

00129

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
2 ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

3

4

5

VOLUME II

6

7

March 5, 2003

8

Millennium Hotel

9

Anchorage, Alaska

10

8:30 o'clock a.m.

11

12 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

13

14 Ralph Lohse, Chairman

15 Robert Churchill

16 Gilbert Dementi

17 Fred Elvsaaas

18 Fred John

19 Sylvia Lange

20 Susan Wells

21

22 Regional Coordinator, Ann Wilkinson

00130

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

(Anchorage, Alaska - 3/5/2003)

4

5

(On record)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this March meeting of 2003 Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back in session. We recessed last night. We're going to go on to proposals this morning. We're dealing with Proposal 02 to start off with. We're back on track. You'll find Proposal 02 under Tab C in your book and Pat's going to give us the heads-up on it.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The analysis for Proposal 02 starts on Page 80 of that tab. This proposal was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management. It's a proposed change to the general provisions for all units to standardize designated hunter regulations. Currently, designated hunter provisions are allowed on unit-specific basis, causing an inconsistency in how regulations address the designated hunter system. This standardization provides uniform opportunity for subsistence users to harvest or benefit from the harvest of ungulates in all areas of the state.

There are unit-specific provisions for 21 hunts in 17 different units. The existing regulations are listed in Appendix A on page 90. With the proposed regulation, designated hunting for ungulates would be recognized for all units and prohibitions of designated hunting would be through unit-specific provisions.

The unit-wide or statewide designated hunting program has the following provisions: Any Federally-qualified user, the recipient, may designate another Federally-qualified user to take wildlife on his or her behalf. The designated hunter must obtain a designated hunter permit. The designated hunter may hunt for any number of recipients. They may not have more than two harvest limits in his or her possession at any one time. And the designated hunter may not charge the recipient for his or her services in the taking of wildlife or for the meat or any part of the harvested wildlife.

In the Federal Subsistence Management program, ungulate means any species of hoofed animal, including deer, elk, caribou, moose, mountain goat, Dall

00131

1 sheep and muskoxen. Action on this proposal will affect
2 decisions on other wildlife proposals, which are 15, 16
3 and 55 in the Southcentral Region and it will also affect
4 52 and 53. 15 would request prohibiting designated
5 hunting proposals and 16 and 55 provides for designated
6 hunter proposals and those deal with Unit 6.

7

8 As far as the history of designated
9 hunting in the program, in 1994 there were only two
10 designated hunts allowed and then there were some
11 requests made and a designated hunter task force was made
12 to review the issue and they prepared a study and then in
13 1995 the Board adopted some provisions for deer and moose
14 in Units 1 through 5 and also deer in Unit 8 and saying
15 on a trial basis. The provisions they have are the ones
16 that were outlined. Since then the other hunts have been
17 added. So Table 1 deals with the history of how
18 designated hunter proposal provisions have been added and
19 then on Page 84 has the harvest history and a total of
20 2,106 permits have been issued and 1,902 animals have
21 been harvested.

22

23 For that first year, because of the
24 concern about -- because the State provisions are
25 different and they're listed on Page 82. The State
26 provisions just apply to caribou, deer and moose. Then
27 they have restrictions as to the recipients. You have to
28 either be blind, 70 percent disabled or 65 years of age
29 or older. Of course, in the State, it's called proxy
30 hunting. Then under the State system either the
31 recipient or the hunter may apply for authorization and
32 no person can be a proxy for more than one recipient at a
33 time. And then that last bullet I said the recipient is
34 responsible for harvest and permit reporting, thinking
35 that with us the hunter had to turn in the harvest
36 reporting, but under our program the recipient is also
37 responsible. Just to make it clear that there's only one
38 person reporting and whoever gets the -- so we parallel
39 the State in that provision.

40

41 With that first year in 1995, when we
42 adopted those provisions in the six units, we printed out
43 18,000 designated hunting permit applications thinking
44 that that many people would be applying and that harvest
45 would increase and 183 permits were issued that year. On
46 average, even for the last year, since we've added more
47 hunts besides those six units, the total history for just
48 one year, Table 3 shows what one year looks like and for
49 the 2000-2001 season it compares with the designated
50 hunter permits and 408 permits were issued or 408 animals

00132

1 were harvested and for all hunters in those units 15,501
2 species were harvested for the similar species. So
3 designated harvest represents 2.6 percent of the harvest
4 of the species.

5
6 And the reason the designated hunter task
7 force had suggested applying the provisions to just
8 whoever requests rather than the state system with the
9 conditions was they felt they shouldn't be in the
10 position of deciding who was disabled and who wasn't and
11 that the designated hunter provisions better reflected --
12 would better allow implementation of traditional hunting.

13
14
15 And there's been a study done by the
16 State by Wolfe in 1987. They looked at harvest levels
17 within communities, so they analyzed when you do the
18 harvest. In looking at harvest levels within five
19 different communities spread throughout the state, they
20 found out that it's not uncommon for about 30 percent of
21 the households in the community to produce about 70
22 percent or more of a community's wild food harvest and
23 they said one of those factors that could explain this is
24 that at different times in the household cycle, a mature
25 household, the higher producers, they're characterized by
26 a larger pool of labor and equipment and a larger set of
27 social obligations to produce food, where some households
28 have more young hunters and they have more resources to
29 produce those foods and then, of course, with all those
30 larger households, then they have a larger pool of
31 obligation and distributing.

32
33 So, the conclusion of the study was to
34 recommend that individual bag limits or harvest limits
35 don't allow recognition of these practices and they
36 recommend alternative management tools, such as
37 transferrable bags or community bag limit. Of course, a
38 designated harvest permit is a transferrable bag limit
39 where those super-productive households are able to carry
40 out the harvesting for the community and then distribute
41 more than one harvest limit throughout.

42
43 The effect of the proposal. Currently,
44 there's 66 Federally regulated ungulate hunts throughout
45 the state and those are shown in Table 4. Designated
46 hunting provisions are available in 21 hunts. It doesn't
47 include the Unit 6(C) hunt because that was a special
48 action. At different times we've done special action
49 hunts and then later recognized them regularly. So if
50 Members were wondering why the 6(C) hunt wasn't in there,

00133

1 it was a special action. But of the 21 hunts currently
2 provided for, 18 of these hunts would fall under the
3 proposed regulation and the unit specific provisions
4 would be dropped.

5
6 There's three hunts that are different
7 from the proposed regulation and they just deal with
8 different harvest limits in possession. That's the
9 caribou hunts in 9(C) and (E), where they have no limits
10 on the number in possession, and Units 9(D) and 10, where
11 they allow four harvest limits in possession. In
12 reviewing the reported harvest for those areas, no hunter
13 ever had more than two harvest limits, but those councils
14 will probably weigh in on whether those provisions could
15 be standardized.

16
17 There has been one instance of designated
18 hunting provisions being prohibited and that was a Unit
19 11 special elder hunt. And when that proposal was
20 passed, it was passed just to allow elders over 60 to
21 participate in that sheep hunt, with the specific
22 prohibition against designating the hunt because it was
23 designed to allow just the people over 60 to participate
24 in that hunt. So that's the only place in the past
25 proposal history where designated hunting has been
26 prohibited.

27
28 A number of concerns have been raised
29 about small populations of ungulates, so that could be an
30 area where unit-specific provisions would come into place
31 about prohibiting designated elder hunts. Either they
32 could be dealt with specific provisions on the permits or
33 just outright prohibited. So input from the Councils in
34 this area about areas of concerns about species that
35 should be prohibited or even just the harvest limits
36 would be appreciated.

37
38 So the preliminary conclusion is to
39 support the proposal and the proposal language is on page
40 88, which is the original proposal. The justification
41 for supporting the proposal is there are currently 21
42 hunts with designated hunter provisions. The harvest by
43 these hunters represents 2.6% of the harvest by all
44 hunters. Extending designated hunter provisions to the
45 remaining 45 ungulate hunts allowed by Federal
46 subsistence regulations should not have a significant
47 impact upon these resources and will provide a uniform
48 opportunity to subsistence users to harvest or benefit
49 from the harvest of wildlife in all areas of the state.
50 Permit data from past designated hunts show that these

00134

1 harvests have occurred within the proposed standard two
2 harvest limit provision. That concludes the
3 presentation.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. In reading
8 the language, it's pretty clear that if I asked Elijah to
9 hunt for me, he couldn't say that will be 10 bucks per,
10 but if he says, gee, I need payment for sno-go gas, would
11 that be allowed? I would hope. Would that be allowed
12 within this if I were to do that? I mean that wouldn't
13 be strictly a payment for services. Did you envision
14 that happening under this?

15

16 MS. PETRIVELLI: I'm sure informal
17 reimbursement, but I think the way the language is, I can
18 imagine informal exchange, but I think it's just cleaner
19 to say they may not charge a recipient for the services
20 in the taking of the wildlife or any part.

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: And I think I'm
23 understanding and that wouldn't have anything to do with
24 paying him at all for his services. Strictly
25 reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. And I think
26 that might be critical to allow for so we don't put
27 somebody in a real bad spot. If I'm understanding this
28 correctly, this would open -- we're talking about users,
29 so anyone essentially that's verbal could ask someone to
30 go hunt for them in the community, so there's absolutely
31 no restriction. Anyone in the community could do that
32 and they could ask anyone else in the community to take
33 their bag limit for them, correct?

34

35 MS. PETRIVELLI: The specific regulations
36 are in Appendix B on Page 93 and the main condition is
37 you must be old enough to reasonably harvest that species
38 yourself or under the guidance of an adult.

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: So pretty much anybody
41 seven, eight years old or older.

42

43 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. That's it for now.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat, you said it was on
48 93 or 94?

49

50 MS. PETRIVELLI: 93. Well, the specific

00135

1 regulations. Then on 94 I included that because we have
2 -- I put the actual designated hunter permit form in
3 there so you'd see what the hunter gets when they apply
4 for it. We've reviewed the process and, of course, that
5 Appendix C has all the corrections on how we need to fix
6 the form, but the form is a three-part process. So it
7 just kind of shows -- designated hunter would apply for
8 this permit
9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I was just looking
11 on one of the bullets, about one bullet up from the
12 bottom. It says the Hunt Report and Permit should
13 provide a space for the hunter to show the Harvest
14 Ticket/Registration Permit number of the recipient in
15 place of the license number. This will eliminate those
16 who are less than 10 years old from becoming a designated
17 hunter program recipients, as the State's new regulation
18 requires the State to issue harvest tickets only to those
19 10 years old or older. Does that kind of answer what you
20 were asking, Bob?

21
22 MR. CHURCHILL: Absolutely. So we're
23 talking about 10 and older.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think. Am I
26 understanding that correct, Pat, or is that just a
27 suggestion in that?

28
29 MS. PETRIVELLI: To revise the form. And
30 I meant to talk to Bill Knauer about that because as we
31 suggest putting these form requirements -- and maybe
32 because the regulations only say you must be old enough
33 to reasonably harvest, but I know any Federally-qualified
34 user must have a hunting license. So, I guess since we
35 require hunting licenses, we might have to require it on
36 the form.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, if you require a
39 hunting license, then that would automatically mean that
40 whoever was the recipient would have to be old enough to
41 have a hunting license.

42
43 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm seeing shaking of
46 the head by the local, law enforcement. Could you give
47 us a clarification on that?

48
49 MR. BRYDEN: Jeff Bryden, Chugach
50 National Forest, Subsistence Lead Law Enforcement, you

00136

1 could designate someone under 16 years of age to be a
2 designated hunter and they wouldn't have a hunting
3 license. So you could have your son, if he was under 16,
4 go out for you and harvest your game if you're unable to.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think the question
7 basically was, could you have your nine-year-old child
8 become the hunter and then you go hunting for the nine-
9 year-old child.

10
11 MR. BRYDEN: Yes. That's a problem that
12 Southeast Council has been dealing with quite a bit on
13 the deer hunting down there. We've been trying to get
14 some age reasonable issue in there. You know, what is a
15 competent age for an individual to go out and hunt on
16 their own, to be able to harvest and at this point I
17 don't believe there is anything like that.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There isn't anything.
20 But you wouldn't be able to have your two-year-old son
21 get a tag and then you go hunting for him.

22
23 MR. BRYDEN: There are people requesting
24 designated hunting permits at this time in Southeast for
25 people that are two and three. As I said, they're eating
26 deer.

27
28 MS. PETRIVELLI: We do have this
29 regulation.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat.

32
33 MS. PETRIVELLI: We do have this
34 regulation though that says you must be old enough to
35 have reasonably harvested that species yourself.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that is found on
38 Appendix B on 93?

39
40 MS. PETRIVELLI: And it is in subpart A
41 of the regulations.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. It's under B on
44 the first part?

45
46 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, the -- yes, in
47 section B.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You must be old enough
50 to have reasonably harvested that species yourself or

00137

1 under the guidance of an adult.

2

3 MR. BRYDEN: What's reasonable?

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you are running into
6 that problem down there.

7

8 MR. BRYDEN: Yes. It apparently is a
9 problem right now, at least in our eyes, with the issue
10 of safety. Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody else have
13 any questions for him? Okay. Thank you. Did that
14 answer your question, Bob?

15

16 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I think it's still
17 a little -- because my experience it's seven or eight or
18 nine is certainly old enough to hunt deer and caribou and
19 it isn't an uncommon practice. I don't have a problem
20 with it. I'm just kind of clarifying. I like the
21 language that leaves it open. It says reasonably.
22 Because I think that would allow for some variance
23 between communities and individuals. Another question.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Bob.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Pat, on page 80, in the
28 narrative, it says, in some cases, certain hunts have
29 been overlooked for this provision, designated hunter
30 provision, creating a hardship on subsistence users.
31 Could you give me some specifics on that so we might
32 better understand?

33

34 MS. PETRIVELLI: It mainly came about
35 because the designated hunter provisions are only where
36 requested, so people had to put in proposal changes and
37 then go through the proposal process and then have
38 designated hunter provision. We newly acquired the
39 Cordova 6(C) moose hunt because in the past we had just
40 just five cows only and then last year we had a bull hunt
41 with 15 permits. And two individuals received a permit
42 in the drawing permit and they had previously received
43 drawing permits in the State system and used the proxy
44 hunter system because they were elderly and then they had
45 received a permit. We don't have any proxy hunting
46 provisions, the general, broad provisions. So then they
47 put in the Native Village of Eyak, submitted a special
48 action request, and that special action request was
49 granted.

50

00138

1 So we thought in case there were other
2 instances, we might as well just -- because the way the
3 designated hunting system evolved, first we had the
4 limited application, then we applied it just to those
5 five units and then, piecemeal, we've expanded it to
6 where it is now. But the one instance where people --
7 you know, it was just that 6(C) moose hunt that
8 precipitated us submitting this proposal so that in case
9 some elders do get it and realize if any other hunts
10 becomes Federal only and not just State that they might
11 be denied the possibility of participating.

12
13 MR. CHURCHILL: So they have both the
14 State and the Federal designated hunter, they just
15 weren't aware of it, and it was limited to the incident
16 in 6(C)?

17
18 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's the one instance
19 that came up.

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else, any
24 questions for Pat? It's kind of interesting that you
25 brought up our -- I think it's Unit 11, basically, sheep
26 hunt. That was requested basically as an educational
27 thing. It wasn't so much for meat, it was that they
28 wanted to hunt sheep -- have the elders have the
29 opportunity to hunt sheep when the sheep were low enough
30 so that they could instruct the younger generation on how
31 to do it. So we felt that it was only fair that the
32 elder would be there, that you couldn't do a proxy hunt
33 and do an educational hunt at the same time. That's why
34 it was limited to the fact -- that was why there was no
35 proxy on that sheep hunt.

