proves to be detrimental, we can cut it back some, trim it, perhaps even stop it. We hope that doesn't happen. So in short, I'm not sure what the mechanism is that we should move forward with right at this point, but I support the CRNA position in spite of the biological conservative comments that have been made. I think we're well within the window here, let's give it a shot and move forward from there.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you Lee. Any other comments? I just want to make sure I understand Taylor's suggestion here. Which - I heard one, but mainly allocation you're talking about, what's the other?

MR. BRELSFORD: Ralph, perhaps.....

MR. LOHSE: I think if I understood what Taylor was saying is that we should handle this basically in two motions. One motion is whether or not to take 15 or 20 caribou.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right.

MR. LOHSE: And the second motion would be basically.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is that what you suggest?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right, I understand that now. Are we prepared to take action and make a recommendation to the Board?

MR. BASNAR: I'm not prepared at this very instant to make a motion, but if we're dealing - if we just deal with the proposals, we would not deal with Proposal #17 and Proposal #17 - you know, we haven't even discussed dates because they apparently don't mean anything, the biologists aren't concerned, they're more concerned with numbers. So we're kind of - we tend to seem to be ignoring the seasons. I haven't heard any questions from the Council. But the Proposal #17 says, only 15 caribou may be harvested, so my inclination would be to move that we do not support Proposal #17 and then go on and move that we would support Proposal #18 as modified, not as written in our booklet. Would that seem reasonable to you Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I would like to have the National Park Service, see if we - Russ, if we voted down Proposal #17 and supported #18, would that be acceptable to the Park Service?

MR. GALIPEAU: Well, I guess we have to take a look at how the proposals came about. Remember Proposal #18, right now, though it's been modified by CRNA, it's not based on the management plan.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Right.

MR. GALIPEAU: They modified it. So see, if anything, I guess my understanding would be is you could adopt ours for the number - for how we applied the plan with the modification, because you remember the plan has some range. And then you can maybe adopt, you know, this is a procedural question, you're out of my range here, and maybe adopt the CRNA's on how to apply the customary traditional piece of that. But CRNA's is still not founded on the plan, you know, they compromised and came in with 20 animals. And they said based on, you know, it was in the range of the plan, but you know, that wasn't the original driver of their proposal, there's was for 28 animals.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, you do have a good question, Lee, I - who can help us here on procedures? Helga?

MS. EAKON: Bruce.

MR. GREENWOOD: My name is Bruce Greenwood, National Park Service. I'll make a suggestion, what you could do is you could modify Proposal #17 to allow for 20 - a quota of 20 head and then you could - Proposal #17 does allow you to make a recommendation based on SRC recommendation on how you would allocate it, so you could, again, in summary, modify Proposal #17 to allow take of 20 caribou and then allocate - and then use SRC allocation process to allocate those 20 caribou and then you'd reject Proposal #18.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I like that suggestion if it'll work. I just want to be sure that CRNA is satisfied when we're done, that's what I'd like to do. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: We would accept you adopting Proposal #17 with modification of 20 caribou permit. And I'd like to also say that at the village meeting they were saying that they would like to have this hunt open all year because it's based on 20 permits. There would be no season dates, there would just be a 20 permit allocation to elders. And they were saying that.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No season?

MS. STICKWAN: It would be open until we got our 20 permits and then it would be closed. It would be open the whole year.

MR. JOHN: Open until they get 20?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right.

MS. STICKWAN: And we would go to our village councils and each of these villages would meet together and we would come up with a recommendation of how we would distribute - which villages would get which permits, you know, and which elders would and we would come back to probably Wrangell-St. Elias and give them our recommendation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you, Gloria. I guess the suggestion is that we use Proposal #17 and modify it if we want to increase the number in Proposal #17 to 20 and use the suggested subsistence resource commission's allocation. And also incorporate what Gloria just mentioned, that is, that there would be no season, just until the 20 permits had been used - I guess, 20 caribou had been gotten. Russ, do you have a question?

MR. GALIPEAU: Mr. Ewan, yeah, this is Russell Galipeau again. Let's make it clear, it's not 20 caribou even if you go to the higher range, it's bull - it's bull caribou, not just any caribou.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MR. GALIPEAU: And the other thing is in the staff analysis, it does address that also that if it's a permit hunt where there's a limited number of permits, that the season is immaterial, how long you make it because, you know, you're only saying you're going to take whatever X-amount of bull caribou it is. So I think what you just outlined is an appropriate way to go about it, is 17 with the modification if you want to deal with the range, and then remember it also states in the staff analysis and also in Proposal #17 that there would be a consideration by the subsistence resource commission of Wrangell-St. Elias to work in conjunction with you in how to allocate those bull caribou.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess Lee had his hand up.

MR. BASNAR: Just a quick question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MR. BASNAR: Do you have any enforcement problem with a year round season, does that give you any problem at all?

MR. GALIPEAU: Well, Mr. Basnar, enforcement is always limited out there. We have, I think, - I couldn't tell you, I think we got one Fish & Game protection officer and then one ranger up in that area. But we feel if it's a limited permit, we know who the permittee is, we don't see any reason why we can't go on with that hunt. And we got to come to where we're trying to trust the users out there, that they're going to live up to their end of the bargain.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: I would just have one comment on that. And that's, I could see giving sufficient time, but after March 31st, what you're doing is you're starting to have cows on the calving grounds and to me I look at this right here and I could see like an August 10th opener and a March 31st closure, which is normal time for hunting. I would take for granted nobody probably would hunt in April, May, June, July, anyhow, but it's nice to have an opener - it's nice to have an opener and a closure so that you can do your record keeping. And I kind of would probably not be in favor of it being opened during calving time and when the calves are young in the summer and stuff like that just for disturbances. I would probably stick with an August 10th through March 31st opener.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: They're usually separated aren't they, the bulls and the cows around that calving time?

MR. GALIPEAU: That's correct. But I think what Mr. Lohse's getting at is that for administrative purposes, it is nice to have a start and a close date. And then they are getting to where you're going to start calving in the latter part of the year, you know, May and June and you're - still the hunt is targeted at bulls and if they're not altogether, it could be harder to find bulls that time of year. The Park is willing to go with as long a season as possible. Sure, we'd like to have some parameters for administrative purposes, but what we'd like to do is see that these caribou get allocated and the users have every opportunity to get them.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are we ready to take action? Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move, but I'd like to explain the way I think that I understand this should go. I would move that we adopt Proposal #17 and then I would - that's to get it on the table and then I would amend it as we have discussed.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. Further discussion on the motion? If you're going to amend it you better do it right away.

MS. MONTAGUE: Trying to put open season on this, we don't hunt the caribou from - after March - month of August. None Native does that. So it don't matter if you have it open all through or with dates on that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: When is this Marina?

MS. MONTAGUE: The end of March. We don't hunt caribou April, May, June or July. August month is when we start hunting again.

MR. BASNAR: But one of the other people just requested it.

MS. MONTAGUE: They know that that meat isn't fit to eat during those summer months.

MR. BASNAR: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we amend Proposal #17. Are we still taking public testimony or are we working on the motion?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let him finish first and then - go ahead - go ahead Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Okay. Because I don't want to stop anybody from speaking if they've got to leave or something. Okay. I move we amend Proposal #17 to increase the number of caribou taken - or permitted to be taken to 20.....

MR. JOHN: Bull.

MR. BASNAR:bull caribou annually. And I would just - that's the end of the proposed amendment, but I would just note that I have not addressed the seasons and I don't intend to.

MR. JOHN: I second it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion seconded to amend Proposal #17 to increase the number of bulls taken to 20 bulls annually. Further discussion on the motion?

MR. ROMIG: We're not going to bring up the season on this motion?

MR. LOHSE: We're just working on an amendment right now, we have an amendment on the floor.

MR. ROMIG: Okay.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Call for the question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Call for a question, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign - motion is carried. Okay, we're back to the main motion; any further discussion on the main motion? Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Roy, I would like to add an amendment. After listening to what she said, I would like to have the season open from August 1st to March 31st.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Repeat the dates again.

MR. LOHSE: That the season opens on August 1st and closes March 31st. In keeping with what she said that hunting wasn't done during the summer months anyway and that way for administrative purposes and for record keeping it would make it a little easier.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, there's a motion, is there a second?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the motion's seconded, further discussion on the motion?

MR. HENRICHS: What are those dates again?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: August 1st through March 31st.

MR. BASNAR: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's been called for, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by same sign - motion's carried. That takes care of that amendment, now back to the main motion.

MR. JOHN: Could we - is this the time to add another amendment to the allocation?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, just a point of clarification, you're - Fred, your question has to do with the idea of which villages?

MR. JOHN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think you want it in a separate motion is what you suggested?

MR. JOHN: Yeah.

MR. BRELSFORD: I think that would be a little bit cleaner.

MR. JOHN: It be on a separate motion?

MR. BRELSFORD: I believe that would be best.

MR. JOHN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We just agreed to this 20 and the season and that is what was in the motion - the main motion now.

MR. JOHN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Why would that be best? I don't understand. It seems like it should be encompassed within the same proposal and they should be amendments to that proposal.

MR. BRELSFORD: Gary, I think the effect is the same whichever way it's handled. My understanding from the discussion a moment ago was that the allocation part of the CRNA proposal, #18, would be the basis of the Council's action regarding distribution of those permits. That you wanted to refer to the seven Ahtna villages and some of the testimony that was provided in the recommendation by the subsistence resource commission. That seems to come out of Proposal #18, rather than Proposal #17, but I don't think - either vehicle could be used and it could be a single motion or separate motions.

MR. JOHN: Okay, I got it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So we can deal with it here as I understand it.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: It just seems to me it would be cleaner if we kept the whole proposal together and just amended the one.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Any further discussion on the motion, the main motion or any further amendments?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Well, if I can get the appropriate wording I would like to insert an amendment to adopt the SRC recommendations on allocation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That would be a good motion, I believe.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Can I do it that way? Do we know, succinctly which wording we're dealing with?

MR. WELLS: Yeah, my name's Jay Wells with Wrangell-St. Elias and the SRC did come up with some wording last Thursday afternoon and I've got that. It still - it was going to be mailed to the Council and I believe that was going out today. I have a hand carried copy, I think Roy already has it. But we could work at a break or something and get the language down for that that the SRC endorsed for making the 804 allocation process.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Was there a second on the - did you make a motion?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: No, I'm.....

MR. WELLS: Did you want that language right now?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I think to close the proposal it would probably be good to have the language now and just see if we could add it in at the same time and then we'll be done with this one.

MR. WELLS: Yeah, the SRC letter's signed by the chairman, John Vale, stated this in regards to the 804 allocation process. It said, the plan recommends the Section 804 allocation process of the total harvest is less than 30 caribou. In determining how to apply the three criteria in Section 804 of ANILCA, the commission placed the greatest weight on the criteria concerning customary and direct dependence on the population as a mainstay of livelihood. It was clear to the commission that the seven Ahtna villages have the greatest dependence and longstanding use on this limited resource throughout history. The commission expects the village councils to work cooperatively among themselves and with the National Park Service and act responsibly to ensure reasonable distribution between the villages will occur. The commission determined that the other two criteria outlined in Section 804 were not helpful in determining who or what communities have a higher priority. All communities included within the Federal customary and traditional use determination are equal in proximity to the resource. the commission also determined that all eligible communities have equal availability to alternative resources, thus, the commission's recommendation's based on the long term customary and direct dependence on the Mentasta caribou by the seven Ahtna villages.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a problem with the recommendation? I mentioned earlier, I do believe you might have a problem with who gets what among the seven villages. I don't think that there will be a problem myself, but I think once the permits - they get the permits, I think they'll allocate among the villages themselves. They probably will have a gathering of elders and say, so and so village gets two and so on, who gets them in the village is up to you

people in the village, that's probably how it will be handled. But I don't know, I shouldn't speak for CRNA, they proposed.....

MR. WELLS: From my prospective with that, we're going to be the ones issuing the permits.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Right.

MR. WELLS: And I guess what I'd like to see the council do is endorse the effort to work - for the National Park Service to work with Copper River Native Association as representatives of those traditional villages and that we would - we would be very amenable to using their expertise to determine within those villages what the allocation is and who's going to get them, you know, which elders, based on their knowledge of the individuals customary and direct dependence. We're going to be very willing to look at their recommendation and issue permits accordingly.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess that's how - if Copper River Native Association agrees with you, that's fine with me. The way I understood it, it would be - it would be kind of taking the lead on - Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, if I understand right, the permits have to be given by the National Park Service and the permits do go to individuals. And so basically, what we're coming up with right here is we're coming up with the seven villages working with the National Park Service to identify the elders that are most dependent or most eligible - to come up with the most eligible persons involved. And that's why to me, I think it needs to be done in two separate motions. I think we need to pass this motion that we have on the table that basically says we want to get these caribou out. And then we need to get down to directing the National Park Service to work with the CNR - Copper River Native Association and the SRC in identifying the eligible elders that are available for those 20 permits.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think we could do it either way. To speed it up we can act on the motion here and pass that and then act on the allocation. Do you want to do that, just act on this motion?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'm just trying to come up with wording that would say relatively close to what Ralph just said. I was hoping he would move that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, what he suggested is that we do it separate.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, but he means the wording for directing the Park Service to work with the Copper River Native Association and the SRC in identifying the most eligible elders from those villages that would be capable - that would be eligible for the permits.

MR. JOHN: I think - this is Fred John, I think that what Jay just read from SRC, I think that we just ask that they follow that direction, what SRC directed.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Well, let me see if I can - given that we've got all this discussion out of the way and it seems to clarify where we're going, maybe I won't have to be as exact, but feel free to correct me as I move along.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think the intent is more important.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah, that's what I'm hoping to get out here so at least we'll start the ball rolling and we can move on. I move that we amend Proposal #17 to ask the National Park Service to work with the villages of the Copper River in developing an allocation method.....

MR. BASNAR: How about to determine the appropriate allocation?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: There you go, to determine the appropriate allocation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second?

MR. BASNAR: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion's seconded, further discussion on the motion?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's been called for, all in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign - motion's carried. It looked like Ralph had a problem there.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, things went a little fast there at the end.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We're hungry.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I was hoping that we communicated.

MR. LOHSE: I was still back on his amendment trying to get things in my mind.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. The way I recall the motion is to ask the National Park Service to work with the villages of Copper River to determine appropriate allocations.

MR. LOHSE: Okay, I was under the impression to identify the appropriate elders, you know.

MR. LOHSE: I think the Park Service has already indicated that's what they intend to do and I don't want to tell them how to do their daily routine.

MS. EAKON: The words, appropriate allocation method, covers - covers it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's agreed on, everybody agrees that will take care of determining who's eligible and all that. So that's our understanding right? Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, just one small point. Could we take the discussion of the SRC recommendation, the favorable discussion of the SRC recommendation; does this motion include the SRC's recommendation? It would seem that's the logical outcome here, so that's clearly the intent, that you're endorsing the recommendation of the SRC?

MR. JOHN: That's what I want.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: That was the intent of the maker of the amendment.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. They did the homework on this Section 804 business and you're.....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes.

MR. BRELSFORD:endorsing their finding, endorsing their recommendation? That's good.

MR. LOHSE: Well, I guess what I was trying to say is that what you're dealing with is you're dealing with two issues here. When you make something that's that broad, you give a lot of scope without much direction. And what I recognize is that if you take that 804 and you take - take the villages of Mentasta and Copper Center, Chistochina, Gulkana, Tazlina and I think Copper Center - I think I missed one - in there, when you look at the elders in those villages you are going to find the people who are the most directly dependent, who have the longest customary and traditional use and they are going to be the people who qualify for those permits. You're asking the Park Service which issues individual permits to work with villages on a village allocation. And there's a total difference between identifying the individuals in those villages who are the proper recipients of those permits and developing a village allocation and there's also a total difference from a precedent setting standpoint, you know. And what I was under the impression from listening to him talk was that these were going to individual elders in these villages, am I correct? And then these elders will be just like any other hunt, they will be able to make designated hunters to go get their caribou if they're not capable of getting it themselves, right? So the Park Service will be dealing with individual permits.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't believe we covered designated hunter. That's something new totally to me and I didn't - I was surprised nobody mentioned anything about it except Gloria. Yes, Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: The village councils would get together and decide how many permits would each village go to, we would come to an agreement on that. And then each village council would decide in their own village which elder would get it - those permits. And we would work with Wrangell-St. Elias on that. They would be issuing the permits, but we would be working with them.

MR. LOHSE: They would be issuing permits to individuals?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Based on CRNA's recommendation.

MR. LOHSE: Based on CRNA's recommendation.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Right.

MR. LOHSE:as to who those individuals should be?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Right.

MS. STICKWAN: And we would be working with the villages and hearing from the villages what they - who they decide they want to give the permits to and how many each would get.

MR. LOHSE: But you would be recommending then to the National Park Service which elders get the permit, right?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

MR. JOHN: Can I.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee.

MR. JOHN:make a comment?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think Lee - wait a minute.

MR. JOHN: After you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah, I - I think it's going to work just real fine and I would hate to see the Council get too involved down at the nuts and bolts level, that's what the SRC's there for. They've already indicated they've done their homework and they're going to provide the local direction to the Park Service on the way they think it should go. And I think what we need to do is take one step backward, endorse the SRC, which we have done with our amendment and let it go forward at that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Fred, do you have a comment?

MR. JOHN: Yes. I'd just like to make a comment here about the Native people in villages. In our mind we only know how our, what you call, cultural laws, and everything, how we live, how we share and how we do things for elders and everything. And in the village, it's kind of hard to explain to Western culture, you know, that this is already an existence in the village, so when we - when I do talk I kind of have a hard time remembering that the Western culture doesn't recognize that there's already an existent law in villages how to distribute and how to carry on these things that we're talking about right now. I just wanted to say that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's an allocation method already.

MR. LOHSE: Already in place?

MR. JOHN: Yeah.

MR. LOHSE: Right.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other discussion? Do we - we're done with the motion, right?

MR. BASNAR: No, we got to act on the main motion.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we're back to the main motion, okay. All right, sorry.

MR. BASNAR: Call for the question on the main motion.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question called for for the main motion. Okay, for the record, does everybody know what the whole thing is - all right, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign - motion's carried. I guess it's about time to break for lunch, but we want to, I guess, have the sheep discussion right after the - the Proposal #19 or #20, which one is it?

MS. EAKON: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask CRNA when they plan to depart the meeting?

MS. STICKWAN: We can stay through today, all day.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So the next proposal is which one?

MS. EAKON: Nineteen.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Nineteen and then we'll take up the sheep?

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. We'll take a lunch break.

MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, before everybody takes off I just want to make an announcement that we're going to put on a dinner for the subsistence council and everybody that came in tomorrow night at 7:00 o'clock at the Masonic Lodge and the Native Village of Eyak is going to put it on and everybody in town's welcome.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We'll call our meeting back to order. I believe we're on Proposal #20, we're done with the National Park Service proposal. We're on Proposal #20 and that's in your packet.

MS. EAKON: Do you want to address #20 before #19, do you want to do the sheep.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do we have #19?

MS. EAKON: Yeah, we do have #19.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, okay, let's get on with #19 then.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there somebody here to speak on Proposal #19? Hollis.

MR. TWITCHELL: I'm Hollis Twitchell and I'm with Denali National Park. I will do my best to get through the program, but I do have congestion and hard speaking here, so if I can't continue I'll have to ask Bruce Greenwood if he'd step in for me.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are we talking about the same proposal, 13 caribou, is that what we're talking about?

MR. TWITCHELL: Yes, Proposal #19.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. All right. But somebody said sheep, that's why I'm mixed up here. We'll talk about sheep after that.

MR. TWITCHELL: Proposal #19 was submitted by the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council on behalf of an appeal to the Federal subsistence board by the residents of McKinley village area. It's been a controversial issue regarding the use of moose and caribou in that particular region, in the McKinley village area for a number of years. And subsequently, Denali's SRC and the members of the community have petitioned to the eastern interior region, the southcentral region and to the Board to move this up as a priority for reviewing.

What Proposal #19 would do is it would provide customary and traditional use determinations for the McKinley village as well as the area along the Parks Highway from Mile 216 to 239. I'll move over to the map and show you approximately where this is. Mile 216 begins right about here at the boundary between Wildlife Management Unit 20 and Wildlife Management Unit 13, the Alaska Range would be the petition. So 216 would extend up the Parks Highway to approximately this location right here about Mile 239, which encompasses McKinley village as well as the Park headquarters and goes up to beyond the other facilities along the Parks Highway, it stops before it gets to the community of Healy.

Proposal #19 would create a positive customary and traditional use for the use of caribou and moose in Unit 13, the south side of the Alaska Range and also for use of moose in Unit 20(A) and Unit 20(C). The proposal would also provide an opportunity for these residents to harvest caribou in Units 20(A) and (C) and (D) when and if the season is reopened. Currently the caribou's seasons in all of 20(A), (C) and (D) are closed presently. It was suggested that if we are going to look at the McKinley village area that we should be also looking at the Healy area because of the close proximity between the two communities and also the fact that Healy lost their rural status by the Alaska Board of Game's decision the same time Healy did in 1987 (sic). So there's some reasons to include Healy in the review.

I just want to point out that the Denali National Park is the primary lands within this region that subsistence use is occurring on. The Park has - encompasses 96 percent of the Federal public lands in Unit 20(C) and also 99 percent of the land in Unit 13(E). There are just a few other agency lands within those units, but they don't account for very much, less than one percent in Unit 20(C) by BLM, three percent of BLM lands in 20(C) and one percent in 20(A). The National Park Service, through ANILCA has subsistence use occurring on the additions to lands that were added to McKinley National Park. The lands within the old Mt. McKinley National Park have been closed to subsistence use. That would be highlighted in the checked areas. This area is closed to subsistence use. These - ANILCA to the north and to the south are where the subsistence use is occurring. The Park Service identifies certain communities around these parks known as resident zones. They were identified in the early '80s, 1981. And if those communities had a significant concentration of subsistence users that had used the park lands, they were added as a resident zone community. Also for individuals who reside outside of these resident zones, there's a system for issuing individual permits so that an individual can demonstrate their use of park lands and if they have a personal family history of use of park lands, prior to ANILCA, then they would be added as eligible users.

To get to the background, in 1981 there were 16 individuals in the McKinley village area and two individuals from the Healy area who came to the Park

Service and applied for subsistence use permits. These permits were granted by the Park based on their personal or family use of the Park's resources, their length of residency, their customary uses, what species, where, when and how long and the means of access that they used to get to those resources. This analysis is an effort to try to elaborate beyond the Park Services criteria and brings in the Federal program's criteria which considers sharing diversity of resource use and means of processing and intergenerational transmission of knowledge.

The individuals who received their permits in '81 continued to use Park lands for moose and caribou until 1987. In 1987 the Alaska Board of Game passed a non-rural determination for the Parks Highway from 216 to 300 and also the North Star Borough. That non-rural determination what's caused the Park Service to revoke the 16 permits that we had issued to individuals along that area. That none-rural determination was appealed to the State Game Board in 1988 at which time the State board reversed their non-rural determination and reclassified the area to be rural with the exception of Denali Park headquarters and the Clear Air Force station. At the same time, the Board of Game changed their 1987 customary and traditional determination that they had made for moose to exclude the areas in Denali National Park and Preserve east of the Teklanika River to the use of moose and also for caribou. So the net result of that was that McKinley Village and Healy were rural communities again, but they didn't have a customary and traditional determination for the use of moose and caribou. That negative customary and traditional determination was appealed to the State Board of Game in 1989. And after extended debate, the State Game Board voted not to change its negative customary and traditional determinations.

In July 1, 1990, of course, the Federal government ended up assuming management of subsistence, taking fish and wildlife on Federal public lands. And McKinley Village residents, again, appealed to the Federal subsistence board to have a review made of this area. Under the Federal program, the Park headquarters area was once again determined to be a rural community. However, there are no members within the Park headquarters community that are subsistence users. No individuals from this community have requested subsistence use or a customary and traditional use of moose or caribou. So the headquarters community is a distinct separate community from McKinley Village and it is characterized by people who have much shorter residencies, who have permanent employment and higher salaries than the neighboring McKinley Village area. For that reason, in these analysis, we have excluded the Park headquarters area from consideration. Part of that reason is that the make-up of the Park headquarters community has a negative effect on McKinley Village when you consider years of residency or other income factors, length of employment, et cetera. So throughout this analysis, we're basically looking at McKinley Village and this use.

What was done in regarding the eight factors in the Federal program was to look at a number of other communities for a comparison that were similar in nature, that being along road corridor areas who were primarily a non-Native community and a number of communities were selected for that analysis. We also included another village just as a comparison basis and that was the village of Tetlin even though it is not on a road system and it is a primarily Native community. Just to provide some sort of comparison on the range of what might be seen. It wasn't intended in this analysis that Tetlin would be the standard of which other communities were based on, it's just simply to show comparisons between road system and primarily non-Natives and rural - primarily Native communities. So you can take it for what it's worth.

Factor number one, which is a long term consistent pattern of use excluding interruptions by circumstances beyond the users control, such as regulatory prohibitions. The community of Healy was established in 1915. McKinley Village was established in the 1920s. And the residents of these communities have utilized moose and caribou since they were established. There have been numerous regulatory restrictions that have been put in place on both, State and Federal, lands in this region that has a significant effect upon their long term consistent pattern of use. And a good example of this would be in the Healy-Lignite area. There's a controlled use area just on the east side of Healy in Unit 20(A) that is restricted to bow and arrow hunting only. In the Yanert controlled use area just east of McKinley Village and in the Wood River controlled use area, there's restrictions on any motor vehicle access other than aircraft for large game. NPS regulations on Park lands restricts the use of ATVs and aircraft as a means of access for subsistence wildlife harvest. In addition, winter hunting seasons with relatively easy access to moose resources have nearly all been eliminated. And most of the Native select lands in the area has also been closed to shareholders use only. So this region has undergone a variety of different regulatory programs that effect what the use patterns had been.

During the 1970s the size of the Denali caribou herd and the Delta caribou herd fell drastically. And in 1975 the caribou season was closed in Unit 20(C) and that particular caribou hunt has never been reopened. In Unit 20(A) on the other side of the Nenana River was reopened in 1980 and it has had substantial restrictions placed on permits and methods. But the season was closed again in 1992, so for the last four years caribou use in Unit 20(A) has also been closed. So that leaves the only caribou resources remaining is those in 13(E) on the south side of Denali. Despite all these regulatory restrictions and changes, the community members have continued to utilize moose and caribou resources. I would indicate that the majority of the households in the McKinley village area used moose and caribou resources beginning in the early 1970s. Several households dating back to begin their use in the 1960s, with two individuals from that area whose dates the use of resources go back into the 1950s.

Sixteen of the 19 permanent households in the McKinley Village area applied to the Park and received subsistence use permits and that's contrasted fairly significantly with the community of Healy which has 270 households in it and only two individuals who have had subsistence use permits from the Park. At one time we had three, but one of the individuals has moved away. So there's a fairly significant difference between McKinley Village and Healy in terms of their apparent need or desire to use Park related resources.

The final thing is that the present population in the Nenana Valley is primarily made of just two generation households. The average length of residency, if you include all the people in the area now is about 13.5 years of residency. That is similar to Tok's length of residency, significantly more than Glenallen's but only half of what you would see in Tetlin. And that information is shown in Table 1 of your text. So a significant portion of the households have about a decade and a half pattern of use.

Factor number 2, the reoccurring use for specific seasons for many years. As I mentioned before, there's been many regulatory changes and closures of seasons. Prior to 1976, fall and winter caribou hunts were the norm. Currently fall is the only season that's opened for moose hunting with exception of a limited area within Denali National Park west of the Tok River. Many of the households expressed the preference for winter hunts for moose primarily because of handling and preservation and moose resources. Prior to the 1960s, caribou

hunting was predominately a winter and spring activity. With the establishment of roads, the Parks Highway and Denali Highway fall access to the caribou hunting grounds became possible and as a result fall use of caribou became quite common.

As I mentioned before, the use of caribou in 20(C) and 20(A) has been closed for quite a number of years. So that means residents in these areas depend pretty extensively on moose as their primary source of large mammals. For a consistent pattern of use consisting of methods and means of harvest which are characterized by efficiency and economy effort conditioned by local characteristics. This area is manifesting practices that have been done elsewhere in Alaska since the early 1900s where small parties of men using high caliber rifles accessing the area in the foothills primarily by foot, dog team or horses prior to the 1960s. With the establishment of the highways and roads in the area, after the 1960s, highway vehicles, snowmachines, ATVs have been common modes of access. Considering all the mechanical restrictions in terms of access, the local residents have used what - within the scope of the regulations the most efficient means available to them. But again, recognize that there's been significant impacts beyond their control.