36
37 MS. PETRIVELLI: And that makes sense.
38 That's perfectly logical for a different purpose.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: See, that's what you're
41 talking about when you're talking about unit-specific
42 regulations based on, you know, the idea behind the hunt
43 or the stock of animals that can't take a designated hunt
44 or the community idea of it. Maybe they don't want a
45 designated hunt.

46
47 MS. PETRIVELLI: So, even though this
48 would be statewide, providing for the designated hunt,
49 there's still the possibility to deny it like there is
50 now. It would just reverse the way of dealing with

00139

1 designated hunting provisions. So now people have to put
2 in proposals to request it and in the future it would be
3 putting in proposals to deny it.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. But this would
6 not preclude those hunts that already have specific unit
7 or hunt provisions?

8
9 MS. PETRIVELLI: They would still be
10 there.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They would still be
13 there.

14
15 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah. It's just they
16 wouldn't be listed in the regulations under special
17 provisions. It would just be there.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, Pat, on Table 2, it
22 talks about total permits issued and total harvest. Is
23 there a figure anywhere that tells how many individuals
24 those permits were issued to?

25
26 MS. PETRIVELLI: Like if it's one person
27 getting the same permit over the seven year?

28
29 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, no. What I'm
30 talking about is, if we break out like 1995, it says
31 1,444 permits. Were those issued to like 1,000 different
32 individuals?

33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: 1,444 different people.

35
36 MR. CHURCHILL: So when it says total
37 permits, that means each one was issued to a different
38 individual.

39
40 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. And then not all
41 of them harvest.

42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure.

44
45 MS. LANGE: Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Sylvia.

48
49 MS. LANGE: I'm confused on this 10-
50 years-old thing on page 94. It says in order to hunt you

00140

1 have to have a State license and the new regulations for
2 the State licensing says you have to be 10 years or
3 older. Is that correct?

4

5 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. Of course, that
6 was just a recent Board of Game action, I think, this
7 fall. Is Bill Knauer here? Bill Knauer is our
8 regulations person. But Bill and I went over it and I
9 know this went on Subpart A, 93. To get the designated
10 hunting permit, you can designate someone and it says you
11 must be old enough to have reasonably harvested that
12 species yourself or under the guidance of an adult. This
13 recommendation for revising the form -- oh, he's Bill.
14 Good. He can answer that.

15

16 MR. KNAUER: Under the State regulation,
17 you cannot get a harvest ticket if you're under 10. This
18 would not preclude someone from under 10 necessarily
19 hunting.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

22

23 MS. LANGE: A follow-up on that if I may.
24 It would preclude anyone from under 10 doing -- I mean it
25 would not preclude anyone from under 10 doing the
26 hunting, but it would preclude them from being the hunter
27 that has the designated hunter because you have to have a
28 ticket, right?

29

30 MS. PETRIVELLI: The harvest ticket.

31

32 MS. LANGE: A harvest ticket in order to
33 need a designated hunter, which seems peculiar to me.

34

35 MR. KNAUER: There's always been the
36 question as to what age someone should be able to
37 harvest. The State struggled with it and they said that
38 if you're under 10, you can still hunt, but your harvest
39 and your limit counts against the adult that you're
40 hunting with. Under the Federal program, a few years
41 ago, contrary to what Jeff said, we worked this out
42 because, with the Southeast law enforcement folks, they
43 approved the language about reasonably able to harvest or
44 have harvested because there are certainly, as Bob
45 stated, children seven, eight, nine years old that are
46 responsible enough to harvest an animal, particularly
47 caribou. There are individuals 16, up into their 20's,
48 that I would not expect to be reasonably able for safety.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: While we have you, do

00141

1 you have any follow-up on that subject?

2

3 MS. LANGE: I'm just mulling it over in
4 my mind how that relates to the 6(C) hunt in particular
5 and other proposals in here. I think that answers the
6 question. I mean we have a problem with the difference
7 between the two laws.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The fact that there's a
10 state hunting license required and I think we just went
11 through that earlier with Terry, there are a lot of
12 units, like Unit 13 I think is one them, but in order to
13 get a State hunting license you have to have completed a
14 hunter safety course. Was that only for specific hunts
15 in Unit 13 or was that just for Unit 13 in general?

16

17 MR. HAYNES: In general.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, in order to have a
20 hunting license in Unit 13, 15, 14, 20 and Unit 7, I
21 believe, you have to have completed a hunter safety
22 course and pass the hunter safety course, which basically
23 precludes anybody 10 years and younger because it's
24 pretty hard to take the course under 10. In fact, most
25 places won't teach you the course under 10. In those
26 units, in order to be a recipient and have an Alaska
27 State license, the requirement would be that you already
28 had to complete that hunter safety course. There's no
29 age limit on it, but you have to have completed the
30 hunter safety course if you were born after -- or is
31 there an age limit? Terry. So it gets complicated.

32

33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Terry Haynes,
34 Department of Fish & Game. The specific language we
35 looked at reads as follows: Beginning on August 1st,
36 2002, hunter education certification will be required for
37 young hunters in Unit 13 among some others. If you were
38 born after January 1st, 1986 and you are 16 years of age,
39 you must have successfully completed a certified hunter
40 education course. If you were born after January 1st,
41 1986 and you are under 16, you must have either
42 successfully completed a certified hunter education
43 course or be under the direct immediate supervision of a
44 licensed hunter who has successfully completed a
45 certified hunter education course.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words,
48 basically, what that's saying is if you have your child
49 out that's under 16 and he hasn't completed a hunter
50 safety course, you have to have completed a hunter safety

00142

1 course.

2

3 MR. HAYNES: If you were born after
4 January 1st, 1986 and they're under 16, that is correct.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But that's in Unit 7,
7 14, 15, 13 and 20, I think, right?

8

9 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Unit 7, 13,
10 14, 15 and 20.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And that probably
13 is the way the State is going to be going, in that
14 direction in all units in the future, I would think.

15

16 MR. HAYNES: I won't speculate, Mr.
17 Chairman.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that throws
20 some more complications in, Sylvia. Thank you, Terry.
21 Back to Pat. Any more questions for Pat?

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If we're done with Pat,
26 you might as well stay sitting there because you're next.

27

28 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
29 The Department's comments on the original proposal appear
30 on pages 78 and 79 of your meeting book. I won't repeat
31 all of those comments, but we do have a lot of concerns
32 about this proposal and this discussion you're having
33 this morning illustrates the fact that it is -- it
34 requires a lot of discussion to try to sort through what
35 the implications would be of having a statewide
36 designated hunter regulation.

37

38 The main concern that Department Staff
39 have consistently mentioned to me about having this
40 provision apply statewide for all ungulates is that it
41 could potentially lead to overharvest of goats, sheep and
42 muskox. Species that concentrate late in the season and
43 often occur in small groups. We prefer that the
44 designated hunter regulation apply only to moose, caribou
45 and deer and be consistent with the State's proxy hunting
46 regulation in that regard. Another option is to limit
47 the number of harvest limits a hunter can have in
48 possession at any one time to reduce the potential for
49 overharvest of particular species in certain situations.

50

00143

1 We can expect designated hunter
2 provisions to have some impact on wildlife harvest in
3 units that contain large amounts of Federal public land.
4 Safeguards may be needed to prevent overharvest of
5 limited resources where harvest quotas aren't
6 implemented. You can assume that when designated hunting
7 is involved that the percentage of success is going to
8 increase. So we need to ensure that accurate harvest
9 reporting is part of the designated hunter program so
10 that we can ensure conservation of wildlife resources.
11 In our written comments on the original proposal, we
12 raise a series of questions we think need a lot more
13 discussion before a statewide provision is implemented.

14
15 The second paragraph of our comment, I'd
16 just like to read some of these questions. How would the
17 regulation be administered in rural communities where
18 Federal agency offices are not present? If you're going
19 to have a statewide designated hunter program, it creates
20 a pretty incredible administrative workload for Federal
21 agencies to ensure that all people who may want to take
22 advantage of the program have a reasonable opportunity to
23 get the applications. What steps would be taken to
24 ensure compliance, collection of relevant data from
25 permits and data entry into a centralized database?
26 Should all ungulate populations in the state
27 automatically be open to designated hunting? We don't
28 think so. Should designated hunters be allowed to have
29 more than one harvest limit in possession for ungulate
30 hunts that are limited by harvest quotas or registration
31 permit, or that are subject to the provisions of Section
32 804 of ANILCA? How would designated hunter permits be
33 issued for Federal subsistence hunts that are
34 administered by joint State/Federal registration permit
35 or by State registration permit? Should the number of
36 designated hunter permits that can be issued to one
37 individual be limited?

38
39 These are the kinds of questions we have
40 concerns about and we believe need a fair discussion so
41 that if you have a statewide application of this program,
42 people clearly understand how it's going to work and the
43 system is in place to keep track of how it works.

44
45 Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
48 questions for Terry? Bob

49
50 MR. CHURCHILL: Terry, thank you. You

00144

1 reference this Federal Interagency Staff Committee. Who
2 was on the committee, do you know?

3

4 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The Federal
5 Interagency Staff Committee has a representative from
6 each of the member agencies of the Federal program and
7 then Staff from the Office of Subsistence Management.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: As a follow-up, and I
10 read your comments pretty thoroughly, I'm seeing both the
11 conservation and user conflict concern that's envisioned
12 in this.

13

14 MR. HAYNES: I'm sorry, what was the.....

15

16 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm reading your comments
17 on 78 and 79 and it appears that the Department has both
18 a conservation concern where we currently have designated
19 hunter program. It seems that the harvest is fairly well
20 defined either by number of permits issued or the
21 population that's being hunted. I'm just wondering. I
22 see a pretty clear conservation concern from the
23 Department. Was there also a user conflict concern that
24 the Department's envisioning in your comments?

25

26 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Conflicts
27 like that have been discussed. I know in Southeast
28 Alaska, for example, right or wrong, there have been a
29 small number of instances where it's been reported that
30 one designated hunter has harvested 20, 30 or 40 deer.
31 Has been designated hunting for several individuals.
32 That may be perfectly appropriate, but it's caused some
33 concern among other residents of the community. In a
34 situation where you have a small number of permits
35 available, and Unit 6(C) may be one case, the moose hunt
36 there, since only a limited number of people are going to
37 have the opportunity to hunt, if an individual gets a
38 drawing permit and then has someone do hunting for them,
39 there may be a perception that's not appropriate. It may
40 be perfectly appropriate because an individual, like the
41 State's proxy hunting program, that's designed to provide
42 opportunities for people who can't hunt for themselves.
43 So sometimes it's perceptions more than reality that
44 cause these kinds of conflicts.

45

46 MR. CHURCHILL: Follow up.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: In reading your questions

00145

1 in paragraph two on 78, would you envision a problem --
2 let's say the community of Anaktuvik Pass. Pretty much
3 their only source of protein is caribou. On an average,
4 I think there's about 84 families in Anaktuvik Pass and
5 they harvest approximately four to five hundred caribou
6 every year to supply that need. A relatively isolated
7 community. Does the Department envision a real problem
8 with a designated hunter program in that type of a
9 community based on the isolation? I don't. I was just
10 curious about the Department's view on it.

11

12 MR. HAYNES: I don't personally see that
13 that would be a problem there because you're talking
14 about caribou, which is a fairly abundant resource. Its
15 availability to people on Anaktuvik can vary from time to
16 time, but the hunting patterns in Anaktuvik Pass have not
17 changed a lot over the years. They're going to provide
18 meat for the community. As Pat noted, the Subsistence
19 Division work has found this 30/70 rule applies in many
20 communities statewide where 30 percent of the households
21 do 70 percent of the harvest, so that practice is likely
22 to continue whether or not they're proxy hunting,
23 designated hunting.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
28 Terry. Sylvia.

29

30 MS. LANGE: Could you explain to me the
31 conservation concerns on mountain goat more thoroughly?
32 I'm not completely familiar with that.

33

34 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Mountain
35 goats tend to occur in small numbers and you could have
36 situations, as some of the Department biologists have
37 told me, where if two or three hunters are out goat
38 hunting and they also have designated hunter permits, so
39 they have the ability to take two goats per hunter. They
40 could come up on a small number of goats in an area and
41 literally take them all and that's not good for goat
42 conservation in our opinion.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

45

46 MS. LANGE: Or their backs. I don't know
47 how they could carry out that many goats. I'm just
48 wondering how high up on the scale is that a serious
49 concern.

50

00146

1 MR. HAYNES: I can't speak to the
2 rationale that went behind limiting the State's proxy
3 hunting permits to caribou, moose and deer, but it seems
4 that those are the species that are most commonly used as
5 a food resource for most Alaskans. When you start
6 hunting goats, sheep, muskox, those are more specialized
7 hunts. Even though they are a food resource, they're
8 probably a less important food resource overall in rural
9 households.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, correct me if I'm
12 wrong on this, and we might have to get somebody from the
13 Forest Service. I think one of the big concerns on
14 mountain goats in Southeast and Prince William Sound
15 where, in the winter time, they're actually driven down
16 by the snow to the beaches and they are accessible in
17 small bunches. I've seen the same thing even up in our
18 country. If you can find a place on the mountain that's
19 best for goats, all the goats will end up being there at
20 some time in the year and they're in small bunches and
21 just like up above our place we could, at certain times
22 of the year, take all the goats that are on the whole
23 mountain just in one thing if we had designated hunter
24 permits. If one of us went up there and had a designated
25 hunter permit for everybody in the family, that would
26 take care of all the goats that live on the mountain. I
27 think that's what they're concerned about more on goats
28 is because they're very -- I know when I was on the
29 Cordova Advisory Committee, we went over and over that
30 because about 6(D) they're so easily accessible at
31 certain times of the year that you could overharvest them
32 if you were capable.

33
34 The other thing that could happen is if
35 you've got two permits or four permits, you're less
36 likely to be careful about which one you shoot and we'd
37 probably harvest more nannies and more kids if we had
38 more permits simply because you wouldn't worry about
39 which one you take. I think that's part of the issue
40 there, isn't it, Terry? Is that some of the things that
41 have come up on goats?

42
43 MR. HAYNES: Yes.

44
45 MR. CHURCHILL: One more question.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

48
49 MR. CHURCHILL: Terry, I noticed in
50 paragraph one on your comments it says statewide hunter

00147

1 regulations should include provisions for improving both
2 permit administration and compliance with reporting
3 requirements and ensuring that permit data are provided
4 in a timely manner to the Office of Subsistence
5 Management for entry into a statewide database. Can you
6 talk about the specific concerns of what the State's
7 envisioning as far as any improvement in permitting
8 process if we were to pass the statewide designated
9 hunter program?

10

11 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. In the past,
12 there have been discussions about designated hunting
13 issues where it's provided for. In some cases, the
14 information hasn't been available to evaluate some of
15 these hunts and I think the Office of Subsistence
16 Management is taking steps to start getting more
17 consistent reporting and development of a database. We
18 want to ensure that some thought has gone in to how
19 you're going to administer and manage a statewide
20 database so that if there are instances where you have
21 potential to overharvest a species, that you're getting
22 timely information so that if it was necessary to shut
23 down a hunt or impose some types of restrictions, the
24 information would be available to the managers to take
25 action that might be needed.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: So, if I'm understanding
28 correctly, what you're saying is the reporting isn't
29 consistent at this point and the database maybe doesn't
30 reflect the actual harvest and we need to improve on all
31 of those elements if, in fact, we're going to do this.
32 Is that kind of the short version?