Consistent harvest and use of fish and wildlife as related to past methods and means of taking near or reasonably accessible to the community. We had a difficult time in ascertaining what the harvest was from Federal public lands in this area because of all the closures that have occurred since '87 and prior. So what you see in the tables within the text represents the harvest for the whole area, including State and other private lands, not just National Park lands. I'd like to refer to several maps on the walls, in 1988, the Department of Fish & Game, Subsistence Division did a community profile study in the area. There were 14 households from the Parks Highway area that contributed to the information on where they generally hunted, trapped and fished, et cetera. On the wall on your right-hand side represents the use areas that were depicted for McKinley Village. The map on the right depicts the areas that were used for moose resources. You can see there's a fairly significant area, Unit 13(B) to the south that was used for moose. The Yanert River Valley as well as the Stampede Corridor leading out towards the Kantishna hills. Some use farther north up along the Nenana River. In terms of caribou, those households utilized lands all across the Denali Highway, again, primarily in Units 13(E), 20(A), the Yanert Valley again and then again across the Stampede Corridor all the way to the Kantishna Hills. Again, this is represented by 14 community households.

On the left-hand wall is the community of Healy. There were 23 community households from Healy that contributed to this information. Healy's use of caribou on this first map is shown to be almost exclusively in Unit 20(A), which is the Yanert River drainage near McKinley Village as well as east into this special use area. Healy's use of moose resources includes both lands in 20(C) and 20(A), as well as down in 13(B) and up along the Parks Highway as well as the Tanana River corridor. When we looked at the harvest ticket data for that area, the McKinley Village harvest for moose and caribou did fall primarily in Units 13(A) - excuse me, 13(E), 20(A) and 20(C) as those maps depict. So the community profiled information certainly matches up with the harvest records. And the same is true for McKinley Village - excuse me, for Healy shared use areas of moose down in Unit 13, but caribou use harvest records primarily up in 20(A).

Means for handling, preparing, preserving and storing fish and wildlife have been traditionally used by past generations. Again, the practices in this area has been basically the same as other places in Alaska with moose harvested

primarily in the fall now. Moose and caribou typically skinned, gutted, killed at the site in preparation for packing it back to the vehicle. Those practices are the same as you'd find pretty much elsewhere across Alaska. A pattern of use that includes handing down of knowledge and fishing and hunting skills and values are lower from generation to generation. There were numerous comments submitted by McKinley Village area residents about how they are passing down hunting and gathering skills to their children. There are a number - several households in the area that have been there for several generations. But still the overall makeup of the community are primarily just two generational households.

A Pattern of use in which hunting and fishing effort or the products of that effort are distributed and shared among others within a definable community of persons, including customary trade, barter, sharing and gift-giving. In your text there's a table, Number 4, that gives the breakdown of the major sources of wildlife harvest for each community. Again, the Park headquarters area's excluded from this information. The total number of pounds for the McKinley Village area is 453, for Healy 591, that's significantly less than Tetlin, but on the other hand is greater than your typical other road communities such as Tok, Cantwell, Glenallen and Trappers Creek which are down in the 200 to 300 and 400 pounds.

And Table 5 is a chart that shows you how many - what percentages of the households in these communities utilize more - how many households share more than 50 percent of the resources. Again, I'll refer you again to Table 5 that when you consider all the species of resources that are considered, McKinley Village and Healy households share 80 to 90 percent with one another, so there's a high percentage of sharing of resources that goes on in those communities.

A use which pattern which includes the reliance on subsistence purposes upon a wide diversity of fish and wildlife resources of the area and provides a substantial economic, cultural, social and nutritional elements of a subsistence user's life. In your text, Table 6, shows the diversity of resources used by more than 50 percent of the households in a particular sample year. And if you refer over to the last column in Table 6, you'll see that the community of Healy had three species that were used by greater than 50 percent of the households. McKinley Village had five species that were used by more than 50 percent of the households.

I guess I would caution you in referring to this data that it was collected by the State for community profile purposes and it wasn't really directed towards a customary and traditional use determinations. And it was looking at a sample year of one year in 1987. I've had a number of the residents in the community suggest that their use of small mammals and birds was dependent upon their abundance and availability and that in this particular year that it may be true that not greater than 50 percent of the households used those resources, but at times of their abundance that they probably would. So keep in mind that this data information reflects what was going on in 1987, primarily one years data.

In conclusion, preliminary conclusions, we would suggest that the proposal as submitted be modified. That the residents of McKinley Village and the area along the Parks Highway, from 216 to 239, except the households of Denali National Park headquarters should be determined eligible for subsistence use of moose and caribou in Units 13(E), 20(A) and 20(C). We suggest that there be no change in the existing eligibility determinations for the community of Healy. That was based on the fact that the residents of McKinley Village and those residing along the Parks Highway generally exhibit the customary and traditional

use factors necessary to qualify for the use of moose and caribou in Unit 13(E), 20(A) and 20(C) and again we'd refer you to those maps. Out of the 16 of the 19 households in the Parks Highway area, those community members came forth and applied to the Park Service in '81 based on their past use prior to that date and received subsistence use permits. Again, the majority of their use beginning back in the early '70s, some other individuals dating back into the '60s and several of them back into the 1950s.

We also recognized that the length of residency of 13.1 years for McKinley Village, it's average length of residency is low, but it's certainly comparable to the other - compared to subsistence use communities with the exception of Tetlin. We also recognize that the wildlife resources use have been consistent over time despite very restrictive seasons, bag limits and limits on means of access. 50 percent or more of the households from this area utilize at least five different subsistence species and exhibit a high percentage, 89 percent, of overall sharing of resources. The household harvests in total number of pounds is comparable to Tok and above - most all in the other comparative subsistence communities. Regarding the Park's headquarters community, again, there's no households at headquarters who participate in subsistence activities on Federal lands. No households have been requested that they be authorized the use of moose and caribou in these units. The average length of residency is significantly less than McKinley Village and McKinley Village is independent of the Park headquarters.

For the community of Healy, while the harvest report statistics and community maps for Healy indicate use of moose and caribou in Units 13, 20(A) and 20(C), again, only two out of the 170 permanent households have applied for and been issued permits by the Park. While there may be other households in that community who could possibly qualify, their use of Park resources is not evident. Again, going over the period - the harvest ticket period from '83 to '94, it indicates that their hunting effort in 13(E) has been minimal, less than three percent of the Healy moose hunters and 23 percent of the caribou hunters concentrated their efforts in Unit 13(E). 86 percent of the moose hunters concentrated their efforts in 20(A) and 20(C), while 54 percent of the caribou hunters concentrated their efforts in 20(A). Also in 20(A) there's less than one percent Federal land in that unit. For Healy, 50 percent of the households utilized three subsistence species, but again, they also exhibited a good percentage of sharing with 80 percent of those resources among community members.

Just as McKinley Village, Healy's average length of residency is low, but it again is certainly comparable to and greater than the other comparable subsistence communities reviewed, again, with the exception of Tetlin. Furthermore, the use of Wildlife resources has been consistent over time despite very restrictive seasons, bag limits, restrictions on access and increasing competition from outside.

There was one factor that we were not able to include in Factor 8 which is social economic information as it's not a criteria of the Federal program but I think it's interesting to review, nevertheless. And in Table 7 and Appendix B is showing income, cost of living and length of employment between the communities reviewed. This information comes from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game's community profile data base using 1985 as a base year. The only things I would point out is the total earned income in the Healy area is \$46,800, the average month employed is eight in contrast to McKinley Village where total earned income is \$29,860, with the average months of employment, 6.2. I mention that only to reflect the fact that the McKinley Village area has primarily a

seasonal nature of employment rather than full-time/permanent and it's reflected in their income. Again, that information is not part of the Federal program criteria, it's just there for your information.

Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are there any questions of Mr. Twitchell here? Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Did you say that was 1985 income?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. We had - we had to refer to primarily the larger studies that were done in the community, for instance, the 1987 c&t information that was collected by the State and then the - and then also the community profile data base. That was the only way to compare amongst all the communities.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have a question about something you mentioned at the very beginning. You were mentioning percent, I don't know, what it was, percent of what of the various sub-units that you were going through. What is that, could you go over that again real quick like for me?

MR. TWITCHELL: The percent of Federal lands in the units.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, is that what you were talking about - yeah.

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. And what I was going to demonstrate there was that Denali National Park lands encompass the significant majority of any Federal public lands in this region. That being, 96 percent of all Federal public lands in Unit 20(C) are lands within Denali National Park. 99 percent of the Federal public lands in Unit 13(E) are within Denali National Park. So essentially what we're dealing with is subsistence users associated with the Park lands rather than the other Federal lands.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Ben.

MR. ROMIG: Yeah, Hollis, did you say that the Healy - that you studied 26 households out of 216?

MR. TWITCHELL: It was not a Park Service study, that was the community profile study that was done by the Department of Fish & Game. It is that data base that we were using. We didn't have the time to go back in and try to sample these communities in just several weeks of time to present the analysis, so we were forced to go back just to the last scientific collection of data, and that evolved in the late '80s.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: For the Denali National Park subsistence resource commission the - this area was not, what do you call it, zoned?

MR. TWITCHELL: Resident zoned?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Resident zoned, yeah.

MR. TWITCHELL: I'm not sure why the McKinley Village area wasn't included as a resident zone in 1981. As you saw or as I stated, 16 of the 19 permanent households did eventually qualify for subsistence use permits. That's a fairly significant portion in my opinion but for some reason it was overlooked or not included.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess my real question is is this actually - would that be starting - would that area then becoming a resident zone, starting in the access.....

MR. TWITCHELL: No, it would not.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No?

MR. TWITCHELL: No.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MR. TWITCHELL: No, it would not. What happens is these 16 individuals showed a personal or family use of Park resources prior to 1980 and based on that is why they were issued the subsistence use permits from the Park and that included the use of moose and caribou. It has been determined that moose and caribou have traditionally been used in Denali, certainly on the south side in Unit 13 and certainly in the north side in 20(C) as well.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other questions or comments?

MR. TWITCHELL: I guess I would only add that if the councils and the Board chose to re-establish c&t use for moose and caribou in this area, it's not necessarily going to open anyone in that community to the use of moose and caribou. Keep in mind to utilize Park lands, they still have to show that use, that personal and family use prior to the 1980s. So essentially what it would do is it would be re-authorizing these individuals who formally had permits from the Park to resume their use. Now, there could be other households in Healy who could qualify and they may come to the Park and apply. I don't think that would be very many at all since it's already been 16 years since ANILCA was passed and I would expect that they would have come forth prior to this time and applied if they were really interested.

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Could I have a clarification on that? Then basically in the Park the fact that this area has a c&t finding doesn't give the individuals in this area the right for a subsistence permit in the Park unless they had prior use prior to the formation of the Park?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

MR. LOHSE: So they're going to have to have been a resident there for a lot longer than the 13.6 years?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's a very good point. These individuals, as I indicated, have been in the area since the '60s and the early '70s, with a couple individuals going back into the '50s. So many of these are - individuals are approaching 50 years in the area, others, '70s are 20, 25 years in the area. These are the people that are under permit from the Park. Now, there's other community members in the area that are much shorter time residents and as such, they bring down the average years of residency for the communities. And I would just, again, stress the fact that these newly arrival residences would not be

able to demonstrate the personal and family abuse prior to 1980, so they're not likely to be receiving subsistence use permits.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So the number is pretty fixed then?

MR. TWITCHELL: The number is very fixed. There could be, like I said, a couple of families or households that could come forth particularly from Healy. I know there's some longer time households there, but for whatever their reasons, they've chosen not to come forward yet.

MR. LOHSE: Well, one other question then, as these households get older, leave the State, move someplace else, then this number actually will gradually drop?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's probably true.

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we accept Proposal #19.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion, is there a second?

MR. BASNAR: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. Helga?

MS. EAKON: Before you do that, may I please tell you about the written public comment?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MS. EAKON: The program (sic) received one comment from a Mr. Joe Sonneman in Juneau. He wrote that he is dissatisfied with areawide determinations. He believes that the preference should be based on individual income rather than area population.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Along those lines, I'm speaking about the motion - on the motion, that was one of my concerns. You know, you open up to a mile - what is it 23 mile area, you open it up to people that are going to move into the area and - a lot of people - that's my first thought.....

MR. TWITCHELL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN:about that. Maybe - I don't know if that's what this person is talking about or not.

MR. TWITCHELL: If there were a lot of other agency Federal lands in that area, that may be true. But the fact remains it's primarily, if not exclusively, National Park lands and the eligibility criteria is quite a bit more difficult to qualify under Park regulations.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, that's why I asked you about the percentage. I was just wondering, you mentioned some percentage, 80 something or 90 something, is that what you said, was the Denali National Park?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. I think 86 percent is in 20(C) and 90.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's about 14 out of Federal lands?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. And those other Federal lands would be near the Nowitna Wildlife Refuge which is off of the road system and a very remote and rural area. And as you can see the community use for both Healy and McKinley Village, none of them travel down into that area. So the information, both in the harvest records and the maps that depict those households studied, none of them traveled to those other public lands.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any further discussion? Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment. I, as you know, I'm a member of the Denali SRC. We've wrestled with this issue for, I guess about 10 years now. And in essence, to boil my comments down and keep them as brief as possible, what we had was a small group of people who were using the lands around the original Denali National Park. Along came ANILCA and expanded Denali National Park encompassing the lands that they had traditionally hunted on. Denali National Park issued 16 individual permits to these people because they were there, you know, when the Park expanded. Then along came the state of Alaska and said, hey, you guys aren't rural and so Denali National Park had to withdraw their permits. The action that this proposal would end up doing would be to get these people back to hunting where they used to hunt. And we're now talking about, I think the number of eligible people has dwindled to somewhere around two or three that are still in the area; is that correct, Hollis?

MR. TWITCHELL: Well, including the couple individuals in Healy, there is about 10 altogether.

MR. BASNAR: Okay.

MR. TWITCHELL: So, yeah.

MR. BASNAR: So we're not talking about a lot of people, but we had a lot - a very tiny group of people that were disenfranchised through no fault of their own. And in some cases, not through any fault of the bureaucrats, but things just evolved at the wrong time and these unfortunate people got caught and they haven't been able to use the lands that they traditionally hunted on. And this, I think, is the right way to go and we as a Council made this proposal and I think it just makes good sense. What we're doing then is we're throwing the determination of who can hunt in Denali National Park back into the hands of Denali National Park and allowing them to continue to make those determinations. We're not opening it up to a wide open group of people to hunt it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Fred.

MR. JOHN: Yeah, I just - I got a question, I'm very concerned. I probably don't understand it very well, it's pretty far away from me. But, what I just kind of see right here, it seems like you're - are they eliminating hunters?

MR. TWITCHELL: No.

MR. JOHN: I mean just, after these guys are gone or getting old and die and everything, what's going to happen?

MR. TWITCHELL: Well, anyone from these households who chooses to remain in the area, all the descendants, anyone who marries in or anyone adopted into those families, if they choose to continue that lifestyle and the use of resources, they too will be issued permits.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You know that it could increase, right?

MR. TWITCHELL: It could increase, but the pattern just hasn't been that. Many of the younger kids who were raised in the area have gone on to school and settled down in other parts of the State.