33

34 MR. HAYNES: I think that they're pulling
35 together the information now. Certainly, what you see in
36 the tables in here is a consolidation of the information.
37 That hasn't been readily available in the past.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

40

41 MR. JOHN: Mr. Chairman.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

44

45 MR. JOHN: I'd like to ask a question.
46 In the State law, do they have designated hunter for
47 young people? I didn't catch it last time whether they
48 did for seven year old. Do they have any kind of
49 regulation for designated hunters? I just want to make a
50 comment on that if they do.

00148

1 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The State
2 regulation that's similar is called proxy hunting and
3 it's limited to hunting for elderly people or people who
4 are disabled. So, in the State system, it's designated
5 hunting, but you can only hunt for someone who is elderly
6 or disabled, not just for anyone in the community.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have follow-up,
9 Fred?

10
11 MR. JOHN. Yeah. I just heard a comment
12 a while ago. I kind of wondered about it. I'm trying to
13 get it back. Somebody talked about designated hunter for
14 young kids, eight, nine years old, and I was wondering
15 where that came from.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that came
18 because this proposed regulation allows for that.
19 Correct me if I'm wrong, Pat, but under this proposed
20 regulation anybody who would be reasonably capable of
21 taking an animal themselves could have a designated
22 hunter take the animal for them. If Bill wants to
23 correct me if I'm wrong on that understanding or am I
24 correct on that understanding.

25
26 MR. KNAUER: You're correct.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, under this proposed
29 regulation anyone who would be capable of taking the
30 animal could have a designated hunter take the animal for
31 them.

32
33 MR. JOHN: Okay. I'll make a comment
34 later on.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry. Just a comment
37 or a question and maybe I'm putting you on the spot with
38 this one here because it's kind of a follow-up to what
39 Mr. Churchill was talking to you about, the
40 recordkeeping. You've got how would the regulation be
41 administered in rural communities where Federal agency
42 offices are not present. We were talking about data and
43 the need for timely data. At the same time we've talked
44 about the fact that 70 percent of the game is taken by 30
45 percent of the communities. This is especially true in
46 rural areas. Currently, we have no data. Possibly, with
47 this designated hunter thing, with the permits, then the
48 practices that are currently taking place would have at
49 least an incentive to do it legally and we would actually
50 end up with some data. Could you see that as being a

00149

1 benefit out of this?

2

3 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Certainly,
4 but that's why we think it's very important that there
5 has been some thought go into how you're going to set up
6 this program statewide, so that it is, in fact,
7 administered properly, that permits are readily available
8 for people who want to use them wherever they're going to
9 be legal to use those and that there's a process for
10 gathering and recording this information and summarizing
11 it at the end of the year so you can take a look at what
12 has happened. So, yes, there certainly is the
13 opportunity for this whole process to provide useful
14 management information. I think there needs to be a lot
15 of discussion about how this whole system will be set up.

16

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, when you looked at
19 the tables that we had here, we haven't really delved
20 into how that information was gathered and what degree of
21 accuracy is felt applies to it. But we did end up
22 getting some information as to the amount of designated
23 hunters success rate. We have a percentage here. I'd
24 like to find out what the confidence level is in that or
25 the feeling of the confidence level in that, but I can
26 see what you mean. This kind of stuff would, technically
27 speaking, become available out of this kind of a program
28 if it was administered properly.

29

30 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think
31 that's true.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
34 questions for Terry?

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you, Terry.
39 Other Federal, State, Tribal Agencies that want to make
40 comments on this.

41

42 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, Council
43 Members. My name is Ken Holbrook with the Chugach
44 National Forest. I wanted to make comment on this
45 proposal related to small isolated populations,
46 particularly goats. We believe this is a risk to
47 conservation and overharvest and probably will increase
48 participation by people who wouldn't normally participate
49 in this hunt. I know this has all been said, but I
50 wanted to reinforce what I've heard.

00150

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What is the status of
2 goats in 6(D) at this point in time? I know that we had
3 some populations that had built back to where there was a
4 harvest on them. I think we still have some populations
5 that there's no harvest allowed in certain -- I think
6 goats are kind of done in very small areas. It's not
7 like the whole 6(D) is one hunt. I think you've divided
8 that up and everything, haven't you?
9

10 MR. HOLBROOK: Yes, that's correct, Mr.
11 Chair. We have numerous sub-units within 6(D) with
12 quotas on each of those. Some as low as one or two
13 animals, some as high as four.
14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Some as high as four?
16

17 MR. HOLBROOK: Four harvest per year, but
18 most of them less than that.
19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Most of them less than
21 four.
22

23 MR. HOLBROOK: Yes. Most of the
24 populations are stable. One sub-unit has declined the
25 last two seasons.
26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How many sub-units do
28 you have?
29

30 MR. HOLBROOK: I think there's either
31 five or six.
32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we're talking, if you
34 have five or six and the highest is four and probably
35 average two, we're only talking of....
36

37 MR. HOLBROOK: We have 17 available
38 animals.
39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Seventeen available
41 animals per year.
42

43 MR. HOLBROOK: Yes.
44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are these 17 usually
46 taken?
47

48 MR. HOLBROOK: They have not been in the
49 past. This last season, due to hunting conditions, lack
50 of snow and icy conditions, we've had nine permits issued

00151

1 and only one animal harvested.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Even with that kind of a
4 take the population is only stable, it's not a growing
5 population.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's correct. Any
8 other questions? I think that's kind of the example of
9 what we're talking about when we're talking about small,
10 isolated populations that don't fit into this kind of a
11 program and that's the concerns that have been expressed.

12

13
14 MR. HOLBROOK: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
15 As a manager, we don't object to designated hunters. We
16 just needed some process or system which we could
17 regulate to protect the population. So, a recommendation
18 would be if a designated hunter is used, there's still
19 potential for increased participation, but no more than
20 one permit at one time or one animal at one time and have
21 to report before re-entering the field. That way we can
22 open and close as necessary.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then I'll ask you one
25 question that came off of this comment down here. Do you
26 feel if we have a designated hunter program that the
27 overall success rate or, in other words, the overall take
28 of animals will increase?

29

30 MR. HOLBROOK: Yes, sir. That's
31 primarily because many people who would not normally hunt
32 goat can now ask somebody who is proficient at goat
33 hunting to take one for them. I don't believe goat
34 hunting is an activity that all hunters participate in.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, it's not. It's an
37 activity that most hunters choose not to participate in.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 Does anybody else have any questions for
42 him? Sylvia, did you have a question for him?

43

44 MS. LANGE: No.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, are there any
47 other Federal, State or Tribal agencies that wish to
48 speak to this?

49

50 MR. LAMBERT: Hi, Mr. Chair, Council. My

00152

1 name is Mike Lambert and I'm the tribal biologist for
2 Native Village of Eyak. I know Bruce Keen, our executive
3 director, spoke yesterday afternoon briefly about our
4 Proposal 55, which would allow all wildlife designated
5 hunter in Unit 6, primarily (A) through (C) sections.
6 With that proposal that was submitted by the Native
7 Village of Eyak, we certainly would support a statewide
8 designated hunter for ungulates since we're proposing for
9 all wildlife in that unit.

10

11 Typically, the Native Village of Eyak
12 wouldn't speak for other villages or other users in other
13 areas outside of their traditional use areas, customary
14 and traditional use areas. Typically, we would just
15 support a designated hunter for our unit, but, overall,
16 we support this proposal.

17

18 Just a comment on the Federal managers'
19 responsibility on tracking harvest numbers. There's been
20 discussion here of concerns of tracking those numbers and
21 it seems to me that that responsibility, regardless of
22 you passing it -- you know, if this proposal was to go
23 forward, they would have the responsibility to do that.
24 The Native Village of Eyak currently is implementing a
25 sea otter management plan. Just as a comparison, we're
26 developing our own tracking system to monitoring tribal
27 harvest of that population. So, as an example of
28 managing responsibly subsistence harvest, we'd expect the
29 same thing by Federal managers, too, so I don't think
30 that that would be a concern at this point. That's all I
31 have.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
34 Mike Churchill.

35

36 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, I was trying to
37 stay shy of the debate. I agree with you. I think the
38 responsibility is clearly defined to track; however, the
39 accountability and, in fact, accurately doing that has
40 been an ongoing problem with both State and Federal.
41 Anything that you might have, because I know you guys
42 have done some really neat work, offering that to us
43 would be helpful. But that's an ongoing concern with
44 statewides, is making sure we do collect the data to
45 protect all the users, and we heard plenty of testimony
46 that in a number of instances that simply isn't being
47 done and it's not through malfeasance. It just isn't
48 being done. We're struggling to find systems that do
49 that, as we talked about the cow caribou hunt yesterday
50 on the Nelchina and a quick and accurate reporting time.

00153

1 With all due respect, I think that is a very real issue.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

4

5 MS. WELLS: Any comments on the language
6 that would -- there's been questions about having a two-
7 harvest limit in possession. Do you have any comments on
8 that concern, I guess?

9

10 MR. LAMBERT: I think initially when -- I
11 can only speak for the proposal the Native Village of
12 Eyak submitted under our unit, specifically in
13 Southcentral Alaska, but the reason we put the two
14 possession limit in there was because that was kind of
15 what we saw in other units was being implemented under a
16 designated hunter provision. That would somewhat address
17 the opportunity for abuse that some people have concerns
18 on. I've heard a lot of discussion this morning on
19 mountain goats and that would somewhat limit an
20 individual from just, you know, blasting an entire -- you
21 know, say there's a herd of five or something, it would
22 prevent an individual from harvesting all five of those
23 animals as a designated hunter. At least it would limit
24 them to two. So that would help in that sense.

25

26 I know in our proposal there was one word
27 left out in one of the sentences. I'd need to grab my
28 book. But specifically to that same statement, it says
29 individual limit. If an individual was out hunting, they
30 could still hunt for themselves, but they might be
31 carrying a designated hunter permit for another
32 individual in their family, so it would prevent them --
33 the two kind of evolves out of that, too. They could
34 still hunt for themselves while they're hunting as a
35 designated hunter.

36

37 MS. WELLS: Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, Mike, as long as
42 we're talking kind of theoretical, how do you think it
43 would go if we were able, for the majority of communities
44 -- I used the example Anaktuvik Pass to say the community
45 of Anaktuvik Pass traditionally takes and obviously needs
46 500 caribou and we just say they can take 500 caribou.
47 We don't care who harvests them. As long as, obviously,
48 there isn't wanton waste and I doubt that that's ever
49 been demonstrated. How do you think that would work from
50 your perspective? Just designate for a community X

00154

1 number of animals and then just step back and whoever
2 takes them takes them. How do you think that would work
3 from your experience?

4
5 MR. LAMBERT: Well, I've got to be
6 careful here. Mr. Chair, Mr. Churchill. I can't speak
7 for another village. That village, if that was their
8 preferred -- in their area, for that community, if that
9 was their preferred option, then obviously it would work
10 for their area. I wouldn't want to speculate on somebody
11 else's area or for another village for that matter.
12 Sorry.

13
14 MR. CHURCHILL: Not a problem. I thought
15 as long as you were speculating on the statewide you
16 might want to speculate on something else. So, thank
17 you, Mike.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
20 Mike? I've just got one, Mike, and I will not put you on
21 the spot. I'll just ask you how many times do you know
22 anybody that goes goat hunting by themselves? And I
23 think that's part of the danger on the goats, is usually
24 nobody goes goat hunting by themselves. It's not exactly
25 a safe occupation. So, if you had two hunters and they
26 both had designated hunter permits, that increases the
27 odds tremendously when we're talking about limits of one
28 to four for a whole unit. I guess you can't really
29 answer that one. From your experience, do you see much
30 single goat hunters?

31
32 MR. LAMBERT: No, but I think it is a
33 limited number of people that would go goat hunting. In
34 talking to the Forest Service on this issue, the local
35 office there in Cordova, I guess my only thought there is
36 they're concerned about how they track those animals and
37 the timely manner they're reported. I think you would
38 just have to track that differently than they're
39 accustomed to in the last however many, 10 years they've
40 been tracking. You know, 10, 20 years they've been
41 tracking them. So they just may have to adjust the way
42 they track that harvest to account for that.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mike. Any
45 other questions? Susan, do you have something?

46
47 MS. WELLS: Well, I'm skipping over here
48 to Proposal 55 because I was looking at the language,
49 comparing your proposal to this one, and we have the
50 terminology ungulates in the one that's before us and in

00155

1 yours it's wildlife. I don't know if I'm jumping ahead
2 on this one. I think that makes a major difference and I
3 don't know if we want to look at that term now.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can ask some
6 questions.

7
8 MS. WELLS: What is your definition of
9 wildlife then?

10
11 MR. LAMBERT: Those animals listed under
12 the wildlife regulations specifically in the Federal
13 level for our area. That's all wildlife. It would
14 include also bears, coyotes, beaver.

15
16 MS. WELLS: And marine mammals?

17
18 MR. LAMBERT: No. Marine mammals would
19 be outside of the scope of the Federal regulations
20 because it's marine waters.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Again, Susan, we have to
23 remember that this applies only on Federal land. This
24 doesn't apply to all regulations statewide, it doesn't
25 apply to all hunts statewide, it doesn't apply, like he
26 said, to marine hunts which are under a different set of
27 regulations.

28
29 MS. WELLS: So do you have a comment on
30 why you chose the word wildlife as opposed to being more
31 specific to the needs of your area?

32
33 MR. LAMBERT: The all wildlife proposal
34 is specific to Unit 6, area (A) through (C), so it isn't
35 a statewide proposal for Alaska. It's specific to the
36 area that the Native Village of Eyak has customary and
37 traditionally used, so they just applied that proposal to
38 that area.

39
40 MS. WELLS: Can I have a follow-up? If
41 this proposal was to be passed and it would apply to this
42 area, would the term ungulate be enough to supply the
43 need of your area?

44
45 MR. LAMBERT: Well, I think the Council
46 would be fairly satisfied and that's why I want to
47 support -- you know, that's why I'm here right now
48 testifying in support of the statewide ungulate
49 proposals, because I think that addresses the majority of
50 their need, yes. The Native Village of Eyak Council

00156

1 submitted an all wildlife as more of a simplification for
2 our unit because I don't think there is a conservation
3 concern, you know, for other wildlife not included under
4 ungulates, although I think bears are something that's
5 been discussed. But, overall, there's plenty of
6 harvestable opportunity for other wildlife.

7

8 MS. WELLS: Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else? Sylvia.

11

12 MS. LANGE: I've been comparing and
13 contrasting the two proposals as well and I know you're
14 speaking to the statewide, but going back to specifics in
15 the Native Village of Eyak Proposal 55, it mentions
16 family only designated hunter. Can you explain that a
17 little more as to why that provision is in there?

18

19 MR. LAMBERT: Yeah, I think in the family
20 originated out of the other units' designated hunter
21 proposals that have already been approved. We just tried
22 to submit language that would be consistent with what's
23 already available in the Federal regulations. Although,
24 in talking with Pat Petrivelli and other staff at the OSM
25 office, there was some concern by Chenega Village in
26 regards to the in your family because they thought that
27 might be a hardship on their village as far as there
28 might be families that don't have anybody else that could
29 actually hunt for them, say the elders. So we said we
30 would be willing, if that was a hardship on a village
31 within that region that we're discussing that are
32 proposal is submitted on, we'd be willing to take that in
33 your family out. But having that in your family could
34 actually help in regards to preventing misuse of a
35 designated hunter also, so we would leave that up to the
36 Council to help us in that decision.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

39

40 MS. LANGE: Yeah, I'm intrigued by it
41 because it would be helpful in areas where there's
42 concern that you'd be overharvesting, but it would be
43 kind of species specific in some respects, so it makes it
44 a little difficult, but it's an intriguing concept
45 anyway.

46

47 MR. LAMBERT: Right.

48

49 MS. LANGE: And you mentioned that
50 Chenega thought that that would create a hardship. On

00157

1 the other hand, it seems not having a designated hunter
2 could also create a hardship, so it seems like the whole
3 purpose is to try to facilitate the users to get at the
4 resource.

5

6 Thank you. I just appreciate you coming.

7

8 MR. LAMBERT: Mr. Chairman. I would like
9 to mention the in your family was a concern that I had
10 because it seemed like in the Staff analysis they use
11 that as a reason to deny the proposal and I guess I was a
12 little concerned with that because the intent of the in
13 your family really was to clarify the Federal reg, you
14 know, to be consistent statewide and we weren't intending
15 it to, again, be a hardship on another individual village
16 when that was submitted. We would certainly support the
17 Regional Advisory Council and their help in determining
18 if that's important enough to leave in or not.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm kind of like Sylvia
21 on that one, Mike. It was intended as a unit-specific
22 proposal and in Unit 6 it probably would help alleviate
23 to a certain extent because we're dealing with limited
24 populations of animals. It would at least apply in Unit
25 6. I don't know if it would apply in other places from a
26 statewide proposal. I know that a lot of the concerns
27 that I heard expressed would probably be addressed by
28 having it in the family. Some of the things we heard at
29 the meeting there is the idea that that would be one way
30 to keep it in the family, any member of the family could
31 take the animal that way. I'd have to look to the rest
32 of the Council for ideas on whether that would apply in
33 other areas, but your proposal is a unit-specific
34 proposal. So it could be, even if we pass this, when we
35 got to that, we could still pass that as a restriction
36 for Unit 6 if it was wanted. Any other questions for
37 Mike? Mr. Churchill.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: If instead of family we
40 substituted a more broad word like clan, would that help
41 the original drafters in terms of what they were trying
42 to do and yet not limit another community? Would some
43 kind of substitution like that be consistent with what
44 the desires were and address Chenega's concern and still
45 keep it the way the drafters wanted it to be?

46

47 MR. LAMBERT: I think I can answer this
48 question very carefully. I think it would be more
49 appropriate, at least for the Native Village of Eyak, if
50 it was worded village or Native Village of Eyak or

00158

1 villages or tribal governments. I was listening to
2 testimony yesterday in regards to clans and, personally,
3 I would be a little uncomfortable answering that for the
4 Council for Native Village of Eyak, but I think tribal
5 governments actually would be, to them, more appropriate.
6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mike, in that regard,
10 again, we're dealing with a rural community composed of
11 Natives and non-Natives and, consequently, family would
12 apply to both Native families and non-Native families.
13 If we use the word clan, you'd be eliminating a big part
14 of the community. If you use tribal government, you'd be
15 eliminating a big part of the community and this
16 regulation does apply to both parts of the community.
17

18 MR. LAMBERT: Yeah, I agree with you, Mr.
19 Chair. Actually, you would have to word it similar to
20 what you did yesterday where you mentioned family entity,
21 clan, in the other proposal that was approved yesterday.
22 So, yeah, if you were to go to that extent, you would
23 have to be more specific to represent all the users.
24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

26

27 MS. LANGE: A follow-up on this family
28 business because there's different ways in the world
29 certainly to identify who your family is. Sometimes
30 they're blood relatives and sometimes they're not. Maybe
31 you could consider some kind of language like immediate
32 or extended family. I don't know. I'm just throwing
33 that out.
34

35 MR. LAMBERT: Mr. Chair, Council. I
36 agree with you, but I think those here that know when
37 they're writing Federal regulations and trying to
38 encompass all users in the whole state, it gets difficult
39 trying to be that specific. So, again, I agree with you,
40 but we would have to decide together how that regulation
41 would be worded.
42

43 On that same note though, I would like to
44 clarify yesterday when Mr. Cain, our executive director
45 for Native Village of Eyak spoke in regards to Proposal
46 55 because he couldn't be here today, Ms. Lange asked him
47 a question in regards to designating a child to hunt and
48 I think Mr. Cain was unaware that I'd been in discussions
49 with Council on that, so I just wanted to clarify that a
50 member of the community at a local meeting thought it was

00159

1 a neat idea to -- the idea on a limited hunt, like in
2 Cordova on moose where there's a limited number of
3 permits, and you drew the tag as an adult, you could
4 actually designate your child to go out and harvest that
5 animal for you as a way of passing on knowledge of
6 hunting in my case. In regards to the Council, it would
7 be ways of passing on traditional knowledge. So it would
8 be a unique situation that you could actually pass that
9 information on in regards to hunting for your child,
10 whereas at this point you wouldn't be able to do that
11 under Federal regs. I just wanted to clarify that. And
12 I visited with the Council on that and the Native Village
13 of Eyak Council did think that that was a neat idea in
14 regards to the designated hunter and support of that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mike. One
17 thing for your information and for Sylvia's information,
18 the Federal government has a definition of family as it
19 applies to these hunts. I'm going to ask Bill Knauer if
20 I'm correct on my definition. The definition of family
21 when you apply it to Federal hunts is all the people
22 living under one roof or one address basically. Am I
23 correct on that, Bill?

24
25 MR. KNAUER: Not quite.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not quite. Okay. Good.
28 That's why I asked you. But we need to get that out
29 because I don't think there's any definition like
30 extended family or immediate family, it's just family,
31 right, Bill?

32
33 MR. LAMBERT: Do you have any additional
34 questions for me or should I stay?

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think Fred's got a
37 question for you, so just hang on for a second, Mike.

38
39 MR. KNAUER: The definition of family in
40 Federal regulation for the Federal subsistence program
41 means all persons related by blood, marriage or adoption
42 or any other person living within the household on a
43 permanent basis.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it's an or, it's not
46 and. So there's your extended family right there, by
47 blood, marriage or. Okay. I stand corrected. So that
48 would apply to the situations that we were talking about
49 in Cordova where you have grandparents and parents and
50 kids living in the same community but not the same

00160

1 household. Fred.

2

3 MR. JOHN: I just wanted to ask a
4 question. I didn't get Bruce Cain's comments yesterday.
5 Did he say anything about a young hunter going out being
6 a designated hunter as part of their training?

7

8 MR. LAMBERT: Yeah, Mr. Cain did speak
9 that there might be a concern for a younger-aged kid that
10 could put in for a hunt that might be of an age that
11 wouldn't be safe, so I think that there probably should
12 be a minimum age of some sort. It sounds like the State
13 recommendation is 10, which seems fairly young to me, but
14 I couldn't give you a certain age that the Council of
15 Native Village of Eyak would support.

16

17 MR. JOHN: That's all I want to know.

18 Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
21 Mike? Thank you, Mr. Lambert.

22

23 MR. LAMBERT: I will comment later on as
24 we get to 55.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You did put that on your
27 green slip, didn't you?

28

29 MR. LAMBERT: I can submit another one.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.

32

33 MR. LAMBERT: Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we take a five-
36 minute health and welfare break?

37

38 (Off record)

39

40 (On record)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll call this
43 meeting of the Southcentral Regional Subsistence Advisory
44 Council back in session after our break. I don't know if
45 I have to call it back in session or not, but we will
46 just so everybody sits down and is quiet. We were on
47 other Federal, State and Tribal Agency comments. Do we
48 have any other Federal, State, Tribal Agency comments?
49 We're on Proposal 02, designated hunter statewide. We've
50 got one? Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments.

00161

1 Mike, did you have another comment to make first?

2

3 MR. LAMBERT: No. I left my pencil on
4 the table.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll let you get up and
7 get your pencil.

8

9 MR. CHANDELAR: John Chandelar, Paxson
10 Fish and Game Advisory Committee. I'd just like to make
11 a brief comment on this designated hunter program and
12 what we've seen in Unit 13 right now, which has
13 designated hunter for Nelchina caribou. At this point,
14 we're seeing the potential for some abuse on this because
15 we have an easily accessible unit, we have hunters from
16 Delta Junction, Glennallen area. You know, everything is
17 available on the road system. You get a lot of hunters
18 there in a hurry when the caribou are passing through.
19 With a limit of two, like for myself, there's four people
20 in my family, I could go out and shoot eight caribou.

21

22 If we're going to allow a potential cow
23 take in this area in addition, that could lead to a real
24 fast overharvest when the caribou are moving through this
25 area. I mean there are times in this open country there
26 might be a couple thousand caribou available in a Federal
27 area at a given time and I've seen as many as 30 or 40
28 cars lined up on the highway waiting for them to cross
29 into a Federal area. So, with a designated hunter and,
30 in addition, a cow take in Unit 13, I think there's a
31 real potential for abuse and unintended abuse on a herd
32 that isn't maybe able to withstand that.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions? Fred.

35

36 MR. JOHN: I've got one question, John.
37 You've been up there where they have a designated hunter
38 in place and a proxy hunt in place for the state. What
39 would be your confidence level in the reported take
40 versus what you actually would feel like is actually
41 done?

42

43 MR. CHANDELAR: I'd hesitate to put a
44 percentage on it, but I would be willing to guess, you
45 know, just an educated guess, that the reported take is
46 probably less than half of the actual take and that
47 certainly doesn't include animals that are shot and left
48 for one reason or another. The potential for that,
49 particularly on a hunt where you have designated hunters
50 who can take numbers of caribou really exist because they

00162

1 shoot animals and may not find all the wounded ones or
2 being able to even track them because caribou, being a
3 herd animal, you're not -- at times we've seen a lot of
4 shooting going on and no one really knowing what they
5 have shot. This happens up there. You may like to think
6 that it doesn't happen anywhere, but it happens up there
7 and I've seen it, a lot of it. One of our advisory
8 committee members found nine dead caribou this year in an
9 area probably no more than two square miles shot and
10 left. They were not all cows, but mostly cows.

11

12 When you allow people to shoot a lot of
13 caribou in a hurry, such as a designated hunter program,
14 you're going to have this because we're having it now
15 when you don't have a terrific amount of that, it's going
16 to be worse when you have a cow season in addition to
17 that. Our advisory committee is absolutely opposed to
18 proxy hunts or designated hunts because of that, because
19 of the abuse. We recognize the need, but there is no way
20 of enforcing it or controlling it.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: John, a piece of this
25 that we've talked about is age when people start hunting.
26 What is your observations of when in your area young
27 people generally start to hunt caribou?

28

29 MR. CHANDELAR: We see actually very few
30 young hunters in this area. I will say in the last
31 several years we've seen an increase. I would say 10 or
32 12. We've also, as the advisory committee, had
33 discussions on this as to age because -- I mean myself, I
34 grew up in Alaska, I was born here, hunted here since I
35 was a little kid and I was hunting alone when I was eight
36 years old. But a lot of that has gone away now and there
37 are not that many people living out and have that
38 opportunity. They've just not been taught. I like the
39 Department regulation the way it reads now as far as the
40 State regulation, which requires a hunter safety course.
41 I don't have a problem with that. I think it's
42 necessary, especially in hunts on the road system where
43 people can come from far away and not necessarily under
44 Federal regulations or State regulations have any
45 background in hunting whatsoever. I mean I could come
46 from North Carolina and be in Delta Junction or
47 Glennallen for a year and come and hunt.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

50

00163

1 MR. CHURCHILL: This has nothing to do
2 with age, but do you see that, or was it discussed in
3 your A.C., a significant problem, the number of people
4 new to hunting as it relates to both wounding, loss rate
5 and other practices that result in wanton waste is the
6 fact that we have a lot of hunters out in the field that
7 are new to hunting and haven't been raised in a hunting
8 culture?
9

10 MR. CHANDELAR: Yes, definitely. I mean
11 specifically, not to pick on a particular area, but when
12 the Federal Board designated Delta Junction as a
13 subsistence customary and traditional use of the Nelchina
14 caribou, that opened up a huge population that doesn't
15 have customary and traditional applications for the
16 Nelchina caribou and with the addition now of the missile
17 defense system in Delta Junction we've added another
18 potential group of hunters, great numbers of hunters who
19 will be well-equipped, well-financed and mobile to come
20 and utilize this herd. There is particular opportunity
21 for abuse of a designated hunter program and I don't
22 think we -- I mean right now we're seeing a significant
23 number of abuse cases and they can only increase given
24 the situation.
25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.
27

28 MR. CHURCHILL: How would you advise us
29 to deal with that issue of the person new to hunting in
30 terms of how we might make them a better informed or more
31 ethical or responsible hunter? How would you advise us
32 on that? What should we be doing and looking at?
33

34 MR. CHANDELAR: I'm not sure that it's
35 addressed by hunter education. That certainly would
36 help, but I'm not sure it can be addressed that way. I
37 think it has to be addressed by regulation that, in
38 effect, makes the hunt more restrictive or more difficult
39 for the hunter to take, so he has to look at what he's
40 taking before he pulls the trigger. Any time you allow
41 the hunter to shoot an animal just because it's a caribou
42 or just because it's a moose gives him the opportunity
43 for abuse. The more he has to take a look at the animal
44 and study the animal, the more respect he's going to have
45 for the animal and the more educated he's going to have
46 to become and it's going to be self-educated, not forced
47 on him by an agency. So that's my view of it.
48

49 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.
50

00164

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any
2 questions for John? I've got one. You brought up and it
3 came out with Mr. Churchill's discussion with you, that
4 we heard from the Copper River Native Association, we
5 heard from a lot of the residents in there, and that's
6 the idea that we have this population of people now who
7 are eligible to take part in this hunt who are well-
8 financed, very mobile, have lots of equipment and things
9 like that. Where the average, I'll say, Copper River
10 Native Association person, average person that lives in
11 the area hunts on a very low -- you know, one of the
12 things it says for subsistence is that it should be done
13 in an economical manner.

14
15 You brought up before when I was talking
16 to you about the potential for snowmachine abuse on the
17 cow hunt. We've heard about the four-wheelers driving
18 them back and everything else. Would you look at a way
19 to restrict and make people more respectful of the animal
20 and respectful of the hunt if basically we said in Unit
21 13, for that Federal hunt, no mechanical equipment? In
22 other words, you hunt on your own two legs or you hunt
23 with a canoe or something like that because people are
24 going to have to take a closer look. We've heard from
25 the old subsistence way of life. When you want to go out
26 and get a moose for a potlatch, you go out and take a
27 walk. Would you think that could possibly be one way to
28 address the abuses that you see up in that country?

29
30 MR. CHANDELAR: Our advisory council or
31 our advisory committee has had discussions about this and
32 traditional methods and traditional means and how the
33 intent or what we perceive the intent of the subsistence
34 management to accomplish was to give meat to households
35 that needed it. It wasn't to make a sport hunt out of
36 it. The big joke in the Paxson area is you can tell the
37 difference between the Tier II hunters who are coming out
38 of Anchorage and Fairbanks because they have four-
39 wheelers pushing it and they're coming up to hunt and you
40 can tell the real subsistence hunters because they come
41 up there in an old beat up pick-up truck. If they've got
42 an old three-wheeler in the back, they're lucky, and it's
43 falling apart, but that's what they've got. Those are
44 people that need the meat and those are the people all
45 these regulations were intended to address. At this
46 point, the mobility of the hunters certainly creates a
47 problem for what we view as the true subsistence hunter
48 who isn't mobile. Especially when you have limited
49 number of animals to take, the mobile hunter takes the
50 animals. The guy that really needs it, that can't afford

00165

1 these toys, doesn't get it. He doesn't have the
2 opportunity and never will have and it's going to be
3 worse and worse the more you continue allowing more
4 people on a limited hunt, whether it be with a designated
5 hunter program or whatever.