MR. JOHN: I just want to continue my question. What - so the newcomers that probably have been there - are going to be there for what - how many years, since ANILCA opened, will they ever be able to hunt?

MR. TWITCHELL: Not unless they move into one of the resident zone communities. The resident zone communities was a concept suggested by Congress that the Park Service employ in which it takes the c&t use by a large component. And anyone who moves into these zones are automatically eligible.

MR. JOHN: Automatically able to hunt. I was just worried about, you know, I had an idea that we'd never be able to hunt again after these guys are eliminated. That just clarified my question.

MR. TWITCHELL: If they choose to move into Cantwell, which they haven't chose to do, then they would immediately be qualified.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes. I think we all ask questions that we're really concerned about, you know, coming from another Park area and dealing with resident zone communities, we understand that there could be problems with opening a wide area, you know, to.....

MR. TWITCHELL: Um-hum. (Affirmative) There's been no effort by the Park Service.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN:become a resident zone.

MR. TWITCHELL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MR. TWITCHELL: There's been.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just hope that doesn't - that this isn't leading up to, that's why I asked that earlier.

MR. TWITCHELL: No. The Park is not planning to petition for that to be a resident zone community nor has the Denali subsistence resource commission even suggested that, so it's not anyone's intention to move in that direction.

MR. JOHN: Can I - I've got another question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, Fred.

MR. JOHN: Yeah, what's eastern interior doing, I was thinking, another thing is that - Mckinley Village, that part on the highway is on the eastern interior council.....

MR. TWITCHELL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. JOHN:and how - why are we to make their determination for them, I wonder?

MR. TWITCHELL: The Denali's SRC as well as the communities, members from this area have petitioned the eastern interior region to consider their use of this area. Over three years ago now, the eastern interior region went on record in a letter to the Federal subsistence board suggesting that these people should be qualified in asking that it be moved as a high priority for the board to consider, so eastern interior is, through that letter, is in support of this.

MR. JOHN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other comments on the motion?

MR. ROMIG: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's been called for, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign - motion's carried. Okay, we're down to, I believe, the next proposal, and that's on sheep, it doesn't have a number, just a new proposal by CRNA. Are you prepared to go yet - make a presentation?

MS. STICKWAN: These maps were produced by the study that shows our sheep use. Along with that, I took out some - some studies that were done over the horizon backscattered (ph) by Ahtna. We used their information and we got permission to use that from Ahtna and we're presenting this as testimony from people who said in the OTH-B that they use sheep, their names were crossed out - the names of the tape were crossed out, but the rest of the - the rest of the testimony the way it is.

We want to get customary and traditional use of sheep in Unit 13 because we've always hunted sheep in that area. We want to continue to be able to hunt sheep. It is hard for us to continue hunting sheep because of the 7/8ths curl requirement and because of State and Federal regulations. Traditionally the people went out sheep hunting from the month of August through October. After they got through fishing they would go out to their places where they stayed during the winter to trap and hunt, about three to 12 families would move out together to their different areas in Unit 13. Traditionally they got sheep by having a stone fence, they chased the sheep up the hill and have these stone fences blocking them off and they would chase them there and shoot them because they'd just be blocked from that stone fence. They chase them up against it and just shoot them with their bow and arrow. That's how they used to get sheep traditionally.

They used the fur for bedding and clothing. They ate the meat. And they used the horns for spoons and utensils, they made spoons out of the horns. People today continue to hunt sheep, we want to be able to continue to hunt sheep, but it's hard for us because of the hunters in the area and because of the State and Federal regulations. We still eat sheep meat today and we'd like to continue that. We want to have c&t determination for sheep in Unit 13.

We have elders here that are going to testify who - about sheep c&t use.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We'll have - I mentioned that it didn't have a number, I guess, we are - I'm getting mixed up here a little bit myself. We're talking about Proposal #20. I thought we were talking about a different proposal. Phillip, go ahead.

MR. SABON: Phillip Sabon from Copper Center. Yeah, I'd like to see the sheep opening for Alaska - like it was. And we used to hunt up through Klutina Road, up through (indiscernible) Lake up - and towards Paxson way. What do they call that place, beside of Pump 10 and across the river in - it's a different Unit.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's the one we're talking about, across the river.

MR. SABON: It's the one?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MR. SABON: Yeah, they used to hunt over there to.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Unit 11.

MR. SABON: Yeah, Unit 11, all the way up to - where they used to hunt sheep down.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, you're talking about Unit 13, right, right now?

MR. SABON: Yeah, 13 I think.

MS. STICKWAN: We have c&t for Unit 11 in sheep.

MR. SABON: Thirteen, too, I mean 11 too?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, I guess - I don't know, I thought 13?

MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.

MR. SABON: Yeah, I'd like to see this open again. You know they used to use the horn, too, to - they used to make spoon out of it. And fur, too, they used to use. Sometime they make moccasin out of it. They use it for mattress too. So I'd like to see it open again for us.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you. I thought myself, Unit 11, we were talking about also, but I guess not, it's just 13?

MS. STICKWAN: We have c&t for 13 - I mean we have c&t for 11.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MS. STICKWAN: We're requesting this for the eight villages - all eight villages.

MR. EWAN: (Indiscernible) should talk about what we've been using for years, not just like now, today, back in '50. There's been subsistence - been way before me, too. I am 80 years old, I'm still a kid to them. My great-grandpa and beyond, from the beginning they've been using all the animals, what they've been eating, that's what we talk about today, not this meeting today for Federal or State. We have our own Indian rights. This is already been law, our Indian rights. (Indiscernible) State, Federal has. We got our Indian laws in Alaska. If Alaska was all Indian country, it was. Then everybody come in and just take our rights away, they take our land away, they take everything away from us, what we own, we don't own nothing now. We just start with - we fought this through a stage. When the subsistence, it's been there many years and every

year I go to Anchorage and Juneau, I've been there once with subsistence - save subsistence. You know, back there with (indiscernible), glad to be with them, what we talk about, like I said, what we use. You know, what we don't use we don't talk about it, what we use we talk about it. There's no household (indiscernible) what we use, anybody's household with what they use, moose, fish or anything. What we - what they've been eating, that's what we talking about. We don't try to put anybody down, we try to keep everything open for everybody. Like the sheep, right now, we're just - we're going for sheep today, we're going to talk about. We want the sheep because when my - maybe some day for us to use, we don't know what's going to happen (indiscernible). Like now you can't get shoot anything you want anywhere. You can't shoot a moose or a caribou, if you do now, that's why we got a think about it. We got a thing about what we being eat - what we're going to eat, they don't. That's why we got to talk about it, not just go out and shoot and just leave it there. The moose and caribou, even sheep they do that to. I like to see the - we like to see the sheep be opened. We use the sheep, when we get sheep. We use the skin, we use the skin, pants and mukluks they use to make out of it. (Indiscernible) Alaska, people come in to Alaska we don't get no more sheep, too. Where there used to be a lot of sheep, I don't see no more sheep, like back rabbits. That's true that you can see them - in - in September they come down, that's when we used to get sheep. Up - sheep back the other side of Mentasta on the mountains, we don't see sheep there no more, up on the - National Park or Wrangell mountain, that's where they be getting sheep and up Kulchina River, there a lot of place where hunt sheep, up - up Nabesna Road, we don't - we know everywhere, we know where we been hunting, that's what we talk about. We use the sheep, everything what's made - we keep everything we use, we don't throw nothing away. I'd like to see - we'd like to see the sheep kept open. Just a few days at a time anyway.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you Pete. You know, I'm just recollecting some of the things that I heard from Elders speak about over in our area. That is they don't want to lose a right - I'm talking about the elders like Pete and other people in that area. They used to do this and because of the way things are being done today, they do not want to lose that right, that subsistence right. I know - they all know that it's open to sports hunting and all that. But it should be kept open for those people that want to continue that way of life, that is their goal here, to keep subsistence - keep subsistence hunting open for Unit 13 and they also talk about 11, but 11 already has c&t determination to my understanding on sheep.

Any other comments? Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this the comment period then?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: This is where we're talking about Unit - Proposal #20.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought it was in general about.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, we're talking about Unit - yes, we'll open it up for anybody that wants to speak, but we're talking about Proposal #20 right now. Yeah, anybody else want to talk on Proposal #20? Gloria, you got to come up here to the mike.

MS. EAKON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that Bruce Greenwood will present the staff analysis for this proposal.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right.

MS. EAKON:in Rachel Mason's place.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Were you going to say something Gloria?

MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead you can make a comment while we're waiting.

MR. JOHN: I just got a question when I looked through the proposal here and it seems like the proposal - regulation should be unit hunt on 13 for - or on 11 for Unit 13 residents or village or whatever you want to do, for subsistence hunting; is that right there, Gloria?

MS. STICKWAN: What's that?

MR. JOHN: I see that most of the place, on Unit 13 there's very few public land, traditional hunting area for sheep for the villages.....

MS. STICKWAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. JOHN:and the majority of the hunting area for the villages is in Unit 11. I was thinking if you kind of made a mistake there?

MS. STICKWAN: We have no determination for Unit 13, so whatever mountains in that area we'll have c&t for, we want to have c&t for those.

MR. LOHSE: Gloria?

MS. STICKWAN: Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: You already have a determination for Unit 11?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes, we do.

MR. JOHN: Okay. Thanks.

MS. STICKWAN: We didn't list out Cantwell in our proposal I just now noticed, so we'd like to include them in Unit 13. They have traditionally used sheep up in that area, they're probably one of the most sheep hunters.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We're talking about the Nabesna area and Chistochina, but that's all mostly State lands, that's what we're talking about?

MS. STICKWAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's hardly any Federal lands around. The bulk of your Federal lands is Unit 11?

MS. STICKWAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So we won't even worry about Federal lands, we're going to - we're not worried about the State lands.

MS. STICKWAN: Okay. But we.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's the point that Fred is trying to make.

MS. STICKWAN: But we were still wanting to have c&t for whatever Federal lands there are on Unit 13.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could anybody show us on the map what we have here or what we're talking about - Bruce.

MR. GREENWOOD: Mr. Chair, I've worked in this area some, but I've had - I did not prepare this analysis, but I'm prepared to go ahead and discuss it with you. But to respond to your question, if you notice in your books there's some maps in there. I believe they are probably in the - they'd look like this, it's a foldout map.

MS. EAKON: Right after Page 69 in your proposal book.

MR. GREENWOOD: No, it would be in your staff book there, in your regional council book.

MS. EAKON: It's in the staff analysis booklet, yeah.

MR. BRELSFORD: The ones that were sent to you have the maps inserted in them, otherwise we have extra sets.

MS. EAKON: Okay, we have extra sets here.

MR. GREENWOOD: Thank you Taylor. These maps that Taylor's handing out were prepared in 1984 and they depict the areas that the residents used between 1964 and 1984. The researchers went into the villages and asked the people what areas they used for the different subsistence resources that they harvested and the residents drew these areas on the map, so these are a consolidation of those maps.

If you note, the first one is Chistochina and that little introduction there you can see - they didn't copy very well, but the darker checkered land is the Federal lands and the light color in the background would be State, private and other lands. The cross hatched areas are the areas that were depicted as a harvest use area for sheep.

MR. BASNAR: What game management unit is that area that's subsistence - you want these northwest of Mentasta way?

MR. GREENWOOD: That's in 13(C) and Unit 12.

MR. BASNAR: Okay. So it is in 13 they did use it?

MR. GREENWOOD: Yes. However, if you note there at this point in time, in 1996, there are no Federal lands show in Unit 13(C). At one time there may have been Federal lands there but at this time there is not Federal lands. And the next map would be Chitna. And if you note there the Chitna use area is in 13(D) and it's left of Chitna, they have other use areas, however in Unit 11 that are on Federal public land. The third map is Copper Center, most of their use areas are in 13(D) west of Chitna and there's a small use area up in 20(D) most likely the Tok management area.

I could take you through each map if you'd like to and discuss areas which each community has used or you can just go ahead and look through and ask questions if you had any questions regarding that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think this map is beginning to show what I was afraid of, there's hardly any Federal land where there's sheep.....

MR. GREENWOOD: Well, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN:in Unit 13.

MR. GREENWOOD: Yes, I could give you - we have the percentages of Federal lands, I could read those if you'd like me to. If you note on your - on Page 66, your staff analysis you could follow with me if you choose to. Of the entire Unit 13, 9.5 percent of the land is administered by the Federal agencies. In Units 13(A) and (E), less than one percent is Federal lands. 13(B), 7.7 percent is Bureau of Land Management land. In 13(C) .6 percent is National Park Service land and Unit 13(D) 1.2 percent is Bureau of Land Management land and 7.2 percent is U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service land. So as we summarize here, the proposal does not effect very much Federal land. Despite the low level of Federal land in the unit, this analysis provides an overview of customary and traditional uses of sheep in Unit 13 and will address the location of sheep harvests in relationship to the Federal public land.

So an analysis was completed on this proposal. All of the eight factors were discussed in detail and there's information that does show that these residents have harvested sheep within Unit 13. I could read all those - I could go through item by item and read that or I could go to the conclusion and just summarize it. The justification - what we recommend is to adopt the proposal. The justification is there's excellent evidence that the communities in Unit 13 have customarily and traditionally used sheep. Therefore, under the Federal subsistence management program, residents of Chistochina, Chitna, Copper Center, Gakona, Gulkana, Mentasta, and Tazlina should have a positive customary and traditional use for determination for sheep on Federal public lands in Unit 13.

However, there's no evidence that the use of sheep by residents of Unit 13 communities occurs on Federal public lands. For this reason, the Federal subsistence management program cannot establish seasons or harvest limits for sheep within Unit 13.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: So basically what you're saying is that while we should have customary and traditional finding for sheep since they did use sheep, there is no sheep on any of the Federal administrated lands so there could be no Federal subsistence hunt for sheep?

MR. GREENWOOD: Correct. That's a simple way of stating it. And I will mention that it is discussed and the thought is is that the present opinion is that if people customarily and traditional use animals within this area at one time and they don't use it now, they want to establish customary and traditional use, in case number one, the populations - sheep is maybe not a factor, but the populations could shift and move into the area or to the Federal public lands, status could change as a result of land selections. But at this point in time, we would not want to establish Federal seasons or harvest limits within Unit 13 for sheep.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Helga.

MS. EAKON: Public comments. The program received two written public comments on this proposal. The first one was from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game who stated that the Board of Game negative findings for Unit 13 were based on very low levels of contemporary use. It is the Department's feeling that there's an extremely limited amount of sheep range on Federal lands in Unit 13. Currently every Unit 13 resident can hunt sheep on all sheep range in Unit 13 being restricted only to taking one mature ram.

The second comment was from Joe Sonneman of Juneau who opposes the proposal. He feels that the customary and traditional use ended in 1940. That traditions evolve, the present custom and tradition does not include what the proposal proposes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other questions or - if not, thank you. You heard the recommendation and you heard Gloria speak on this proposal, what is the wish of the Council? The recommendation as you've heard was to make this have a positive customary and traditional use determination for sheep on Federal lands in Unit 13, that's preliminary justification I guess.

MR. LOHSE: Roy, can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: Is that what we have to find is a customary and traditional use on Federal lands? If it is, then we don't have any - we don't have any sheep on Federal lands or can we find a customary and traditional use in Unit 13 per se, while - but we're supposed to strictly deal with what's on Federal lands; right, is that what I understood you saying?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, you know, I wasn't even involved in this proposal. But I do support them just, you know, setting - I guess, on record what they did in the past, you know, on Unit 13. They want to have a favorable finding for subsistence for sheep in Unit 13. At that time I guess it was all either Federal lands when all this happened, must have before the date - from this date taken over and all that. I guess that's all the justification process - all been determined, I guess. I don't know, I see your point.

MR. LOHSE: I was just wondering if we can act on this is what I was asking you?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: According to the recommendation I guess we could. Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think this goes back to the question that we've talked about since the beginning of the regional councils and that is, that the Federal subsistence program has jurisdiction only on Federal public lands. So the Federal subsistence board can only reach decisions regarding the uses of Federal public - wildlife on Federal public lands and your advice to the Board only takes effect on Federal public lands, so that much is crystal clear. What's been suggested here is that you might make a finding that recognizes historic patterns of use in Unit 13, but when it comes to authorizing a season or a quota, a harvest limit, since the animals are not found on Federal public lands there could be no, you know, season, no hunting season and no bag limit, no harvest limit.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: What is the wish of the Council on this proposal? Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Roy, in my opinion there's no question that they did use sheep in Unit 13, I mean from talking to people and from being there. It's just - what

I'm wondering is, you know, other than we can make - we could make a statement that they use sheep in Unit 13, but we can't find for sheep use on Federal land in Unit 13 because there is no sheep use on Federal land. That's what I'm wondering, is what - how we could handle that?

MR. BASNAR: That's not completely true. The Tok management area - no, that's not 13 is it?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: How about.....

MR. LOHSE: We sat and looked at the map here and we can't - we can't find.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Isn't there some Federal land left over along the Denali Highway?

MR. LOHSE: No.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All State?

MR. BASNAR: Just that little corner down along the Tango lakes.

MR. LOHSE: All we have is this right here.

MR. BASNAR: The little Tango Lakes area there. And there's no sheep on Tango Lake.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: How about on Teekle Road - River here?

MR. LOHSE: There's sheep on that range.

MS. EAKON: There's another consideration that might boost - boost the staff recommendation is that there may be - there may be selected lands within the Unit that will not be conveyed in which case it would revert to Federal management unit. Now, I do not know this, but there's a possibility.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee.

MR. BASNAR: I think Ralph's got an excellent question here. I have no question in my mind what has been traditional use of sheep in these areas. But Ralph has, I think, pinpointed this to Federal lands in this area which is - our jurisdiction is limited to Federal lands and geez, I don't think there's any sheep on the Federal lands. Now, I fully recognize that people have used sheep in the entire area, but we're only allowed to discuss Federal lands.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, Helga.

MS. EAKON: May I suggest a little break so that the agency people could huddle on this because it is.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Take a five minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we'll call the meeting back to order. I believe the staff has some recommendation for us to deal with Proposal #20.

MR. GREENWOOD: Mr. Chair we had a little meeting here and we talked about this and we feel it would be appropriate for the regional council to make a recommendation to reject this proposal and we would support that and carry it through to the staff committee and the subsistence board as a rejection of this proposal. For the reason that, at the present time there are very few Federal lands in Unit 13. There is very few sheep on - I guess there are probably no sheep or very few on any of the Federal lands in Unit 13 and none of the harvest data shows the use of sheep within Unit 13. We would also like to state that if in the event that the lands - land status does change as a result of land selections and so forth, that the staff would then take this proposal and - and resubmit it again in the subsequent year if the land status does change.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Do you have the recommendation? Let me just say that it's too bad that you have come to that recommendation. I think the CRNA people really would like to have a favorable c&t determination for sheep there. But there just seems no way to do that without enough Federal lands and all that. The obstacles are many.

MR. JOHN: We're just going to take action?

MR. LOHSE: Is there any way that we can say that we recognize their use in Unit 13 but we find - but we have to - you know, but we have to - but we should find some way to recognize their use, customary and traditional use of sheep in 13, but that we can't make a finding for on Federally managed land at this point in time. In fact, maybe how that's how we should make the motion.

MR. JOHN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Great.

MR. LOHSE: You'll second it?

MR. JOHN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: I'd like to make a motion that while we recognize the use of the residents of Unit 13 for customary and traditional use of sheep, at this point in time we can't find a finding for use on the currently managed Federal land in Unit 13.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second?

MR. JOHN: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion's seconded, further discussion on the motion? Well, I wonder if Lee and Gary disappeared on purpose here - oh, here comes Gary.

MR. LOHSE: Well, now we got a quorum, now we can vote.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you have comment?

MR. LOHSE: We have a motion on the floor.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you have comment Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: No.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Would you repeat your motion for Gary's benefit?

MR. LOHSE: Did you get that motion so you can repeat it for us or should I repeat it again?

COURT REPORTER: I can go off record and rewind the tape and play it back?

MR. LOHSE: Did you get it Helga?

MS. EAKON: Ralph Lohse moved that the regional council recognized that while the residents of Unit 13 have customary and traditional use - use of sheep, we recommend a no finding on currently managed Federal lands in Unit 13.

MR. LOHSE: Because of the absence of sheep.

MS. EAKON: Because of the absence of sheep. And Fred John, Jr. seconded the motion.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any further discussion on the motion?

MR. LOHSE: They recommended that we reject the motion, we wanted to at least state that we recognized that there was customary and traditional use of sheep.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: And then the motion goes on and it says, but.....

MR. LOHSE: But we can't make a finding for it on current Federal land because there are no sheep - currently Federally managed land.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Did you want to say something?

MR. LANGDON: Well, I just wanted to - I think the way that it's presently worded it says the residents of the region.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

MR. LANGDON: Steve Langdon, University of Alaska.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. LANGDON: Does it say the residents of the region?

MR. LOHSE: It says residents of - yeah, residents of Unit - residents of Unit 13, right.

MR. LANGDON: I'm not sure that that - Cantwell's outside of 13.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, it's in 13, Park 13 - in Unit 13.

MR. LANGDON: So are all the communities in 13 then?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Pretty much I would think.

MR. LANGDON: Okay, that's all right. Is it supposed to address Ahtna use or all use?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph, your the motion maker.

MR. LOHSE: I was just recognizing the communities that were there.

MR. LANGDON: The communities that are.....

MR. LOHSE: I would say all use since ANILCA says Native and non-Native.

MR. LANGDON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Bruce.

MR. GREENWOOD: I'm Bruce Greenwood. I think Steve may have a point there. I just - a real quick look here, Chistochina, for example is in Unit 11. You may want to refine that to what the original proposal was was the seven Ahtna villages, that's what the request was for. So if the motion's stated instead of the residents of Unit 13, the seven Ahtna villages may be the better way to do that.

MR. LOHSE: Will the second concur?

MR. JOHN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: Second will concur on that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think.....

MR. JOHN: We're just rejecting this one?

MR. LOHSE: Right.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Unofficially Gloria stated she wanted to include Cantwell. I don't know if people heard that.

MS. EAKON: Cantwell was inadvertently omitted.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Which would make it eight villages.

MR. LOHSE: Well, is Cantwell an Ahtna village?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes. Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell, Denali National Park. In terms of Cantwell, there are no sheep populations in Denali that range on to the south side in Unit 13. So if the community of Cantwell regarding Denali National Park lands, there's no habitat in that region, so Cantwell's use of sheep would have to be from some other areas to the east. You have to go clear through the south in Unit 16(B) before you have sheep on the southside of the Alaska Range.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, the motion's second, further discussion on the motion?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I guess I'm not - I think I understand what the motion is trying to say but I - it seems to me it try to do two things and I don't know if we can - is it our purview to do those two things.

MR. JOHN: I think all we're doing is acknowledging they have customary and traditional, but there's no Federal lands so we can't do anything about it.

MR. LOHSE: So we're coming up.....

MR. JOHN: So we're just.....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: So essentially I guess we're recognizing a c&t, but we're not - but we're saying that there are no lands so how can we recognize a c&t for no Federal lands is what I don't understand.

MR. LOHSE: Well, we.....

MR. JOHN: We acknowledged their c&t, for these Ahtna villages.

MR. LOHSE: But we can't make a finding for c&t on Federal lands because there's no sheep on Federal lands. So.....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I don't know, maybe I'm not understanding something but if it's fine with everything else, I'm not going to.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let me try to explain something that I know that bothers everybody and that is, as I stated earlier, I don't know if everybody listened. Before the map was - I mean the land was cut up like this, pretty much all of it was Federal lands and maybe at that point - during that time, I'm talking about before 1959 when the State became a state and 1971 when the Lands Claims was passed, I think the Native people - the Native community used all the land, it was Federal land, for sheep, everything. And we're talking about sheep up in Chistochina as you heard, Chistochina's in 13, Chistochina, Tazlina Lake area, north Paxton area.

MR. LOHSE: Chitna area.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, Chitna area. How do you ignore that, to say no c&t determination for these communities that did use that area pretty much - they live in Unit 13. That I have a problem with.

MR. JOHN: Yeah.

MR. BASNAR: I don't think we're ignoring it, Roy, I think it's just a case of we have our charter. We have to look at Federal lands and that's what we have to look at and I think our hands are tied. I'm sure not ignoring this. I know where you're coming from and I agree, but what could we do about it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion on the floor, any further discussion on the motion?

MR. BASNAR: Would you repeat the motion?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, the motion is to - Helga would you read it one more time?

MR. LOHSE: Helga, would you read the motion please?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee was out of the room.

MS. EAKON: Ralph Lohse moved that while the regional council recognized that the - is it now the eight Ahtna villages including Cantwell?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MS. EAKON: Customarily and traditionally used sheep in Unit 13, the regional council cannot at this time make a finding of c&t use on currently managed Federal land in Unit 13 because of the absence of sheep. And Fred John, Jr., seconded the motion.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any further discussion on the motion?

MR. JOHN: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's been called for, all in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign, the motion is carried. That takes care of Proposal #20. I believe we're going to open it up now for public comment. There are some people - if you are going to speak, please sign up back there, somewhere there's a sheet or let us know what your name is for the record on a piece of paper somewhere, your address and so on.

Is there anybody from the public that wants to speak? Did you sign up Henry - okay, come on up. State your name.

MR. MAKARKA: Henry Makarka.

MR. LOHSE: You're from Cordova.

MR. MAKARKA: I'm from Eyak-Cordova, lifetime resident, born here, lived here all my life. Couldn't even afford a trip to Spike Island unless I get on a log and paddle across.

You know, when you folks look at a situation of our Federal government the way it is one day it's shutdown for a week and then it opens up and then they shut our government down again for another week and then they open it up and then they shut her down again, well, I hope that isn't the way you folks operate. I understand that you're an advisory committee to the Federal subsistence board in creating those particular regulations that are going to happen out of this. I personally don't think that this is a time of intimidation for anyone in the matter with what you're dealing with, you are dealing with the indigence of the state of Alaska. And I think that's pretty self-explanatory when it comes to survival methods of which they have had throughout the years. A lot of us, sure, maybe some of us say, well, I subsist in Safeway, well, I do part of the time too. But as long as I was able to do, I went out and subsisted and ate what I caught.

I hope that you folks, however, you submit your laws and I - I look at the situation from the standpoint with what our State government has done. For 20 years they have made the political football with the subsistence issue. Whether it was to comply with the Federal law or the State law. I can remember in the days and maybe I should say the status quo is what - how the State was run beforehand, before this became a political football and I must - I may add to that at the expense and the suffering of the Native indigence of the state of Alaska, at their suffering. I would hope that somehow if you have any influence upon the State government, I understand that our Lieutenant Governor Ulmer is

vigorously pursuing trying to resolve the subsistence issue. Whether you folks have any influence upon them, Federal and State, I certainly would hope that you do try to influence them to comply with one way or with ANILCA or whichever way the problem maybe resolved.

It's been too long now with that particular issue. And I just - when it comes to you folks, I understand as well as anybody whether it comes to an exploitation of our resources or what. Not too long ago Senator Stevens was here and gave us an opportunity to voice her opinions and I voiced my opinions then too about the subsistence issue, even dealing with the State and Federal government. I mention the fact that, my golly, can't you do something about once in a while maybe with the percentage of laws that you pass, whether it be Federal or State in favor of the Natives because after all when you look back - when you look at the history of the American experience of the massive exploitation of resources and now we're on the last Frontier - to put it bluntly, this is the last place for the massive exploitation to continue on with, I don't think so. I don't believe that. But I do feel simply - sympathize with the Native population, they are the indigence, they survived through that method, they never wasted anything with what they had done. I admit to the fact, too, like myself I subsist in Safeway and some of the modern, too, but I do crave the natural foods that I was brought up on. So if you would - as an advisory board, I would hope that you somehow have an influence upon the State and Federal government to resolve this subsistence issue. It's becoming too much of a mockery as far as I'm concerned. And it's becoming a massive exploitation. I use the term bluntly because I feel that way within my own self. I have fought the subsistence issue from the time I first became involved with the Native activities and that's why I belong to several different boards, but I'm out of it now. I refer to it - I was on the inside, but now I'm on the outside looking in, I have that opportunity to voice my opinions as I see them, too, as my fellow Natives see them too.

So with that folks, I would hope very kindly that you do have some political influence upon resolving the subsistence issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you, Henry. I appreciate your remarks. Is there anybody else that would want to speak from the public before we get into the agency reports? If not, then we'll go on into the agency reports and the first one is National Park Service, Wrangell-St. Elias.

MR. GREENWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I'm Bruce Greenwood. I'm going to present this for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, they had to get back before the weather changed. I'd also enlist the support of Roy and Fred because they were at the SRC meeting where most of this information was discussed.

There was an SRC meeting held last week and there are two points of interest that Wrangell-St. Elias National Park wanted to be conveyed. One is a proposed hunting plan or recommendation concerning water fowl. What they'd like to do is establish a fall subsistence season and bag limit consistent with the State season and bag limit for water fowl and two; provide a general exception to the harvesting of migratory birds and their eggs for subsistence purposes to all Alaska Natives, as is the case for western Alaska.