6
7 I truly think that that is the only way
8 to address it, is to make the hunt more restrictive. You
9 can't take as many animals in a very short period and
10 that also eliminates a lot of the problems we have with
11 the designated hunter program because I'm not going to go
12 out and shoot six caribou because I can't pack them to
13 the road, you know. If I'm out there on foot and I have
14 to use an ockeo (ph) to pull them in, then likely I will
15 only take one at a time or maybe two and I'm going to get
16 my kid to go with me to help pull because I'm getting
17 old, you know. I think that's an important consideration
18 and it lends itself to or at least it has a potential to
19 eliminate a lot of the abuse that we're starting to see
20 that's only going to get worse.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
23 Fred.

24
25 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, in regard to your
26 mechanized hunting, the four-wheelers and so forth, on
27 the Kenai Peninsula, there is a restricted area where
28 they allow the four-wheelers for part of the season but
29 not for another part. As I recall, the catch or the
30 harvest is just about equal. One of the things the
31 hunters like about it is it's very quiet in the woods.
32 You don't hear the damn machines running all over the
33 place and chasing the animals and so forth. I was
34 surprised when I was back there I met hunters that really
35 didn't want to kill animals. They want to go hunting,
36 but they don't want to kill it. But that's one thing you
37 might look at.

38
39 MR. CHANDELAR: That's a workable
40 solution. Several years ago, four or five years ago,
41 when the State was looking at ATV use, one of our
42 proposals as an advisory committee addressed that by
43 hunting -- at that time we were looking at a moose hunt,
44 which was relatively short term, like a 20-day hunt, and
45 we proposed that that was a split season of sorts and one
46 of the things we have discussed on caribou in the past
47 was taking like alternate months. You know, you can use
48 motorized this month and not the next month or something
49 along those lines. Splitting it, but not splitting it,
50 so you would say, okay, you can only use motorized

00166

1 through November and then after that there's no
2 motorized. We were splitting it month by month to give
3 everybody an opportunity. You know, like you could hunt
4 on motorized in October and November had to be non-
5 motorized and then December could be motorized again.
6 That's a relatively easy enforcement issue and relatively
7 easy to enforce as long as it was published in advance it
8 shouldn't be a problem. So, yeah, we did look at that
9 and I think that's a way of doing it also. It allows all
10 the groups an equal opportunity.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As far as that applies
13 to designated hunter, do you feel like the fact that the
14 equipment is being used it gives the opportunity, I guess
15 I'd say, to abuse the designated hunter part of the
16 proposal, the mechanical?

17
18 MR. CHANDELAR: Sure. As it applies
19 strictly to designated hunters, yeah, it does. I don't
20 think there's any doubt about that. I mean any time
21 you're allowed a snowmobiler to go out and he could take
22 up to -- I mean if there's no restrictions on your number
23 of designated hunter permits, you could take 10 caribou
24 and snowmobiles today can go anywhere and they can haul
25 just about anything back with the right snowmobile.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I wasn't thinking so
28 much of the fact that they could take 10 at one time. It
29 was just they could find somebody to hunt for every
30 weekend and they could hunt every weekend of the whole
31 season if they wanted to.

32
33 MR. CHANDELAR: Correct.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If they had the
36 mechanical equipment with which to do it. It's kind of
37 interesting what you said about you could tell who's a
38 new hunter by the equipment and everything. A friend of
39 mine I think put it even better yet. He says you can
40 tell the new hunters because they've got all the latest
41 Cabela's camouflage clothes on and the rest of us are out
42 there in a pair of jeans and a wool shirt.

43
44 MR. CHANDELAR: True. The difference is
45 we can recognize them at 60 miles an hour.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I also like your idea if
48 you have to go out with the ockeo (ph), you have the kid
49 come along to pull it. I've been fortunate enough in the
50 last few years, I have kids of the right age. I haven't

00167

1 pulled an animal home for three years now or gutted it.
2 In Cordova, what they did is they allowed the mechanical
3 equipment to go in to bring out animals that are already
4 shot, but you couldn't take the mechanical equipment in
5 prior to taking the animal. In other words, I think it
6 was, and Tom can correct me if I'm right, below the road
7 you can't take a four-wheeler or anything like that until
8 afternoon of the day that you took an animal on, so you
9 can't take the mechanical equipment in there to hunt, but
10 you're allowed to take the mechanical equipment in there
11 to bring things back out. And even that would still give
12 a designated hunter an advantage, but it would at least
13 make them slow down ahead of time before they took the
14 animal.

15

16 MR. CHURCHILL: We were talking about
17 referencing 15(C) and the way the regulation reads is the
18 area is closed to anyone using motorized vehicles for
19 moose hunting, including the transportation of moose,
20 hunters or hunting equipment and/or parts of the moose
21 from September 11th through the 14th and September 17th
22 to the 20th. I guess I'm thinking about some of your
23 comments. In thinking about it, if we were to apply that
24 to your area, what is your thought? How would you
25 fashion that? Obviously, the intent of that is to allow
26 people to get in and set up camp and do their hunting,
27 but it's also long enough spaces that you're not going to
28 have people running in and out. How would you craft that
29 as it relates to your area?

30

31 MR. CHANDELAR: I think it should be
32 structured. If you did do something like that, I think
33 it should be structured to avoid motorized access when
34 the bulk of caribou are moving through the area, which
35 would be October, early November part of the season when
36 there are the potential for terrific numbers of caribou
37 to move through an area in a very short period of time
38 and again the end of March. I would make sure I avoided
39 those areas with motorized. Beyond that I don't know if
40 it matters a heck of a lot however it worked, you know,
41 because if the rest of the season when you're talking
42 December, January and February, the caribou that are in
43 the Federal areas in Unit 13 are usually caribou that are
44 going to stay there all winter. There have been caribou
45 available in Unit 13 in the Federal areas that all months
46 of the year for the last five years within legal areas
47 and there are today. So the opportunity is there, but at
48 this point a lot of it would be for mechanized travel
49 only because they're quite a ways out there. As long as
50 you left the highway systems open, I guess it would be

00168

1 okay because they are accessible off some of the highway
2 systems.

3

4 In the mid winter parts when there are
5 not as many caribou available and they're a little
6 tougher to hunt, I don't think you would have quite a
7 problem with the designated hunters because it is a chore
8 to get them and it is a chore to get out there and the
9 days are short and the weather is not great, so the
10 potential for abuse is less. So rather than making a
11 regulation or making requirements that limit the
12 designated hunter take, if you structured your hunts
13 correctly, then the weather and environmental factors
14 would limit the take rather than by regulation, which
15 makes it more attractive to people. You're not saying
16 you can't do this, it's just that, hey, you don't want to
17 do this. I think that's one way of approaching or
18 eliminating some of the abuses, by letting the
19 environmental factors eliminate the abuses.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One more question.

22

23 MR. CHURCHILL: John, your advisory
24 committee has shown some concern about some of the small
25 game populations in your area. Designated hunter
26 provisions, have any concern as it relates to those as
27 well?

28

29 MR. CHANDELAR: I don't think in the past
30 we've seen any problems with small game. I'm personally
31 not aware of any designated hunter small game, you know,
32 ever, though I'm sure it occasionally happens with
33 ptarmigan.

34

35 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what Bob was
38 getting at was right there. The one from the Native
39 Village of Eyak dealt with all wildlife, but that was
40 only in Unit 6.

41

42 MR. CHANDELAR: Right.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Where the Fish &
45 Wildlife one was ungulates only. I don't think the proxy
46 hunt currently deals with anything besides ungulates,
47 does it?

48

49 MR. CHANDELAR: I'm not sure how Unit 13
50 is worded, but I think that's correct. We've never had

00169

1 to address that and I've never heard anybody even speak
2 of it.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, John. I
5 think you've requested to talk a little bit later on the
6 proposal that we went through on Unit 13.

7

8 MR. CHANDELAR: Yes.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Maybe some of these
11 questions we can get then, but you showed some of the
12 concerns that's been expressed on the designated hunter
13 part.

14

15 MR. CHANDELAR: Okay. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
18 other Fish & Game Advisory Committee comments?

19

20 MR. CARPENTER: Good morning, Mr.
21 Chairman, Members of the Council. My name is Tom
22 Carpenter. I'm a co-chair of the Copper River/Prince
23 William Sound Advisory Committee. We have some comments
24 in regards to Proposal 02, the statewide proposal from
25 OSM for designated hunter. I guess the best way to
26 explain our position is we fall somewhere in between what
27 the Staff has requested through their proposal and what
28 the Native Village of Eyak and an individual in Proposal
29 16 and 55 have requested. We fully recognize that the
30 designated hunter provision is a worthwhile remedy to
31 some hardships that some people have in regards to not
32 being able to go out and harvest animals.

33

34 The perfect example was last year in
35 Cordova where we had a fairly new hunt on the books and
36 one of the individuals that got drawn was an elderly
37 woman. She's in her mid to late 80s, lived in Cordova
38 basically her whole life and there wasn't a provision on
39 the books that allowed her to have somebody harvest that
40 animal for her. That's completely ridiculous. Our
41 position is there needs to be a way that elderly people
42 -- they should continue to be able to participate in the
43 taking or give somebody the ability to bring home some
44 meat. It's a real shame that people, when they get old,
45 quit partaking in the resources that they grew up with.

46

47 But we do think that there needs to be
48 some restrictions in regards to the designated hunter
49 program. That's where we differ from the Staff's report.
50 Some of the concerns that we have, and they've been

00170

1 talked about a little bit here from some different people
2 that have presented evidence to the Council, is that we
3 feel that protecting the elders of a community is very
4 important. We think that this can be done by mirroring
5 the State regulation that exists.

6

7 In Cordova, we have kind of an unusual
8 situation compared to some of the other testimony we've
9 heard. We have a very limited population of moose and
10 goats and bears, so we don't have 30 or 40 thousand
11 animals that are going to transient in an area. So,
12 basically, we have a certain amount of harvest that's
13 going to take place. It's going to take place every
14 year, so it's kind of irrelevant who goes and does it. I
15 guess our point is, is that we feel if you mirrored the
16 State regulation that required an individual to be 10
17 years old to be able to put participate in a subsistence
18 hunt and you also require that a designated hunter would
19 only be able to hunt for what the Council might consider
20 an elder, whatever that age is is up to the determination
21 of the -- the State has an age. This Council may have
22 something slightly different. We feel that we need to
23 protect that.

24

25 We also feel that through the designated
26 hunter program, right now if you're 10 years old you can
27 have a harvest ticket in your name under State
28 regulation. If you're under 10, you can go out and hunt,
29 and we think this is very important to allow young
30 individuals to be able to continue to hunt and to learn
31 from people in their family or relatives, friends, about
32 hunting, but you're allowed to go out and harvest an
33 animal on a person's harvest ticket as long as they are
34 hunting with you. So, for example, Mr. Lohse could take
35 his son if he's under 10, his son could harvest an animal
36 with him, but Mr. Lohse would have to punch his harvest
37 ticket. We feel that that guarantees that people are
38 going to be able and villages are going to be able to
39 teach their young about hunting and we also feel that by
40 setting a minimum age requirement that it guarantees
41 protection for the elders in the community.

42

43 We don't think that anybody ought to be
44 able to hunt for anybody of any age. We don't feel that
45 that's what the designated hunter program is all about.
46 The State proxy hunting is not about that. It's about
47 teaching the young people and it's about protecting the
48 livelihood and the surroundings that the elderly people
49 have grown to develop.

50

00171

1 We also have some concerns in regards to
2 the bag limit that an individual would be able to have in
3 his or her possession under the designated hunter program
4 that you can read in the Staff analysis. Our biggest
5 concern, you've heard testimony before, is mainly for the
6 idea of a bag limit of two in possession for mountain
7 goats. Coastal mountain goats, their populations
8 fluctuate quite drastically, depending on the winter.
9 This winter we have zero snow. It's expected that the
10 the populations are going to be stable and possibly
11 increase. Next year you could have a winter that's
12 devastating to the population. So the populations are
13 fluctuating quite a bit.

14
15 The big concern that we have in regards
16 to the designated hunter idea for mountain goats is that
17 typically, if you want to maintain population stability
18 in a hunt, especially with mountain goats, because the
19 goats look very similar in stature, the horns. I mean
20 it's very hard to identify a billy from a nanny unless
21 you study the animal. We think there is a very high
22 potential of doing severe damage to mountain goat
23 populations because if you take an individual that has
24 the ability to harvest two bag limits and you send them
25 up the mountain, if they see two goats, they're going to
26 shoot two goats. They are not going to look and see if
27 they're a nanny or a billy. They're going to shoot the
28 two goats.

29
30 Our idea is that if the Council is going
31 to allow ungulates, as the Staff has written their
32 proposal, and consider mountain goats, that you cannot
33 consider a bag limit of two. It's very irresponsible.
34 We just think the populations of mountain goats in Prince
35 William Sound cannot handle that. There's a very high
36 potential that -- we would rather see an individual be
37 able to go harvest a mountain goat for somebody, one
38 goat, study the animal, shoot responsibly, take the
39 animal back to that individual. If they want to hunt for
40 themselves, they can obviously go hunt for themselves
41 later. But, if you don't restrict the number of animals
42 they can have in their possession, we feel we will lose
43 our hunt. The Prince William Sound and Cordova area lost
44 their goat hunts for about 15 years because there were
45 too many nannies being shot. The populations took a
46 devastating decline due to overharvesting of nannies and
47 kids and bad winters.

48
49 We would rather have a stable hunt that
50 allows people to go out, take responsibly the animals

00172

1 you're going to harvest than to lose the hunt completely.
2 So, I guess you can see our position is somewhere in
3 between. We are in favor of a designated hunter program,
4 but we think that there needs to be some serious
5 restrictions in regards to who can hunt for who and bag
6 limit requirements.

7
8 Just one other thing, and we can get into
9 this later in Proposal 55, you talked about conservation
10 concerns earlier and I guess my comments in regards to
11 mountain goats are on the record, but I would like to
12 talk about black bears in Prince William Sound in regards
13 to conservation concerns. Prince William Sound is Unit
14 6(D) and the average black bear harvest in 6(D) over the
15 last 20, 25 years has been about 150 to 200 animals.
16 From '99 to 2000, the harvest is increased to 450
17 animals. There's some concern with the biologists that
18 the black bear population -- they're fairly confident
19 that it's stable and they're going to be able to monitor
20 it over the next few years to look at skull sizes, if
21 they decrease, the female percent that's harvested.

22
23 I guess my point is that when you take a
24 proposal, as Proposal 02, that covers the state as a
25 whole, there are different populations of animals and
26 different cultures. As Mr. John stated earlier, somebody
27 in Mentasta might have a certain way of doing things, but
28 somebody in Cordova might have a completely different way
29 of doing things. So think that the Council really needs
30 to look at these issues on a unit-by-unit basis as you
31 did with Proposal 1 based on the same analysis.

32
33 That's all I have. Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions? Bob.

36
37 MR. CHURCHILL: Tom, thank you for being
38 here. Any idea why the harvest on black bear has jumped
39 to what appears to be two to three times the average in
40 the last year or two?

41
42 MR. CARPENTER: The tunnel going to
43 Whittier. That's typically the biggest reason for the
44 increase. There's a lot more accessibility to Prince
45 William Sound.

46
47 MR. CHURCHILL: Are these animals being
48 taken for food or for the hide? What's your sense?

49
50 MR. CARPENTER: Mostly the bears are

00173

1 taken for the hide. At the last meeting, the area
2 biologist -- there was a small percentage of the animals
3 that were primarily harvested for meat. Most of those
4 are from people in Prince William Sound, Chenega,
5 Tatitlek, Cordova. Typically, the people that come down
6 from, you know, Anchorage, the bigger metropolitan areas,
7 they're mainly down there for sport, for the hide.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: Do you have a concern
10 with wounding loss rate in this hunt?

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: In regards to the black
13 bears? I think that there's probably concern for
14 wounding loss rate on any hunt. I think it depends on
15 the mentality of each hunter. Some hunters are very
16 responsible and some aren't. I think that's our concern
17 with the bag limits. If you could guarantee that all
18 hunters were responsible enough to take and make a proper
19 shot -- I mean it's just hard to speculate there.

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
24 Tom?

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If not, I've got a whole
29 list here I'm going to ask you. Some of these you may
30 not know the answer to and if you don't, maybe we could
31 get some help from somebody else. Am I correct that
32 under current management practice in Prince William Sound
33 on goats, a nanny counts as two and a billy counts as one
34 or am I wrong on that?

35

36 MR. CARPENTER: No, that's right. I mean
37 the State and the Federal managers -- it's basically an
38 open hunt because you don't want to necessarily punish
39 somebody for bringing in a nanny because they do look so
40 similar. If a certain area has an allotted bag limit of
41 four animals in that specific area, if a hunter comes in
42 and reports a nanny as his kill, then immediately not one
43 animal is recorded, but two animals.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, from that
46 standpoint, if a person went out as a designated hunter
47 and took two goats and they both turned out nannies in
48 the only sub-unit that's got a limit of four, he'd have
49 limited that sub-unit out. In any other unit, he'd have
50 taken more animals than was hoped to be taken in that

00174

1 unit.

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: That's right and that's
4 one of our concerns. Prince William Sound primarily has
5 very big areas with very limited amount of animals that
6 are to be harvested in each one of those areas. We felt
7 that if you had three or four hunters out there, for
8 example, at one time, which isn't a very large number of
9 hunters for the area that we're talking about, if you're
10 allowed to have a bag limit of two goats in your
11 possession and each one of them came back with a nanny
12 and a billy, they just exceeded the goat harvest by
13 double what the managers wanted and that's where we think
14 there's a real problem.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, basically, that's
17 why your idea that they should be brought in one at a
18 time because they could be found out whether they're a
19 nanny or a billy and you wouldn't have a tendency to
20 overshoot it by quite so far. You understand that
21 underneath the Federal designated hunter proposal bears
22 aren't covered. I mean under the Federal one there is no
23 designated hunter for bears. Well, under the Native
24 Village of Eyak one, bears would be covered because
25 they'd be under wildlife.

26

27 MR. CARPENTER: Yes. I was just making a
28 point to conservation concerns in regards to the bag
29 limit number that Staff has addressed in the statewide
30 proposal, that a person would be able to have two in
31 possession. I was just using it as an example.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, in Unit 6, aren't
34 you required to take the meat from a black bear?

35

36 MR. CARPENTER: You're required to take
37 the meat from a black bear in the spring. After a
38 certain date, I'm not sure when it is in the summer,
39 maybe it's after July 1 or June 1, I can't remember the
40 exact date, you're not required to possess the meat.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you're not required
43 to possess the meat on a fall hunt, but you are required
44 to possess the meat on a spring hunt.

45

46 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When Bob brought up
49 wounded loss rate, are black bears capable of being shot
50 out of a boat that's got power on it?

00175

1 MR. CARPENTER: In Unit 6, legally,
2 you're not allowed to harvest any animals out of a boat
3 that is being mechanically operated. You can use a
4 vessel as a platform, but it cannot be under power at the
5 time the animal is being harvested. So, theoretically,
6 you could have an air boat that you took into the field,
7 the engine could be off and you could be standing on the
8 top of the cage to shoot a moose, but you couldn't chase
9 a moose down or shoot the animal while the engine is
10 running. Take a seine boat. You could have a seine boat
11 anchored in the head of a bay, anchored. You could shoot
12 off the vessel, but you couldn't shoot off the vessel
13 while it was moving.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it's while it's
16 moving.

17
18 MR. CARPENTER: While it's moving.
19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because that's what I
21 was wondering, if maybe that would answer Bob's question
22 as to loss rate. The average person is not a very good
23 shot off of a boat moving or rocking.

24
25 MR. CARPENTER: No, that's true.
26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And if they could shoot
28 bears off of a boat, that would enter into it. I had one
29 other question on this designated hunter thing. Under
30 the Federal one, it says any other Federally-qualified
31 subsistence user could take for any other Federally-
32 qualified subsistence user. Under the Native Village of
33 Eyak one, they substituted the word family. Do you have
34 any comments on that or we should wait till we get to 55
35 on that?

36
37 MR. CARPENTER: We had a lot of
38 discussion about this at our meeting. We feel that by
39 addressing the bag limit and by addressing the
40 requirements, for example, a minimum age, 55 years old,
41 that a person could designate someone else, we feel that
42 those address -- it doesn't really matter if you live
43 next to a person for 50 years and she's an elderly woman,
44 if you want to go out and bring her a couple deer, who
45 goes and does it isn't really pertinent. We feel there's
46 a real concern about minimums and maximums.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So your concern isn't as
49 to who does it, so a Federally-recognized subsistence
50 user would be perfectly adequate as long as they weren't

00176

1 capable of doing it for just anybody as long as they were
2 capable of doing it for an elderly person.

3

4 MR. CARPENTER: Right. That's exactly
5 right. Any Federally-qualified hunter is fine with us.
6 I guess our big point is we don't think that a guy who's
7 40 years old, in perfect health, that's hunted all his
8 life that wakes up with a headache on Sunday should be
9 able to tell somebody go get my moose for me. That is not
10 what the designated hunter program is all about. I think
11 we're all quite aware of that. It is to continue to
12 provide for the elderly that have grown to know and enjoy
13 a resource all their life and it should not be taken away
14 from them. We also feel that there should be some
15 minimum age requirements. First of all, it takes the
16 onus off of the Federal manager to determine who is
17 qualified to harvest an animal. That is the biggest
18 reason that the State said, and they studied this problem
19 for quite a while, that 10 years old is the minimum age
20 that you have to be to have a harvest ticket in your
21 possession to hunt on your own. But they also made a
22 provision in there, which we feel is a good one, that
23 allows a person under 10 to harvest an animal with an
24 individual and the older individual could punch the tag
25 for that younger person. We feel that it covers all the
26 bases necessary, it allows for the youth to continue to
27 learn how to hunt. When they become old enough, they
28 have possibly a few years of experience already, but they
29 were taught by somebody and that's what we feel is
30 important.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That basically then
33 would eliminate the idea of a family with six young kids
34 putting in for like the drawing in Cordova, putting in
35 for eight drawings for their family, and then getting the
36 designated hunter, to have the father go out and take it
37 for the little one year old or two year old or something
38 like that.

39

40 MR. CARPENTER: Well, it would basically
41 eliminate them. It would basically say that you have to
42 be -- you know, we have a pretty unusual hunt. We may
43 have one of the only Federal drawing hunts in the state.
44 I don't know that for a fact, but it's kind of an unusual
45 situation. The way the hunt works is there's going to be
46 five cows and 15 bulls harvested under this Federal
47 system. They're going to get harvested, but there's not
48 going to be any more or any less. They're getting
49 harvested. It's almost 100 percent success rate. But I
50 think the Council and our advisory committee want to look

00177

1 at this responsibly. We want to allow for kids to hunt,
2 we want to protect the ability of an elder to participate
3 still have that kind of wild food in their household.

4
5 We think there's a limit and we feel that
6 the State limit of 10 is perfectly reasonable, but you've
7 got to take this into consideration. If I were to be
8 drawn and I had a child that was eight, I could have that
9 child harvest that moose and I could punch that one tag
10 for that child. Basically the same way that the State
11 does it. So it's not necessarily saying that just
12 because a child is not 10 that they are not going to have
13 the ability to harvest an animal. They still could if
14 somebody in their household would designate that child
15 under the same ability the State allows for. So we think
16 that all the bases are covered there.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They just wouldn't be
19 able to increase the odds under the lottery system.

20
21 MR. CARPENTER: That would be the only
22 thing they couldn't do. I guess we think that 10 is a
23 reasonable age to put in for a drawing hunt.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've got two Freds that
26 want to ask you a question.

27
28 MR. ELVSAAS: Go ahead.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred John.

31
32 MR. JOHN: Thank you for your comment. I
33 really liked that, going out with a young child and
34 hunting, when you take him out and you try to kill his
35 first moose. You said something about qualified harvest
36 or something. What do you think about what the child
37 should know? Just shoot a gun before he takes his first
38 moose or know how to share, care, skin and knows all that
39 stuff that goes with hunting? I know I could take out my
40 grandson, he's 10 years old, and he could shoot a moose
41 probably, but that's all he'd do. I mean he wouldn't
42 know nothing about it. I was wondering what you, as a
43 person, think about it.

44
45 MR. CARPENTER: Well, I think those
46 comments are pretty pertinent to this discussion.
47 Especially when you're talking about an animal the size
48 of a moose. I don't think that there's necessarily -- if
49 a father or a brother or somebody wanted to teach a kid
50 how to shoot, shooting the animal is the easy part.

00178

1 People able to take care of an animal as big as a moose
2 or, for a 10-year-old kid, a deer for that matter,
3 caribou, is a pretty big task and that is why we feel
4 that the age of 10, to be able to go out and do it on
5 your own is the very minimum age that we feel comfortable
6 with allowing. The way I've addressed this situation,
7 that you would still be able to, if you had a son that
8 was eight years old, take him out hunting. That's what
9 we want. We want kids to hunt, but we want you, as an
10 adult, or somebody to be in a supervisory position to
11 teach him how to shoot, first of all, how to gut the
12 animal, how to harvest, how to butcher, how to pack it
13 out. You know, there's a lot of things that need to go
14 on there just besides shooting, so I think addressing the
15 minimum age is very crucial.

16

17 MR. JOHN: Did you say that as a father
18 you could be a designated hunter for the young child?
19 Did I hear that? I don't know.

20

21 MR. CARPENTER: Well, the way I would
22 perceive the hunt to take place in Cordova, for example,
23 is there's 20 animals that are going to be drawn and if
24 you are to mirror the State regulations, if I were to
25 draw one of those bulls, for example, and I had a child
26 that was nine years old, I would be able to go with that
27 child if I thought he had the ability to perform the task
28 to shoot the animal, I would be allowed to have that
29 child harvest that moose and I would punch the tag
30 because the tag would be in my name. So that's giving
31 parents, grandparents, brothers, the ability to teach
32 kids how to hunt, but it's also done in a responsible
33 manner. There's an adult there to supervise the activity
34 to guarantee there's no wanton waste, first of all, that
35 it's done in a proper manner, that all the animal is
36 harvested. I mean those are important things to teach
37 kids. So, yeah, I think the way I'm addressing this is
38 that you would be able to take a child under the age of
39 10 exactly like the State allows to harvest an animal if
40 you are with that child.

41

42 MR. JOHN: Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

45

46 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you. As I understand
47 what you're saying now, if a person is under 10 and
48 somebody, say his father, gets a permit to hunt, the
49 child can do the hunting for the permit.

50

00179

1 MR. CARPENTER: With the father.

2

3 MR. ELVSAAS: But the child can do the
4 hunting.

5

6 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

7

8 MR. ELVSAAS: But, in turn, the child
9 cannot get a permit and have the father do the hunting.

10

11 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

12

13 MR. ELVSAAS: And you say it mirrors the
14 State's. What happens to the State's position about
15 everybody is the owner of all the resources and just
16 because of age somebody is disqualified? I'm stretching
17 the point here, but, on the other hand, I don't feel
18 comfortable with the State's concept of everybody is
19 equal except some.

20

21 MR. CARPENTER: I understand your point.

22 I guess our point to that is that we feel that the
23 Regional Advisory Council and the Federal Subsistence
24 Board needs to look at it not necessarily based on what
25 you said, but there needs to be a certain age that an
26 individual is responsible. We don't necessarily feel
27 that an individual under 10 years of age possesses the
28 ability or the responsibility to go out and harvest an
29 animal himself or herself. I guess by addressing this
30 proposal in the way that we did, yes, we are saying that
31 an individual, for example in the Cordova hunt, would not
32 be able to put in for the drawing hunt until they're 10
33 years of age, and that's because we don't feel that an
34 individual that's 10 years or younger possesses the
35 ability or the responsibility to harvest that moose by
36 themselves. But, on the other hand, we do feel that an
37 adult that has a permit should have the ability to take
38 his or her child out and teach them how to harvest that
39 animal so that when they become 10 years of age they do
40 have the ability and the responsibility and respect for
41 that animal to do it on their own.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have any more
44 questions, Fred?

45

46 MR. ELVSAAS: No, I don't believe so. I
47 think we're getting a little off of the statewide issue.
48 When we get to 55, that will probably be better because I
49 have concerns about that. On the other hand, we're
50 talking about subsistence here, so subsistence is a

00180

1 little different than trophy hunting.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions? I
6 think, Fred, that in this case here, what he is talking
7 about is a specific subsistence hunt.

8

9 MR. ELVSAAS: Right.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was looking at what he
12 was saying and how it would apply to the Federal
13 regulation that we're looking at in front of us. The
14 Federal regulation in front of us, as a statewide thing,
15 has no restrictions by age at either end. I know that
16 that's a concern a number of people have brought up, how
17 do you decide who you can take it for. Technically
18 speaking, I think what we came up with, under what Pat
19 was saying, is that they would have to, at least in
20 certain areas, meet State requirements, which would put
21 an age on it. In other areas, there are no requirements.
22 Am I correct on that, Terry? There are no requirements
23 in some parts of the state for who is qualified to have a
24 State harvest tag or is it 10 all over the state?

25

26 MR. HAYNES: (Nods in the affirmative)

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's 10 all over the
29 state. Unless somebody has a question for Tom, I have a
30 question for Pat.

31

32 Thank you, Tom.

33

34 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat, can I ask you a
37 question real quick. Maybe I've lost something along the
38 way, but with our discussion yesterday one of the
39 requirements for a Federal permit in these different
40 areas was that they had a State hunting license.

41

42 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. Well, it was for
43 the -- to get the ceremonial permit you had to follow the
44 methods and means defined in the regulations. In all our
45 methods and means we say that you have to have a State
46 hunting license.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That brings up a
49 question in my mind because that's for methods and means
50 on any Federal hunt, right?

00181

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, that was for the
2 ceremonial. In the Subpart A provisions about the
3 permits for the ceremonial says you must follow the
4 methods and means defined in the provisions. But then in
5 our Subpart A about the permits, it says in order to
6 receive a Federal subsistence registration permit or
7 Federal designated harvester permit or designate someone
8 to harvest for you under a Federal permit, you must be
9 old enough to have reasonably harvested that species
10 yourself or under the guidance of an adult. But that was
11 under the ceremonial permit.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that is not a
14 requirement for all Federal hunts that you hold a State
15 hunting license.