Currently there is no Federal subsistence season for water fowl. In National Parks, only Federal subsistence hunting by local rural residents is authorized. Therefore, it is not possible for local rural residents to hunt under a State authorized migratory bird season and bag limit like it is in National Preserves Refuges and Forest Services lands. The commission believes the harvest of

migratory birds for subsistence purposes is an important customary and traditional practice. It is also recognized that Alaska Natives have a longstanding subsistence use of birds and their eggs. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act allows Alaska Natives in western Alaska to harvest certain migratory birds and their eggs for subsistence purposes. The commission believes that all Native Alaskans have similar customary tradition use of migratory birds and their eggs and should be provided for.

What the Park would like you to do would be to.....

MR. BASNAR: Who wrote that?

MR. GREENWOOD: This is the - this is the SRC, the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC.

MR. BASNAR: Okay.

MR. GREENWOOD: And this has been an issue that has - I know has been a concern for a couple of years now, maybe Roy or Fred could articulate exactly how long, I know it's been a concern for a couple of years. And the SRC is writing a hunting plan recommendation that goes to the Secretary of the Interior. In order to do so, they have to have public comment on this hunting recommendation. Part of the public comment is presenting it to regional advisory councils for your support and endorsement or comments otherwise. So what they'd like to have you do is to either endorse it through a motion or provide comments regarding this.

I could read the other one or you could act on this one first and then we could go on to the next issue.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. You heard the recommendation from the Wrangell-St. Elias subsistence resource commission. We recommend that we have - open it up for migratory bird hunting and gathering of eggs. We didn't talk about season, we're talking about really fall, right, at this point?

MR. GREENWOOD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: But we didn't - we just - I think we want to propose this through this Council to the Federal subsistence board, that's what we would like to do. Unless Fred has anything to add - for your information our resource commission is composed of about half and half, half Native and about half non-Native and I didn't hear anybody opposed to this recommendation. In fact, the proposal was made by a non-Native as I understand it. There presently is no hunting - subsistence hunting in the Park?

MR. GREENWOOD: Correct, for water fowl.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: For water fowl, right.

MR. BASNAR: Why is there not any water fowl subsistence hunting?

MR. GREENWOOD: The reason why it is is that the only kind of subsistence hunting that can occur in a National Park is that that's what is under ANILCA. And under ANILCA, water fowl hunting is not authorized.

MR. BASNAR: Well, I'll be damned.

MR. GREENWOOD: Yeah, subsistence harvest of water fowl.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman - Taylor Brelsford. I think a simple clarification will make it easy to see. They're separate Federal legislation and actually several international treaties that govern the harvest of migratory water fowl, the most important of those is the treaty with Canada. And those were implemented in Federal legislation in the 19- - I believe it's 1916 the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. That's currently under renegotiation, so you may hear discussion of it around - in the past few months in fact. But since that is handled in separate legislation, there's no authority in ANILCA to provide for subsistence opportunities for migratory water fowl. The same thing is true for marine mammals. They are also handled under separate Federal legislation, and so don't come under the terms of ANILCA, Title VIII. Okay?

MR. BASNAR: If that's the case, then the Board doesn't have the authority to act upon any recommendation that we might have in - so what's the purpose?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think the purpose is to - we - how do you get things started, you go through steps. I think it's just a matter of recommending to, I guess, the proper agency - proper level. We didn't - I guess the resource council thought that we would like to gather support from other organizations such as this, the advisory council.

MR. GREENWOOD: Mr. Chair, I'll provide clarification on that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. GREENWOOD: You wouldn't be recommending to the subsistence board, you would be essentially writing a letter to the Secretary of the Interior commenting on this hunting plan recommendation.

What it is is that, what the Secretary of the Interior would do, if the SRC advances it's hunting plan recommendation without public comment which would include other advisory groups within the area, it's going to get sent back to the SRC and say did you notify the regional advisory council of this issue. So what they're doing is they would like to have an endorsement or recognition of this so they can have it as part of the public comment.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any questions or comment? You want to make comment Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah, if I could. I haven't seen this proposal before, I don't know what kind of information we've gotten on it. And although I - it sounds very reasonable to me, highly enlightened, I - we've - at times we, depending on various reasons it seems we take a proposal without much information and then at time we bombard ourselves with information for, in some cases, what seems like years, and I think is literally years, and I'm kind of curious, is this the way we're going to do business or if this is in some category as was stated perhaps it's just a recommendation as going a little different route so we can treat it differently. But I'm concerned that we're maybe not getting as much background data as I'd like to have.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'm sorry, I don't have much background information. This process was started before I came on to this commission. There was a letter at the very first meeting, a proposed letter sent to - I forgot who, the Secretary of Interior or something on this - and we haven't met for two years so in between there's hardly any discussion, it came up again. We just want to make

it known to the various, like you say, advisory councils, that this is what we would like to do here and if you would lend us a hand that'd be great, I mean in trying to accomplish what we're trying to do.

MR. GREENWOOD: I have a letter here from Wrangell-St. Elias.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you want to read that?

MR. GREENWOOD: Yeah, the letter pretty much states what I'd previously read, but I can go ahead and read it. This is; Dear Mr. Ewan. On February 20th, 1996, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park subsistence resource commission approved the following draft hunting plan recommendation concerning authorization of a fall, Federal subsistence water fowl hunt consistent with the State season and bag limit. As you know in National Parks only Federal subsistence hunting is authorized for local rural residents, therefore, it is not possible for local rural residents to hunt under State authorized migratory bird season and bird limit like it is in National Preserves Refuges and Forest Service lands. This recommendation encourages the Secretary of the Interior, through his authority under Title VIII, subsistence season and bag limit for water fowl. In accordance with Section 808 of ANILCA, we request your review and comment on the draft recommendation. We're asking that the council review this recommendation at the next council meeting. Please send any comments to John Vale, Chairman, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park subsistence resource commission.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any problem with that. That's different than what, either you or somebody else said. You're talking about gathering eggs and you weren't talking about specific seasons and from what I heard you read just then, you said, in continece with the State seasons and bag limits, except within a National Park.

MR. GREENWOOD: Right.

MR. BASNAR: Have I got that correct?

MR. GREENWOOD: Correct.

MR. BASNAR: I don't have any problem with that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I said that. I didn't know that it was already - that's there.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I think it answered my question. It seems to me what we're asked to do is give comment on this proposal actually given by someone else. We're not asked to make a proposal ourselves, is that what I understand?

MR. GREENWOOD: That's correct.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Okay, so that I don't have a problem with. This answered my question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: What is the wish of the Council on this?

MR. BASNAR: Well, I'll move the Council support the recommendation of the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion, is there a second?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. Further discussion on the motion?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's been called for, all in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign, motion is carried. Okay. We have some other.....

MR. GREENWOOD: There's one more, the second - the second letter that I have is written to Secretary Babbitt and.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I was explaining to Lee that I was chairing that commission before John Vale was writing these letters, I haven't seen those yet.

MR. GREENWOOD: But what this letter is, we're submitting to you - we are submitting to you a proposed revision to the charter of the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park subsistence resource commission. We're requesting that the charter be amended to allow the subsistence resource commission to report, not only to the Park superintendent, but to the Federal subsistence board and the Federal regional subsistence advisory councils. As you know, the Federal subsistence board and the Federal regional advisory council system were established in 1990 after the Federal assumption of the subsistence management of the Federal public lands. This, of course, is well after the passage of ANILCA, which laid out in general terms how the subsistence resource commissions would function. The commission believes that under the current management regulations the advisory system would function much better with the changes to the charter.

I'll give you a brief summary of this. Right now, anytime - and I will ask Hollis Twitchell - defer to him if he has anymore further comment on this. Anytime an SRC has a recommendation, if you follow the exact letter of the law, they would have to forward any of their hunting plan recommendations through the Secretary of the Interior. What they would like to do is they'd like to change the charter for the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC to allow the SRC to report to the regional council and to the Federal subsistence board in addition to the Secretary of the Interior. They feel that this would actually, in a sense, legitimize what is occurring anyway. For example, the SRC made a recommendation today for the Mentasta caribou plan, you adopted their recommendation. We'd like to have it legitimized so that it's officially recognized that the SRC can report directly to the regional councils in that manner, without having to take a hunting plan recommendation through the Secretary of the Interior. I think, Lee, you may recall we discussed this in the last Denali SRC meeting last June in quite detail.

So what I understand the SRC would like to do would be for you to endorse and, again, support this recommendation to change the charter.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'd like to speak on that. I fully support that. What the old charter said was something like the SRC would report to the superintendent - Park superintendent and the Governor's office - to the Governor's office, that

pretty much was it. We just want to expand it to be able to use this forum here, the council, to make some recommendation that we'd like the Federal subsistence board to consider. And I guess that's pretty much it.

MR. BASNAR: The question that comes to my mind is I think we now have that privilege, that authority, whatever word we choose to use. Would the charter amendment.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We're talking about our SRC charter.

MR. BASNAR: I understand - I hear you. But right now as an SRC member, Denali SRC, we send letters to whomever we please. We have that latitude at the current time, I just wonder if we need to go through the mechanics of a charter change in order to do what we now have the latitude to do.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee, I don't know what the process is. I don't know whether the Secretary of the Interior has to sign off on this or what, but it appears to me that is why we have to go up through the channels, have some support along the way. The other thing that we want to do besides reporting to the superintendent is to be able to go directly to the Secretary of the Interior, which this would allow this new - proposal would allow. Bruce.

MR. GREENWOOD: To clarify that, Lee, I could read that - the present charter presently states the commission reports to the superintendent Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. What they'd like to do is they'd like to change this to read, the commission reports to the Federal subsistence board, the appropriate Federal regional advisory councils and the Superintendent of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.

MR. BASNAR: And that's exactly my point. That cranks in the requirement on the SRC that they don't have at the current time. That requires the SRC to report to this council. Right now they may report to the council, but they're not required to do so. I just don't want to see us building a fence that we're going to have to jump over, unless I missed the point.

MR. GREENWOOD: You may have a valid point there. And maybe what the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC may want to consider is putting the word, may.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MR. GREENWOOD: Instead of have to or put a word, may - may report to the advisory council, the Federal subsistence board.

MR. BASNAR: Because there are issues that an SRC will discuss that would really not be worth the time of this Council, the Council might not have any interest in, particularly local - and I can't think of one off the top of my head, but I'm sure there are many times that Wrangell discusses things that we wouldn't have any interest in and the same with Denali. But if they have something - any SRC has something that's a major importance, they now may address this Council and get our blessing or our curse or whatever we put on it. I like the latitude.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think what - you'd have to understand, I guess, the SRC from Wrangell-St. Elias, their make-up and what they have done in the past to really understand what they're getting at, I guess. They had a superintendent that kind of slanted that commission and guides and, you know, people like that, had the majority on the commission and they - there were issues that were discussed

at that resource development council that really didn't concern subsistence issues as much as they're starting to now. What they're trying to get around is if we get another superintendent like that, we want to go through - get by them somehow and I think that's what the commission, itself, is looking at. Go to the Federal subsistence board or some other avenue that can get your wants and needs across. If you have a superintendent that's, you know, opposed to you - when you have a favorable superintendent like we have right now, we don't have a no problem, we just use the old process, but I think some of the old members learned something serving on the - some of these members served eight, nine years or something like that, they're third terms - many of them are third terms, you know, they've been around a long time. And those are the guys that are recommending it and I support them.

MR. BASNAR: Well, I just - I don't care what you do in Wrangell-St. Elias SRC, I just don't want it to set a precedent that it would require Denali SRC to come up with some mandate that I have to report to this Council.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We could put that - we could put that in our letter.....

MR. BASNAR: But if you use the word, may, I don't have any problem and I'll support you.

MR. GREENWOOD: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. GREENWOOD: I think one thing that is now, it's kind of more of an informal process, the SRC going to the regional advisory council. I think what Wrangell-St. Elias SRC wants to do is one, is have a recognition - recognize that this is a way to go and have it recognized that way, where as now it's not totally recognized, just kind of happens because people work together.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could I add one more thing that I know I heard our resource commission mention was that maybe the National Park Service doesn't want to send us over there because of cost. But a lot of members would like to voluntarily go to meetings in Anchorage, anywhere, you know, just pay their own way. And that's what I've heard over there. I think they were prevented from going to some meeting that they wanted to attend elsewhere and representing the views of the commission, but the Park Service just couldn't send them over there. And there's several comments that - from our commission, these guys are - some of them are business people, they'd be able to pay their own way, they said, we'll go. If you can't afford to send us, we'll go on our own. So that's another point that I thought should be known. Yes, go ahead.

MR. GREENWOOD: That's it.

MR. BASNAR: One final question. Bruce, what would the - what would be the impact of a charter change at Wrangell-St. Elias on other SRC's in Alaska?

MR. GREENWOOD: I'm not sure. And I would be reluctant to say one way or the other. I would think ideally that each SRC would make a similar motion and request this written into their charter.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, you got to look at, I think, each SRC as being, you know, a little bit different because of the makeup. I think we have 18 resident zones in our area - communities. We have, I think, a good mixture of people over

there who have pretty strong views about subsistence and how it should go over there.

I think Hollis wanted to say something, go ahead Hollis.

MR. TWITCHELL: I was looking in ANILCA itself where it talks about park and monument subsistence resource commissions. And in there it talks about development of hunting plans for subsistence hunting in the park. In one of the elements that it talks about is that after personnel from either the state of Alaska or the Department of the Interior gathers information, it has to be submitted and it has to go through a consultation with local advisory committees and regional advisory councils and any testimony received from public hearings held in the vicinity of the commission. So ANILCA in itself is very clear that any proposal that a SRC makes needs to have public review by local advisory committees and regional advisory councils. So I don't - I don't see quite what the issue is, the SRC's I'm familiar with are all more than willing to work through the Federal subsistence board regional advisory councils and local advisory committees. This seems just to be a technical question. The only thing that's not identified in here is the Federal subsistence board.

MR. JOHN: Then I think we should - I think Mt. Wrangell-St. Elias, I thought they wanted that on paper.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Anything else?

MR. GREENWOOD: Nope, that'll be it. I believe they would like maybe a letter written acknowledging or concurring with this is what Jay was asking me to ask you to provide.

MR. LOHSE: I make a motion we write a letter concurring with the word, may, inserted in it, with.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second?

MR. LOHSE:recommendation of SRC.

MR. BASNAR: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion, seconded, any further discussion on the motion?

MR. JOHN: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question called for, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by same sign, motion carries, thank you. Is that it for Wrangell-St. Elias?

MR. GREENWOOD: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Next agency will be - which one, I lost my - Denali National Park. Okay, Hollis.

MR. TWITCHELL: I promise to make this brief. I don't have anything from Denali to mention to you at this point. The one thing I was going to talk about is the

National Park Services review of its regulations and the law in terms of subsistence on park lands.

It's been 16 years since ANILCA was passed and almost the same amount of years since the Park Service formulated their subsistence regulations and certainly many things have changed in the State regarding subsistence since that point of time. It's caused a lot of concern about some of the field managers in the Park Service on where we are going in the future with subsistence and how user friendly we are or are not going to be. As a result from a lot of these concerns from field managers, a review panel was formalized to look back at the law where it was plain - where it was very clear in what was printed, then look at situations that aren't very clear. There's many things ANILCA did not address about subsistence and particularly with National Park Service lands as well.

So an effort is underway for us to take a serious look at how the Park Service manages subsistence and try to focus in on where there's some ambiguities, where some of the definitions are - can be interpreted very widely or in some cases, they're interpreted too narrowly. One of the things we, as the field managers, were concerned about is most of the policies for subsistence were generated not necessarily in the State, very often coming from Washington and the higher level of management and it seems to me like a lot of the times the local subsistence users, themselves, were one of the last peoples to be consulted in terms of these regulations. In an effort to try to reverse that process we have submitted to the regional councils, as well as the SRC's, this initial review and ask for comments. This is just the beginning process, we're not at the end of it, it's simply a draft form that identified some potential problems that will be coming along. In there we talk about general subsistence issues, eligibility as it applies to Park lands, access regarding Park lands, use of cabins, construction of cabins on Park lands, trapping, how trapping's managed in those areas, customary trade as well as subsistence resource commission's themselves. What we ask of you is if you have an interest and would like to review it, there are action items at the end of some very brief dialogue, we're requesting if you think any of those actions are appropriate or if they're not appropriate, why. What sort of regulatory needs there are and are any changes necessary. Any other comment you have regarding how Park manages subsistence is certainly welcome as well. The comments we're requesting, that they - I see in this document, have used May 1st as the time period, so we don't expect those presently today, but in the future. I know in the case of Denali we extended the deadline beyond May and we have until the end of June, I believe, so that it would be adequate time for the Council to review it.

That is it. After the comment period there's really no deadline for what the completion of the paper is going to be. Again, I would like to stress that we wanted to take this to the subsistence users first before we elevated it any farther beyond and encourage and hope that you would have the time to take a look at it. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you, Hollis.

MS. EAKON: I want to say that you do have a copy of the paper in your books as 7(A) (2).

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. We'll continue with the agencies then.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: What do you want to do?

MS. EAKON: However, we missed U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management and Taylor was the man. Report #1 that we kind of skipped.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. We'll get back to that. We'll get back in order here, okay, U.S. Fish & Wildlife. Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief. I think the Federal subsistence program would like to continue to express its great appreciation for the effort that this Council has exercised in facing some very complex and very difficult questions and that's reflected again, - I think you guys take the cake for the thickest analysis book and perhaps some of the most difficult questions that the Federal subsistence program faces. And your diligence and your care in reasoning through these questions is one that continues to inspire a bunch of us and the staff. I think we enjoy working for people who work hard. And I'd like to at least open with that remark.

Otherwise, there have been some staff changes in the Federal subsistence program that you may have realized but let me mention them to you. We were very happy to welcome Tom Boyd as the new deputy assistant ARD. He - is that right, deputy assistant regional director - too many A's in there. He comes to us with a lot of background, we're very fortunate to have somebody who can hit the ground running. He wasn't quite so fortunate. He came just in time to get locked out with all of us during these furloughs. But he has many years experience with the Federal subsistence program working as a staff committee member for the BLM. A lot of familiarity with regions in which the BLM has a lot of land, the Denali Corridor, the Pipeline Corridor, some of the Seward Peninsula areas. So that's a - we don't lose much time on the learning curve having Tom come as our new program leader. Also in the past several months, we bid farewell to Dick Marshall who worked with all of us many times in the meetings in Southcentral. He's now retired and he's off - I don't know I hope he gets a sunburn, in Florida for a couple of months and will be back on the Kenai this summer where he's retired to live. And acting in his place for several months is Rachel Mason. So she's now actually the acting chief of the resources division at the present time. And we welcome and endorse her expertise in that new capacity as well.

Otherwise, there's several topics that Fish & Wildlife Service staff are asked to talk with you about, the Katie John implementation, the rural, non-rural proposal from the Council, elsewhere in the agenda, so I think I'll just leave my opening comments to that at the present time.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thanks. We'll go on down to the next agency.

MS. EAKON: Chugach.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Chugach National Forest?

MS. EAKON: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. ZEMKE: Could I have a second, I need the overhead there?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Let's take a couple of minutes here and get some coffee.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let's call the meeting back to order. Everybody take their seats and we'll hear from Chugach National Park next.

MR. ZEMKE: All right. I'm Steve Zemke from the Chugach National Forest. Not the Fish & Wildlife Service either.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No wonder you.....

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, all us bureaucrats, you know, we're all the same, but we don't really profess to that. I heard some ohs back there.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Open up a new park.

MR. ZEMKE: Well, some people say we are. But actually I'm here to talk to you today about three main topics. The first is kind of an update of what's going on in the Chugach. And I think in the last meeting and hopefully in the mail you got one of these, it's called the schedule of proposed actions, I think it's in your book. It's supposed to be under Tab 7(A) (5), but I saw it was kind of floating on the top there.

MS. EAKON: It's in the front pocket.

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, in the pocket. The acronym is SOAPA, some people would say we'll probably get on the SOAPA box to discuss it, but - anyway, what it is is a discussion of ongoing actions that are planned for the Chugach National Forest or some kind of environmental documentation's going to occur on, either a categorical exclusion environmental assessment or possibly environmental impact statement. And it's also divided into three different - four different categories. First would be actions that would be decided out of the Forest Service headquarters office here in Anchorage - or there in Anchorage. Then also there's the three ranger districts, there's the Glacier Ranger District, which is out of Girdwood, the Seward Ranger District out of Seward and then Cordova here in Cordova. So I'll just kind of lead you briefly through it. There are 24 actions that are scheduled here and some of them may or may not occur, they're - you know there is currently ongoing analysis. Probably most of them really don't involve subsistence resources directly. A lot of maybe trail development or viewer platform, one of them - to the Glacier Ranger District, if you're a traveler on the Seward Highway, the pots up on the top of Turnagain Pass have been a high priority on the Forest for many years and if you've been travelling on that road you probably know why.

But anyway, the first one, the supervisor's office, if you look on Page 2, probably the most impacting one would be the forest plan revision. And looking at it you see the basic description is it's the revision of Land Management Plan which was written in 1984, so it's a pretty old document, 12 years old. That's a quite old planning document, it's probably actually written in about 1982. And basically what we're undergoing right now is an analysis to see if there's any significant change that needs to be done to the Forest Plan. Subsistence resources were discussed slightly in the Forest Plan, the Federal board system and this whole process were involved in now wasn't included in that and so that would definitely be a major topic of discussion. There will be a scoping document that will probably come out this spring to early summer and will be routed to members of the subsistence advisory council, also to the residents - anybody that's on the mailing list, so folks down on the Kenai Peninsula will probably be the most interested in that.

We're looking at having a draft out by 1996, I think that's a bureaucrats dream, but anyway, we're looking at a final decision around 1998. Again, whether that happens or not, part of it is budgets - as we're getting into the declining budgets, the priorities may slightly erode also. So we'll try to keep you informed on what's going on with that. As we'll probably be into alternative development if we are going to be working on the plan through the end of this year and maybe in the fall meeting we'd be able to bring in some definitive alternatives for your discussion. So that's.....

The other one - project that's kind of coming out of the supervisor's office is the Port Dick spawning channel, that - it probably relates mostly to subsistence resources. I think initially it was a project that was proposed by subsistence users down in the southern Kenai Peninsula to bolster the pink runs down there and then it was, in turn, funded by EVOS, and it's designed to try to bring in some more coho and - or pink and chum into the area, primarily for subsistence purposes.

Okay, that's kind of the two major projects on the - out of the supervisor's office that you'd probably be most interested in. On the Cordova - the Glacier Ranger District, there's Paulison Creek, it's a small fishway in Prince William Sound, it was constructed back in the - I think it was the early '80s, it never did work quite right and we're looking at proposing to reconstruct the fishway to allow pink salmons to come over the fishway in a more expeditious fashion. It's really - it kind of sounds like a minor project, but because it's in the proposed wilderness area from the 1984 Chugach Plan it has to go through a lot of hoops to be able to get signed off on.

Okay, then on to the next portion, it would be over in the Seward Ranger District. And if you look on Page 5 there's probably one fishway project, it's called the Palmer Creek Fishway, it's in Resurrection Creek which is a major tri- - or Palmer Creek's a major tributary to Resurrection Creek which flows right through Hope and this project would be designed to pass coho salmon up into a previously inaccessible area. Primarily it would target subsistence users in Hope. There isn't that many coho's in Resurrection Creek, the king salmon run's pretty small and so we're looking at - looking at accessing that habitat to provide probably about 200 cohos to the local community there.

The other major portion of the SOAPA document, from Page 5 on, it details the Chugach Salvage Sale Program. We talked about it a little bit last time and you probably have seen a lot of it in the newspaper and the - possibly on TV. There's about five or six major actions that are involved right now. Currently there's the Moose Pass cooperative sale, it's actually called a cooperative sale because it was designed in cooperation with the state of Alaska because it abuts Chugach Forest land - abuts quite a bit of State land in that area. The State basically decided not to go any further with their proposals because they didn't have enough money to start looking at road development in the area. So the Forest Service has kind of gone on looking at, now we're going to be advertising about 12.5 million board feet in the Moose Pass area. It's going to be divided into two sale packages, one is about a 7.5 million board foot helicopter sale on the North Shore of Kenai Lake. It would be a little bit of road and primarily helicopter yarding so there will essentially be minimal impact. The road that would go in there would essentially be closed to - so it wouldn't bring in new vehicular access into that area. The area is used by residents of Cooper Landing and Moose Pass, which isn't a subsistence community, but they may beg to argue and I know some of you were down in the - last fall's public hearings and there was quite a bit of sentiment about, well, if Cooper Landing was this rural

community, subsistence community, maybe Moose Pass should be also or kind of this is the converse of that. So there's - there's quite a bit of controversy about it down there about who should be and who shouldn't be subsistence users. But this sale actually was kind of designed to try to minimize impacts to subsistence helicopter sale, no new road access to bring in since it's right along the main corridor there, try to limit new vehicular access from users in Anchorage and beyond. There is a 5 million board foot conventional sale just a little bit to the south of that. Again, the roads would be closed and essentially new access wouldn't be accelerated in the area. Okay, that - we're probably looking at those being advertised at the end of this month or be actually sold this month. And there is some - we're proposing helicopter in the area so we're really not sure anybody's going to buy it either, so you know, that's the other kicker.

And then looking on Page 6 and 7 there's some other scheduled actions, there's what's called 6-Mile Creek Sale entry and I'll kind of discuss that a little bit later on. There's the Resurrection/Palmer area. If you look at this yellow document, there's kind of a little map here in the front and it will kind of show these areas that I'm talking about. The 6-Mile Creek area is kind of right in the north end of the area abutting Turnagain Arm, kind of right in the middle of the entry area. And then the Resurrection/Palmer Creek area is kind of on the left side. And then the Snow River Primrose area why down here on the right bottom. And then what's called Seattle/Angrim is up in the right top and then Cooper Landing, Juneau Creek is kind of - it sits right - right in the middle to the left. You can kind of see Juneau Creek 1986 Cooper Landing, that's the previous sale entry, that's right in Ben's home country.

Looking at those proposals right now, we've gone through and developed alternatives for the 6-Mile Creek area, they range from no action all the way up to about 13 million board feet or about 1,000 acres of land. That sounds like a lot, but the 6-Mile Creek water shed's probably 20,000 acres - probably looking at similar entries in some of the other water sheds, Resurrection Creek's more like 100,000 acres and so we're looking at a relatively small land base entry.

The alternatives, I'll leave you to go on to read those. But basically they, again, range kind of like the Moose Pass, some helicopter logging, some non-conventional logging, but essentially about three miles of new road construction, but that would be either closed or put to bed to prevent new access by users outside the area.

So those are kind of the major sale entries that we're looking at coming on line. There will be a news update, I think you guys are on this mailing list, I'm not sure if you've ever - have you seen this before - like either the SOAPA or one of these newsletters?

MR. BASNAR: I saw this, but I don't recall this. I saw this one.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Well, I'll check to make sure that you are on the mailing list in here. I'm not sure, again, this is kind of an update of what's going on in the Chugach - I know some - the southeast area is very interested in what's going in the Forest Service. I'm not sure how you guys are interested, some of you don't look every interested at all. The other one is, you know, how much more information do you really want on some of these. We could come in and look at each one of the individual sale areas, but is it really worth your time to do that, probably not. Again.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Excuse me. It comes out in the newspaper pretty much anyway, right?

MR. ZEMKE: Well, yeah. Some people would say it comes out and some other people would say only one side comes out, and that may be a good side or a bad side. So it all depends on what reporter you get and who they talk to. But these - you could get - like there is a regular newsletter. If the Council, after you read this if you have time - any specific concerns, maybe Ben could counsel you guys on some of this later on if you want. In the SOAPA if you have any interest in any one of the individual projects, there's an individual listed with a phone number that you can talk to them individually on it or project leaders for that specific project.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I do have a question about one of the - Cordova Road mentioned there.

MR. ZEMKE: Which, the Cordova Road?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Material site or something?

MR. LOHSE: The dike maybe?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is that what that is, for the dike, materials?

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I didn't understand that, I just wanted to know whether this is a project going forward or not.

MR. LOHSE: This is just.....

MR. ZEMKE: No, it's.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Department of Transportation, Copper River Highway it says.

MR. LOHSE: This is just past where you saw the swans. It's about a mile past where you saw the swans. Ibeck Creek currently is spilling over into Eyak River and it's dumping glacial water into Eyak River and running Eyak River up and so the proposal is to put a dike down there to keep that spill over and also it protects the property at 6-Mile. It's basically right on the edge of town here. It's not out on the Copper River Highway, per se, I mean it's not part of the plan to extend the Copper River Highway.

MR. ZEMKE: But it's considered Copper River Highway out of town, but it's not - like you said, the extension of the Copper River Highway. And that's one of the things why we kind of put this out, because you might see a little news clip in the newspaper saying that they're going to get gravel for the Copper River Highway and all of a sudden you say, oh, what's that. So like he said, Ralph, did a good discussion of what it really is or - and there's also again those phone numbers where you could talk to the individuals.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have an interest in this yes. I don't know about the others, but I do. I don't mind getting it in the mail.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Well, we'll make sure that - that - again, I think all of you are at least on the SOAPA list, I'll make sure - and I think you are on the update list. This only came out last week, so you may not have got it in your

mail. Since that's another bureaucracy, I'm not exactly sure I've got too much control over how fast they move things.