16
17 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, if you're going to
18 be the hunter yourself, you have to have a State hunting
19 license.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. See, that brings
22 up a question in my mind because we went caribou hunting
23 this fall and I have sons that are 12, 14 and 16. Only
24 the 16 year old has a State hunting license. The other
25 two had Federal permits to take caribou, but they didn't
26 have a State hunting license. So is that part of the
27 provisions that they are required to have a State hunting
28 license?

29
30 MS. PETRIVELLI: Only when required.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Only when required.
33 Okay. So, otherwise, what follows is that they must be
34 reasonably.....

35
36 MS. PETRIVELLI: Old enough to have
37 reasonably harvested that species yourself or under the
38 guidance of an adult.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pat. That's
41 something I needed cleared up. Any other questions for
42 Pat?

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody else need
47 something cleared up? In all of this I kind of lost that
48 thread. Okay. Any other Fish & Game Advisory Committee
49 comments?

50

00182

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. At this point in
4 time we'll go to summary of written public comments.

5

6 MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
7 Is John Goodlataw here?

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: John is here. At least
10 I saw him. Yeah, John is here.

11

12 MS. WILKINSON: Ahtna, Incorporated wrote
13 that they support the proposal for a designated hunter to
14 take goat or sheep for another person. Caribou and moose
15 are already provided for in Federal regulations. The
16 Grayling-Anvik-Shageluk-Holy Cross Advisory Committee
17 supported this proposal unanimously.

18

19 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
20 Resource Commission supports the proposal with
21 modification to require the person designating another to
22 hunt for him or her to demonstrate the need for a
23 demonstrated hunter. The intent is to prevent abuse of
24 such a provision. Specifically, they suggested a
25 requirement such as that in the State proxy hunting
26 regulations either blind, 65 years of age or older or 70
27 percent disabled, with the addition of a qualifying
28 condition being demonstrated need. The latter would allow
29 an individual the opportunity to make a case to the
30 entity issuing the permit on other grounds. In other
31 words, temporary disability or illness or economic
32 hardship. The SRC was also very concerned that wildlife
33 managers retain the ability to make unit-specific
34 determinations about specific wildlife populations for
35 conservation purposes and that supports the proposal with
36 the understanding such unit-specific control would be
37 possible. That's the end of the written public comments.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was Wrangell-St.
40 Elias SRC. Okay. With that, we'll go on to public
41 testimony. I have two right here. John Goodlataw.

42

43 MR. GOODLATAW: Tazlina Village. We
44 support Proposal 02 for designated hunter to hunt for
45 sheep for another person. Caribou, moose are already
46 provided in Federal regulation.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for John?

49

50 (No comments)

00183

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Because Unit
2 13 already has the caribou and moose now.

3

4 MR. GOODLATAW: Right.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Has it worked out? Has
7 it been used? Do you feel that that designated hunter
8 provision has helped that you had in Unit 13?

9

10 MR. GOODLATAW: For the elders, yes, it
11 does.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For the elders. Thank
14 you.

15

16 MR. GOODLATAW: Plus there are a lot of
17 disabled in Unit 13 and some of them can't walk and need
18 help all the time.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm putting you on the
21 spot now, but what do you think about the idea that the
22 SRC had that this designated hunter should be limited to
23 the elders and the blind and the disabled, the people who
24 had a need and not just anybody?

25

26 MR. GOODLATAW: I think 55 and under
27 would be the right age.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words, it
30 shouldn't be for those that are healthy and can do it
31 themselves, it should be for those that have need.

32

33 MR. GOODLATAW: The ones that are
34 disabled, can't walk or sick or something like that that
35 they can't do it theirself.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's what the
38 intention of it was to start off with. Any other
39 questions for John? Susan.

40

41 MS. WELLS: Thank you. How do you feel
42 about a child under 10 having a parent be a designated
43 hunter?

44

45 MR. GOODLATAW: I think it's a good idea
46 only on the safety side and be able to take care of it.
47 As they go, they learn and teach the other little ones.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, if I understand
50 right now what you're saying is that they should be under

00184

1 the teaching of a parent or an elder or brother or
2 something like that.

3

4 MR. GOODLATAW: Right. It's got to be a
5 supervisor with them at all times to teach them what's
6 going on.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
9 Sylvia.

10

11 MS. LANGE: Can you tell me in the
12 designated hunter system that you have right now for
13 moose and caribou, are there any restrictions on who can
14 have a designated hunter?

15

16 MR. GOODLATAW: Like I say, that's 55 and
17 under, you know.

18

19 MS. LANGE: It's only for the elderly, is
20 that correct?

21

22 MR. GOODLATAW: Yeah. It's for really
23 disabled and elders.

24

25 MS. LANGE: May I follow up?

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: (Nods affirmatively)

28

29 MS. LANGE: Have you experienced any
30 problems with the designated hunter provisions so far in
31 your region?

32

33 MR. GOODLATAW: I used it one time when
34 my daughter went out and hunted for me. I had a knee
35 operation at that time.

36

37 MS. LANGE: So it's been good.

38

39 MR. GOODLATAW: Yeah, it worked out.

40

41 MS. LANGE: Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, John. From
44 what I know of the people up country, even if it's legal
45 under Federal law that anybody could do it, in a village
46 situation they understand this is for those that have
47 needs, those that are disabled and the elderly. There is
48 no fear of them misusing it, but what we do have is a
49 population up there that's made up of a lot of people who
50 do not have that cultural background that could and have

00185

1 misused the system, but I don't expect to see it misused
2 in Copper Center because the social pressure alone would
3 keep somebody who is capable of hunting from having a
4 designated hunter go do their hunting for them. It's
5 saved for the people who need it and I think that's
6 exactly what we're hearing from John. It's understood
7 that's who it's for, but all cultures don't understand
8 that. Some cultures sit down and say this is what the
9 law says, so therefore I can do it.

10

11 MR. GOODLATAW: You know, this has been
12 going on for a long time, way back, you know. People
13 respect the elder. That's how it started.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Fred.

16

17 MR. ELVSAAS: First, I just wanted to
18 note that in looking at the designated hunters, the
19 success rate is very poor in regards to the caribou.
20 It's only 2 percent. But, on the other hand, if you
21 restrict the designated hunter to just the old and the
22 sick, what about the guy that finally gets a job on the
23 North Slope and he's at work during the season? He's
24 entitled to feed his family. Couldn't he have a
25 designated hunter? Have you guys discussed that at all?

26

27 MR. GOODLATAW: I don't think it's right
28 because he's able to do what he's supposed to do, you
29 know. He can hunt.

30

31 MR. ELVSAAS: During these days that.....

32

33 MR. GOODLATAW: It doesn't matter if you
34 work or not. You take time off to go hunt.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what you're
37 saying is that if he's capable of working, he's capable
38 of hunting and he's just exchanged his right for hunting
39 for making money.

40

41 MR. GOODLATAW: Right. Anyway, if you do
42 that for everybody, there will be no more game left.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
45 John?

46

47 MR. ELVSAAS: No. I was just curious
48 about that.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Is Ray

00186

1 Neeley here?

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: He's not here. I don't
6 have anybody else signed up for public testimony. Do you
7 want to present? Just excuse yourself from the Council
8 and say who you're presenting it for.

9

10 MR. JOHN: I'm going to excuse myself
11 from the Council. I'm going to read out Joe Hart's
12 comments.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Joe Hart from Chitina
15 Village had to attend another meeting in Valdez and he
16 asked John to put some comments in on these things.

17

18 MR. JOHN: This is just a short comment.
19 I don't really understand it. Anyway, it's on 02,
20 Chitina Native Council supports 02. It says, yes,
21 although it does not lead to wonder if it shouldn't be
22 driven from unit as seen by harvesters. I really didn't
23 understand that, but I've just read it as it is.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So he thinks it should
26 be driven by unit.

27

28 MR. JOHN: Just talking to him, Joe
29 thinks that it should be unit by unit, just like a lot of
30 people say different region, different area, they're all
31 customary and traditional way.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have anything
34 else there?

35

36 MR. JOHN: No. The next one is on 15 and
37 16. Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No other public
40 testimony? Okay. A short, five-minute break.

41

42 (Off record)

43

44 (On record)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We're back in
47 session. We're done with public testimony and I haven't
48 had anybody else come forward while we had our break, so
49 we're onto Regional Council deliberations,
50 recommendations and justification. At this point in

00187

1 time, a motion to put this on the table for discussion is
2 in order.

3

4 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair. I'd like to
5 put Proposal 02, as written on Page 88, for
6 consideration.

7

8 MR. ELVSAAS: Which page are you on?

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Page 88.

11

12 MR. CHURCHILL: Page 88. If I understood
13 Pat Petrivelli correctly.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's actually the same
16 as the version on Page 80. So what we have is we have a
17 motion on the table to put Proposal WP03-02 as found on
18 Page 88 of our manual, which reads: A Federally-
19 qualified subsistence user (recipient) may designate
20 another Federally-qualified subsistence user to take
21 ungulates on his or her behalf unless the recipient is a
22 member of a community operating under a community harvest
23 system or Unit-specific regulations in Section____.26
24 preclude the use of the designated hunter system. The
25 designated hunter must obtain a designated hunter permit
26 and must return a completed harvest report. The
27 designated hunter may hunt for any number of recipients
28 but may have no more than two harvest limits in his/her
29 possession at any one time, unless otherwise specified in
30 Unit-specific regulations in Section____.26. The
31 designated hunter may not charge the recipient for
32 his/her services in taking the wildlife or for the meat
33 or any part of the harvested wildlife.

34

35 That was the motion, do I hear a second?

36

37 MR. ELVSAAS: I'll second it.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been seconded. The
40 proposal is on the table open for discussion. Fred.

41

42 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman. In listening
43 to the testimony, there's great concern about
44 overharvest. If you look at the graph on Page 83 and 84,
45 you'll see that the one for the designated hunters took a
46 large percentage of the harvest was in regard to sheep,
47 which I would imagine would apply to goats also, and
48 that's of great concern here in testimony. Possibly we
49 should look at amending this to say deer, caribou and
50 moose. The other concern I heard was in regards to

00188

1 people taking two limits at one time. Possibly, if the
2 Council agrees, and I don't have strong feelings one way
3 or the other, but maybe they should only be allowed one
4 limit while in the field. In other words, if you're a
5 designated hunter for somebody, you get that resource and
6 then you go hunt for yourself or the other way around.
7 Those are some things I'd like to hear Council comments
8 on.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

11

12 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess my concern is how
13 broadly this proposal applies. I guess my inclination is
14 to move closer to what we've heard testimony on, that
15 this is really aimed at folks that aren't physically able
16 to go out and hunt and we've got growing populations
17 increasing harvests in these areas. I think the areas we
18 have it in now are somewhat limited in scope. I guess I
19 understand the percent of harvest so far, but I think
20 when we broaden this we really have the potential to
21 increase the harvest and I'd like to see us move much
22 closer to what the State regs are in terms of applying
23 this only to people that physically aren't able to hunt
24 themselves. So that's the direction I'm leaning at this
25 point.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

28

29 MR. JOHN: I support this, but I agree
30 with Bob that it should be designated to the elderly, to
31 those that aren't able to hunt, those that are disabled.
32 I heard about the younger hunter taking them out and
33 letting them shoot, you know. I agree that a nine-year-
34 old could shoot a moose. My kids all went to a hunting
35 safety course and they're pretty good shooters, all of
36 them. But when it comes down to the traditional value of
37 sharing and skinning out the animal, taking care of it
38 and all the traditional stuff that we do, I don't think
39 they know how to take care of a moose.

40

41 Like when I caught my first moose, by
42 then I learned how to skin. I was 17 years old. I
43 learned how to take care of the animal and I learned how
44 to get it out. I'd go back and get the village people to
45 carry it out for me. You know, I'd take care of it as
46 much as I could, and they'd come and help me, though I
47 know how to skin a whole moose and everything. At that
48 time, they came out and helped me take it out,
49 everything, you know. But I'm kind of talking about my
50 culture there.

00189

1 In Fairbanks area, they had this one
2 place where you could take your younger people out. I
3 seen this one girl -- I read in the paper one girl had
4 her picture in there with a moose and her gun beside her
5 and everything. In my mind I was wondering, you know, as
6 a cultural person, does she know how to take care of it.
7 All of that goes along with taking care of the meat and
8 stuff like that. To me, she probably just shot the
9 moose, you know, and got her picture in the paper, but
10 she probably didn't know the value of taking a moose and
11 everything, so I'm kind of wondering, you know, what
12 would happen from there on.

13
14 If you're going to go out hunting by
15 yourself -- I believe in taking kids out hunting when
16 they're young, really young, teaching them all the value
17 and everything. One day they go out on the their own and
18 they get that first moose and they come back, they
19 usually have a big dinner, steam bath, all those stuff
20 for them, you know, and treat him like -- you know,
21 really honor him or her and they're proud and they'll
22 never forget their first moose they killed, just like I
23 never forgot the first one I killed.

24
25 I don't think I want to kill a moose for
26 a young person. I think I would like that young person
27 to learn all the stuff first and then let him kill his
28 first moose on his own. I think that takes away quite a
29 bit from a young person when you kill a moose and he has
30 a little ticket that you just mark on that he got his
31 moose. To me, that's not right. I believe in more the
32 elder way. This is almost like Social Security for the
33 Native people, but they teach their young and when they
34 grow old, the young person will take care of them.

35
36 There's a lot of things here. I agree
37 with the whole concept of the thing. Another thing, I
38 don't think this should be statewide. I think each area
39 in the state of Alaska should come up with their own
40 proposal of how they do it in that area. Like I say, I
41 don't want to put my value on another person completely
42 different from our area.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, John. Bob.

47
48 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess in keeping with
49 the testimony and what Fred said, I'd like to offer an
50 amendment that would change the language on Page 88 to

00190

1 read: A Federally-qualified subsistence user who is
2 either blind, 70% disabled or 65 years of age or older
3 may designate another and then to read the same. I'd
4 like to offer that as an amendment.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So this is an
7 amendment. This is an amendment to add a Federally-
8 qualified subsistence user who is 70% disabled, blind or
9 65 and older can designate another. Do I hear a second
10 on the amendment for discussion purposes?

11

12 MR. JOHN: I second it.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
15 seconded. It's up for discussion, the amendment.
16 Comments. Sylvia.

17

18 MS. LANGE: Under discussion, I'm kind of
19 uncomfortable with the restrictions because it sort of
20 goes against the whole sharing concept of subsistence.
21 While I wouldn't term a woman who is pregnant or at home
22 with small children disabled, I would consider them
23 disadvantaged for hunting. Certainly, when I was in that
24 position, my brother went out and got some deer for me.
25 On the other hand, had his bag limit been close or
26 something, I would have been hesitant to ask him.

27

28 Again, I'm uncomfortable with this one
29 size fits all kind of regulation and the whole statewide
30 intent of the main motion as well and I'd be more
31 comfortable with something tailored specifically to units
32 because we've had a lot of testimony here that even
33 within the region 6(D) has a population problem with
34 sheep or they're concerned about them as far as
35 distinguishing between nannies or overtaking of sheep,
36 yet it's not a concern, say, in 6(B). I mean it just
37 seems like the specifics of the different areas are
38 pretty unique, so it's very hard for me to get my mind
39 around this whole blanket approach. Although, looking at
40 the existing designated hunting area, there doesn't seem
41 to be much abuse so far, but the potential is there.