Okay, the third thing that we want to talk about was kind of the updated status of the Prince William Sound goat herd. And that's - you know, there really isn't any specific proposal that you have before you today but you've had some in the past rather, kind of what's called registered goat 230 - 243, around Tatitlek was closed by, first emergency order and then by regular closure. I think it was the year - two years ago and it was basically because of decline of goats. And what's kind of coming about is the goat herds in Prince William Sound, while some areas they're pretty healthy and other areas they aren't that healthy and there's kind of a general increase in overall hunting pressure on the goats over the last few years. So what I've got is kind of several slides to help you out on the last few minutes of the day.

For those who aren't real familiar, the Federal public lands in Prince William Sound and Copper River Delta are 100 percent National forest system lands. And you're not dealing with Fish & Wildlife Service or National Park within this area so when we're talking about goat regulations, we're on Federal public land, Chugach Forest. And the main areas that you're looking at for are Units 6(B), which is kind of this area east of the Copper River Delta which is kind of this area right in here. Then there's 6(C) area right around Cordova and then 6(D), the area kind of west of Cordova all the way over to the western edge of the Sound. And then kind of 6(D) is broken out primarily into 6(D) east, which is kind of Valdez, you know, area, east and then everything 6(D) west is what we're - western side of the Sound.

Currently the customary and traditional determinations made for 6(C) and (D), it's residents of 6(C) and (D), so Cordova, Tatitlek, Chenega are the primary villages that have customary and traditional. 6(B) is no determination as Ralph pointed out after the - I think it was the last meeting that no determination, it doesn't mean that you can't hunt goats there, it means that all rural Alaskans have customary and traditional use of the area.

Let's see, I guess on this current status of the goat hunts in the area, the areas that we're primarily looking at is 6(C), the area around Cordova, you know, you can kind of look out at the back there and you can kind of see where the goats up there, well, that season's been closed, it's been closed since 1988 and a little later on I'll show you why. The area over here in 6(D) east, register goat 243, 244 and - I guess 243 and 244, that's kind of a mixed bag again, 243's been closed for a couple of years now. 245, which, let's see, I guess it doesn't show on the map here, I think it lays right up in this area right in here, it's been closed for a while. Then the goat hunts over in the western side have been open. Okay, and part of that is kind of an artifact of the goat surveys that have been done. And the surveys are a cooperative effort between the Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the Forest Service here and the district office here in Cordova. Essentially they use a super cub to fly all of the local goat habitat areas - the local cliffs, you know, you probably have a pretty good idea. The goats are - you know, they kind of hang in one specific area, you know, they're small populations. They don't move around a lot so that's maybe one of the problems they're somewhat vulnerable to over exploitation, so for the amount of animals that are out there, they probably take a pretty high level of management to be able to provide an opportunity for subsistence and sport hunt, but at the same time still provide a healthy herd.

And if you kind of remember those maps there, the 6(D) area west - that western Prince William Sound has kind of the highest goat population even though it

shows a little dip, it generally is a stable population, healthy and robust population whereas the other goat areas except for 6(C), which was that area we talked about was closed has shown a downward trend over the years from looking at 1986 through 1995. And this - okay, now you remember what you saw before was kind of the overall trend in numbers and I guess looking at that other one, that isn't an absolute population number, those were actually - these were the goats that were observed on cliffs and hills and they do that during a period of time when they can see most of them, so if you see a thousand goats that doesn't mean that there's only a thousand, but there's probably not 2,000 out there, so it's probably fairly close to the upper end of the population level. This here statistic shows kind of the number of goats allowed and this is kind of off of - these areas have been on a registration hunt and been closed on the basis of when - when a certain number of animals are taken from the population where the State has closed them through emergency order, you know, we've closed one through emergency order and, you know, that's basically how the populations were managed rather than maybe do a drawing permit where only a limited number of permits are available, it's kind of a first come first serve - when you harvest that limited number of goats then the population - the hunting season is closed by emergency order. Pretty much all of them - again, here's this - the closure in 19- - full closure in 1989 in 6(C) and no harvest since then. 6(B), the area over there Katalla and Martin River Glacier, kind of the eastern side of Copper River Delta stayed some what static and then most of - particularly in 6(A) and 6(D) it's shown a pretty much - a start decline in the allowable number of goats. And then 6(D), even though it kind of shows up and down, basically it's going to remain static, the number of goats allowed. And then in comparison with that is the number of goats killed is most all the populations - or the number of goats killed have been trending upward, you know, they all show 6(C) is upwards, 6(D) is upwards. And then after an initial decline in 6(D) east it kind of shows - and maybe a static line there. But I guess the overall thing looking at is that even though the allowable number of goats to be harvest has gone down, the hunting has really about remained the same and the goats, the number killed has remained the same even though the total allowable numbers kind of going down and so basically goat hunters are becoming more efficient in harvesting animals it looks like.

And we also have a goat expert here with Roy Nowlin with ADF&G and if you have any real specific questions you could probably talk to him also. Okay, on this statistic it shows - okay, this is at GMU 60 west - west of Prince William Sound, that's where that large robust population was or large robust population. And what this is showing is that over on this - now, here's kind of the total number of goats observed, you know, it's kind of the 800 to 1,000 animals. And over here at a harvest rate is kind of the percentage of the population that's harvested. And you can see that even though the lines been kind of going up and down, it's at a relatively high - for the goat population a relatively high rate like at about three to seven percent, so it's staying maybe in that three to five percent. So there's a fairly high rate of exploitation, but the population level remains pretty constant.

Compare that to kind of 6(D) east over - more towards Tatitlek and Chenega is that in the beginning of this period it had a fairly - that high harvest rate, that's that red line again, it's high percentage of harvest rate, population numbers though declined with that high exploitation rate until around 1989 or so it seemed to stabilize. And so it appears in these lower population areas that - that a lower rate of harvest is needed to be able to stabilize the populations in those areas. Okay, and going back to where we were talking about 6(C), this area right behind Cordova that hasn't been hunted for a while and this shows when it was - the population estimate that was done right before the hunting

closure and these are kind of sub-units of 6(C) and it shows like 30, 32, 43, pretty low population levels. And then here again, is an aerial survey done in 1995, seven years later, and it shows a significant increase in numbers in each one of those, you know, more than doubled. That's the - the actual numbers, you know, is one thing, again, those are observable animals and so - but it shows a really significant increase over - all the way. And so what this kind of points out is that - that if maybe a population gets - start to go down to a certain level, and we were talking about before, registered goat 243 got down to a level of maybe 50 in that small population level, it's time to close it, this does show that a population can rebound. So there's a tool that management can use.

So overall, I guess, this kind of leads to the final point of - we've got kind of three different things going on, one is that, Unit 6(C) where the area's been closed for awhile, the populations have rebounded. We've got a 6(B) west area on Tatitlek where the populations are pretty low, but they seem to have a low exploitation rate and the trending is not down. And we got 6(D) west where the populations are pretty robust and have a fairly high rate of - or have a heavy percentage of harvest. And so what we've got is a real mixed bag out there and you need to have a - some difficulty kind of setting the appropriate goals for harvestable rates and - in the GMU. And we got kind of a couple of solutions. One is that, what we want to manage for is we want to keep the population trend stable, I'm kind of showing you those two graphs before, GMU 60 West we can harvest at that four to five percent harvestable rate and probably not see a trend downward in those areas. But in the other, remainder portion of the GMU on the 6(D) west and maybe over there in 6(B), we probably need to be a lot more conservative, at least, in the near term and harvest it to the two to three and a half percent rate. And then the other solution is, say, well, if - we figure, well, we want to see those herd populations expand since they are down significantly from the earlier like 1970s and 1980s, I think Ralph will probably vouch for that, if you were trying to manage that at a much more conservative level and GMU 6(D) west we could harvest it like at the one to two percent level and then maybe in the rest of the GMU you might want to close it for awhile.

So you know I guess those are kind of the harvest strategies you might be looking at in the future one way or the other. One of the things we have had seen is that we've had Federal subsistence permits and they're available here in Cordova, we also bring them out to Tatitlek and Chenega. And people do pick them up but there hasn't - at least this year there hasn't been one goat recorded and so it appears that either the folks out in the villages aren't hunting or they're picking up their animals under State's sport regulation permit system. So I guess that's it. If you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph, you have a question?

MR. LOHSE: Isn't an awful lot of that area already closed to State sport hunting?

MR. ZEMKE: Closed to State - yeah, looking at the dark cross patch area, those areas are currently closed to State sport hunting. So only the open light areas are the ones that are currently open. And these areas, though, there are goats with - populations that are currently high enough to sustain a huntable population.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: They're all on permit basis?

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. State permit.

MR. LOHSE: No, some of those white areas are closed, aren't they, Mr. Nowlin?

MR. ZEMKE: Well, this registered goat 243 is closed.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

MR. ZEMKE: I should say, yeah, and then the Katalla area is opened. It's registered goat, what 220 is closed currently?

MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, that's closed.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay, and these two areas are open but.....

MR. NOWLIN: Open.

MR. ZEMKE:you're, I guess, what considering closing them also?

MR. NOWLIN: 243 and 24- - 243 is closed, 244 - 244 is currently open under the Federal season, but is not under the State season. And in all the other areas that you see in Prince William Sound, they're all open under both Federal and State seasons. The gray areas are where there are insufficient goat populations to support a harvest whether it be Federal or State.

MR. ZEMKE: There's also some consideration about a goat transplant to Montague Island. They've been working on a habitat capability model to see whether the - the island would be capable of supporting goats. You know, that would provide some more opportunity. Again, it would be an - an environmental assessment would be needed to be able to transport the goats over to previously unoccupied habitat.

MR. BASNAR: Bears might like it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: One thing the subsistence council should understand is that, you know, the biggest goat herds that we're talking about and we're not - you know, the biggest groups that we're talking about are smaller than the Mentasta caribou herd. A lot of these populations of goats are pretty small numbers. And then even as pretty small numbers they're divided up in little areas where there's very little exchange. And so like when he was pointing out in - in 6(C) and he was pointing to the three different groups of goats that they have surveys on them, I think those numbers, if I remember right, those numbers are fairly close because they're counting them when there's no snow on the ground and the goats are white and the goats stick out like sore thumbs, so it's pretty easy to fly around the cliffs and count them. So they're fairly accurate numbers. And you're talking about herds of, you know, a big herd of goats is 100 animals. The average herd of goats there is somewhere between 30 and 70 animals, so you're dealing with populations that you don't have the same mix as you have in caribou, you don't have the same number of animals and you don't have the same movement in the animals. A lot of your goats are in isolated areas. If you're a goat hunter, one thing that you understand is that if you know where the best place is on the mountain and you consistently hunt the best place on the mountain, you can get all the goats off the mountain over time. Because if you shoot the goats that are there, they'll move from a not so good spot to the good spot and so you can get - you know, you can, technically speaking by hunting a limited area, you can really impact the goats in - the

goats in one individual herd. So I think what I'm just trying to say is goats are a lot more - a lot more critical - a lot more susceptible to over-hunting. A lot smaller group of animals than you're used to dealing with when you deal with moose and caribou.

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. And that could be a pro- - Ralph was saying that you're looking at 50 or 100 animals harvestable surplus may only be two animals. And if somebody comes in with a bow and there's five hunters, you know, it's fairly easy to overharvest them - exceed that, even with them trying to do emergency closure. And so management in the next year or two may have to reflect that the population - that's why those numbers, I think, have trended down over the years. It's not - it's a pretty intense situation where you have to try to keep track of it and they area - they're isolated, they don't interchange, like you say, unlike the Mentasta herd, they're not moving from drainage to drainage, they're basically in one watershed. They're in one cliff area. And once you learn where the goats are, like Ralph was saying, you can go back time and time again.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: It's just the hunting that's impacting the decline or are there other factors?

MR. ZEMKE: Well, there's certainly - climate's probably a major factor from - real high abundance in the '70s and then - and there's probably possibly other land management activities - disturbances and that kind of thing that are maybe starting to encroach on populations that haven't seen any in a long time.

MR. LOHSE: The other thing we have to take into consideration, from the time of our high population of goats down here is we've had wolves move into this area where there wasn't wolves before. So we've got, you know, the Suckling Hills, Don Miller Hills, Goat Mountain, these hills right outside of Cordova off Scott Glacier and Sheridan Glacier and that. Those goats at one time had no - and Rude River, at one time had no wolf predation, but today we have wolves which are a definite impact on them. You take some of those locations, like Don Miller Hills for example, there is not any good escape country down there. Don Miller Hills look more like sheep country than they do goat country. And so the impact of wolves on them is a lot greater there than at - than it is in something where the cliffs are going straight up and down. And so we've had that in the past, oh, let's just say in the past 20, 25 years, we've had an increase in predation down there, so it's not - hunting's not the only impact. It's climate, it's predation and hunting - hunting is a factor.

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, they are.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do we know much about the land behind these units here - about the goat population?

MR. ZEMKE: The land you mean - why they.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Whether there is any?

MR. ZEMKE: Pardon?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The numbers back in there?

MR. ZEMKE: You mean how many animals are in each one?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Behind - behind the unit?

MR. ZEMKE: Oh, you mean back in here - pretty much the goats are only to the west side of the coast - coast range. Once you break on the other side, you're pretty much into sheep country and goats are pretty much just over in - into the basins of Prince William Sound. And right over in here, that's kind of the western extent of the goat range, so they're kind of on the periphery of the range, too. And so - the animal population is kind of on the very edge of the range and they're maybe not quite as adapted to that - to that, whereas over here, maybe the southeast Alaska production's a lot higher because the conditions are more conducive toward the goats, whereas you get out on the edge - the edge of the range there, they're kind of pushing on that.

Any other questions.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Interesting. Is that it?

MR. ZEMKE: Yes. Any other questions?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'm not adverse to working through the evening?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Majority rules, how many want to work through the evening?

MR. LOHSE: I have a school board meeting.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: What's the wish of the Council, do you want to recess now and work this evening or recess until tomorrow morning?

MR. HENRICHS: Recess.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Until tomorrow morning?

MR. HENRICHS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. How many want to recess until tomorrow morning, raise your hand? Okay, we'll recess now until tomorrow morning. What time are we starting in the morning Helga?

MS. EAKON: 9:00.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Recess until 9:00 tomorrow morning.

(PROCEEDINGS TO CONTINUE)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 107 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

Public Meeting taken electronically by Salena Hile on the 4th day of March, 1996 beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at the Centennial Building Meeting Room, Cordova, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Salena Hile to the best of her knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 13th day of March, 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 10/10/98