42

43 So I think I'm just uncomfortable with
44 the main motion being statewide and specifics could come
45 unit by unit I would think. At least that's what my
46 approach would be. And I speak against the offered
47 amendment specifically because I think there's other
48 needs. A person breaks their arm, breaks their leg, they
49 can't hunt that season, a single mom. Immediately I
50 think of other uses, how we share now, but if it meant

00191

1 cutting into that person's bag limit, then I think maybe
2 you'd be restricting those customary sharing patterns.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll make a comment on
5 that, Sylvia. This is strictly personal. To me, when
6 you share, you give up something that you have. You
7 don't share something -- if I can go out and take
8 something for you under your license and giving it to
9 you, I'm not sharing it. If I take something under my
10 license and give it to you, I'm sharing it. If I'm
11 really seriously thinking about sharing with you, it
12 doesn't matter how much I have because you can share from
13 a little or you can share from a lot. If I can go out
14 and get yours for you, it doesn't cost me anything. I'm
15 not sharing with you. I'm just going and doing you a
16 favor. If I have a limited amount of resources, I get
17 four deer and I give you two of my deer, I've shared with
18 you. If I can go out and get my four deer and go out and
19 get your four deer, I haven't shared with you, I've just
20 done your job. That's my way of looking at it. It's
21 from that standpoint. Sylvia.

22

23 MS. LANGE: Well, that's your standpoint
24 for the person who's doing the hunting. From the person
25 who's asking you to do the hunting, I might think
26 differently. I think you are sharing and you're giving
27 up something by giving up your time and I may be hesitant
28 to ask you if I know you've already hit your limit. So
29 that's where I'm coming from.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Fred.

32

33 MR. JOHN: We've been doing this for
34 years and years like John just said and it's just natural
35 for us to go taking care of the elders and everything.
36 One thing about a lot of these rules and regulations that
37 I'm kind of a little bit nervous about, back in the '60s
38 when Johnson started his great society, one of the
39 programs that came out was the youth corp, you know, and
40 the young people used to help bring water for the elders
41 and sometimes clean up their house and do things for the
42 elders and here they come with the youth corp and they
43 start getting paid for it, you know. After that the
44 youth start saying, after the summer program is over and
45 everything, then wintertime come along, you know, they do
46 something for the elder, they expect to get paid, which
47 before it was just natural for them to help. This
48 designated hunter program, you know, it says the right
49 thing, but we've been doing that for a long time. I'd
50 just make that comment.

00192

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's kind of
2 what I was trying to get at, John, is that if you like to
3 hunt, you could look at this as an advantage. I could go
4 hunting for you because I like to do that. I'm not
5 sharing with you anymore, I'm getting something for
6 myself and that's kind of what I was getting at. Sharing
7 goes out the window when it doesn't cost you anything.
8 It doesn't become sharing anymore. I see your point
9 totally, that it's hard to be a person to ask somebody to
10 share out of what they have, but if you can say could you
11 go get mine, it's a little bit different. I can
12 understand what Fred is saying right there. It's one of
13 the reasons we don't pay our kids for any household
14 chores. We expect them to do that. Mr. Churchill.

15
16 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess my experience is
17 it's rarely an issue of asking. Within a community you
18 know if somebody isn't able to hunt for one reason or
19 another. It seems to happen so consistently and I think
20 we talked about it earlier. Along the Kuskokwim, in
21 certain cultures, if you had a death in the immediate
22 family, you don't hunt for a year. You're prohibited
23 from it, but I haven't seen one of those families ever
24 lack for food during that year and they don't ask anyone.
25 I mean they don't. It just happens. I think the
26 generosity and sharing is going to go on and that's
27 different than I think what we're addressing here with a
28 designated hunter.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert, anything to
31 say? We're dealing with the amendment right now and we
32 should stick closer to the amendment one way or the
33 other, but on something like this it's hard to stick
34 right to a specific because it's all tied together.

35
36 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, I agree with Fred and
37 Bob about the disability people. I think they should
38 have a designated hunter. In Denali National Park, we've
39 got a different kind of rule over there. It's one animal
40 per household no matter who it is. You could have a
41 partner hunt, but your partner uses your tag and you
42 can't get another animal after. I'd go hunt for somebody
43 that's disabled.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan, do you have
46 anything to say on the amendment?

47
48 MS. WELLS: No.

49
50 MS. LANGE: I have another comment.

00193

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Sylvia.

2

3 MS. LANGE: Bob, what did you think about
4 the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC's recommendation? They have
5 the same requirements which mirror the State, which
6 essentially is in your amendment and they added
7 demonstrated need, being temporary disability for
8 economic hardship.

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: I think that's a bag of
11 worms I wouldn't touch, quite frankly. I think that
12 would be very, very hard to measure. When we start tying
13 economic need to access to the resource, my experience, I
14 wouldn't do that.

15

16 MS. LANGE: What about temporary
17 disability, like broken leg?

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pregnancy.

20

21 MS. LANGE: Pregnancy, lactating,
22 whatever.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: I just wouldn't. I think
25 those things are handled day to day in communities that
26 I've seen and I don't see a need to put that in.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we have an
29 amendment. If there's no further discussion.....

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
34 called. After this amendment we're going to take a lunch
35 break. All in favor of the amendment which adds 70%
36 disabled, blind and 65 years of age -- after a Federally-
37 qualified subsistence user, 70% disabled, blind or 65
38 years of age may designate another Federally-qualified
39 subsistence user. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed, signify by
44 saying nay.

45

46 MR. ELVSAAS: Nay.

47

48 MS. WELLS: Nay.

49

50 MS. LANGE: Nay.

00194

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it looks to me like
2 we have three nays and three ayes and one abstention.
3 Were you an abstention or did you say aye? Oh, four ayes
4 and three nays. The ayes carry it. Now, we can still go
5 over whether or not we want to have a blanket one like
6 you were talking about and these other issues that I
7 thought that Fred brought up that were real good. We can
8 do that after lunch. We're going to take a break for
9 lunch. It's already 12:04 by my clock, which means it's
10 12:15 by other people's clock. So let's take a lunch
11 until 1:30.

12

13 (Off record)

14

15 (On record)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is the Southcentral
18 Regional Advisory Council after lunch and we are back on
19 discussion on proposal two. We just finished voting on
20 the amendment on Proposal 02. We have in front of us an
21 amended proposal that included age, disability and
22 blindness. For discussion purposes, do we have any other
23 amendments that anybody would like to offer to help make
24 this more palatable?

25

26 MR. ELVSAAS: Are you talking about the
27 disability concept or the motion in general?

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The motion in general
30 because the disability concept is already a passed
31 amendment.

32

33 MR. ELVSAAS: I would like to see two
34 amendments. The first one I would offer is I would move
35 to amend the proposal to be for moose, caribou and deer
36 only.

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have an
41 amendment before us that limits this statewide designated
42 hunter proposal to moose, deer and caribou only and
43 you're substituting that for the word ungulates?

44

45 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the reason behind
48 that is?

49

50 MR. ELVSAAS: The public testimony and

00195

1 the concern of the sheep and the goats and this small
2 herds being decimated.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm in support of this as
7 well because I think we had testimony from a variety of
8 sources that talked about not only the sheep and goat but
9 muskox that tended to congregate and could be some real
10 conservation concerns if we included those. By only
11 including moose, caribou and deer, I think that fixes
12 that concern that we've heard.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

15

16 MS. LANGE: I apologize if I'm confused.
17 I'm having a hard time reconciling the scope of the
18 statewide proposal versus a regional proposal because
19 statewide I don't know what stocks are in danger of being
20 overly impacted. I know regionally, because of the
21 testimony here today, what stocks would be threatened
22 perhaps or at least there's the potential for threat
23 because of testimony for our region. I'm having a hard
24 time reconciling that in my mind. While I respect the
25 amendment, I don't like the main motion, I guess, so
26 that's where I'm at.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I understand right,
29 Sylvia, you're back to your original objection, which is
30 that the statewide thing is too broad and it should be
31 either area by area or unit by unit or stock by stock or
32 something like that.

33

34 MS. LANGE: Yeah. And also because the
35 testimony I've heard and the information I have is really
36 relegated to our region, so I just feel uncomfortable
37 making decisions based on things I don't have information
38 on for other areas, so correct.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As a Council, we've had
41 a real reluctance to make decisions for other areas in
42 the past. From that standpoint, what you've expressed
43 basically is that you're uncomfortable with the breadth
44 of this proposal. When we're looking at the amendment
45 right here, what we have to look at is if this proposal
46 passes, does this amendment address some of the problems
47 that have been brought up in our testimony. Fred.

48

49 MR. ELVSAAS: I have to agree. I feel
50 very uncomfortable addressing anything outside the

00196

1 region. The Office of Subsistence Management made this
2 proposal asking for a statewide thing and our concern is
3 Area 2, so I think we're properly addressing it. If
4 other areas have something else, the Board, itself, when
5 they address it, will take all of this into
6 consideration. But our considerations are for Region 2,
7 even though it's a statewide proposal.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I think you
10 made something pretty clear there. What we're doing is
11 we're expressing our opinion on this proposal as it
12 relates to our region.

13

14 MR. ELVSAAS: That's right.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

17

18 MR. CHURCHILL: One thing that helped me
19 was on Page 78, the last paragraph on the page containing
20 on the second page seemed to be covering those species on
21 a statewide basis from ADF&G. That's why I was real
22 comfortable with what Fred was proposing and then I have
23 the benefit of some other information from ADF&G that
24 kind of verified that.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

27

28 MS. LANGE: One comment that was made in
29 the public testimony from the advisory committee out of
30 Cordova was that they recommended just reducing the bag
31 limit on the sheep and didn't have any problem with that
32 as far as addressing the conservation concern for goat.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think, if I remember
35 right, Fred, from what you showed me, the concern went
36 beyond Prince William Sound goats when you looked at the
37 tables over here on the sheep.

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, from that
42 standpoint, that would address the concerns that we have
43 in Prince William Sound, but what we're recognizing is
44 that these, just like Fish & Game and some stuff in here
45 says, is that these populations, these kind of animals in
46 particular are more vulnerable to this kind of a hunt.

47

48 Thank you, Sylvia.

49

50 Mr. Churchill.

00197

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question on the
2 amendment.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The amendment
5 that is before us is to replace ungulates with deer,
6 caribou and moose. Am I correct, Fred?

7
8 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The question has
11 been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
16 saying nay.

17
18 (No opposing votes)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. You
21 said you had another amendment, Fred?

22
23 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would
24 move to amend the main motion to state that no hunter may
25 have more than one bag limit in the field at any one
26 time.

27
28 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have an
31 amendment before us for discussion to reduce the
32 designated hunter may hunt for any number of recipients
33 but may have no more than one harvest limit in his or her
34 possession at any one time.

35
36 MR. ELVSAAS: That's right.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you explain your
39 reasoning behind that, Fred?

40
41 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes. It was made very
42 clear to me, listening to the testimony, this would
43 follow in line with good hunting practices by allowing
44 more than one bag limit you stand the risk of more
45 wounded animals not being taken. Apparently there's been
46 several found in that country already, but this would
47 make it so that if somebody was to be a designated
48 hunter, they either hunt for the party before or after
49 they get their own game.

50

00198

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what you're saying is
2 that they could hunt for their designated hunter and they
3 could choose to take their animal first or they could
4 choose to take their own animal and then go after the
5 animal for the designated party.
6

7 MR. ELVSAAS: I guess the easiest way to
8 say it is wouldn't we feel wonderful if we saw somebody
9 coming out of the woods with four hindquarters. If
10 you're going to get two animals, bring one out before you
11 go after the other.
12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments on
14 this. Mr. Churchill.
15

16 MR. CHURCHILL: No. I'm just ready to
17 call the question if there was no discussion.
18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.
20

21 MS. LANGE: It never came under testimony
22 here, but just talking to somebody on the floor about it,
23 the discussion was about designating a hunter for deer in
24 our particular area around Cordova and going out and
25 getting just one deer is a costly undertaking for a
26 single animal. So pooling resources is often done where
27 everyone will go on a single boat and go out to the
28 islands or wherever. I don't know how that would affect
29 that particular harvest.
30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think I can answer
32 that, Sylvia. It says one limit. The limit in Cordova
33 is four deer. So ever hunter on that boat can have four
34 deer, but the designated hunter couldn't have eight. He
35 could only have four, which puts it in the realm of still
36 being economically viable to go do it. John.
37

38 MR. JOHN: I think I'm going to vote
39 against this amendment because I like to hunt sheep, but
40 I'll always have a moose permit and if I go sheep hunting
41 and I've got a designated moose tag for somebody else,
42 I'd like to kill that moose while I'm out sheep hunting.
43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You still could.
45

46 MR. JOHN: But what I heard on the
47 amendment is that we had to have ours first.
48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, that's not what it
50 is. You can only have one limit of any animal in your

00199

1 possession at one time. You could have one sheep and one
2 moose and it wouldn't matter whether it was his or yours.

3

4 MR. JOHN: I'm sorry.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It wouldn't matter
7 whether you got yours first or his first. Fred.

8

9 MR. ELVSAAS: Just one comment, Fred. If
10 it's a little one, it's his.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That cleared that up.
13 You'd give away the best one?

14

15 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
18 called. This is strictly on the amendment for one limit
19 down here where it says recipients may have no more than
20 one harvest limit in his/her possession at any one time.
21 The question has been called. All in favor signify by
22 saying aye.

23

24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
27 saying nay.

28

29 (No opposing votes)

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
32 unanimously. We now have a proposal in front of us that
33 has three amendments on it. Do we have any more
34 amendments that anybody wishes to add to this proposal?
35 Susan.

36

37 MS. WELLS: You said it has three
38 amendments. I thought the first amendment that we
39 discussed about defining who was out in the field failed.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It passed. It passed
42 four to three.

43

44 MS. WELLS: Okay.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So this has the
47 amendment on the elderly, disabled and blind, it has the
48 amendment on the ungulates to deer, caribou and moose, it
49 has the amendment from two possession limits to one
50 possession limit and this is still a statewide proposal.

00200

1 Again, this proposal will go before the Board. They will
2 make their own decision on it. What we're doing is
3 giving direction here. We can either vote the whole
4 proposal down, we can vote the proposal in as amended or
5 we could offer another amendment. Sylvia, another
6 amendment?

7

8 MS. LANGE: I'm considering one.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Don't consider it. Put
11 it on the table.

12

13 MS. LANGE: I'm still uncomfortable with
14 the amendment that limits the recipients of the
15 designated hunter and in discussion with an individual on
16 the floor I was told that it's easy to get special
17 dispensation or whatever they call it for temporary
18 disability through ADF&G under State regs, so that's
19 missing if we're talking about Federal lands. So I would
20 offer an amendment that allows for....

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Temporary disability.

23

24 MS. LANGE:temporary disability.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have another
27 amendment. Do I hear a second?

28

29 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll second it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'll second and speak
32 to it?

33

34 MR. CHURCHILL: Here's something, if this
35 addresses it, where we could say blind, permanent or
36 temporary disability 70%, would that speak to what your
37 concern is?

38

39 MS. LANGE: I guess. I don't know how
40 you're 70% pregnant though.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: That's the beauty.
43 You're 100%, so you're 30% over the requirement. Not
44 having ever been pregnant, but my wife assures me that
45 she either was or she wasn't.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's interesting,
48 Sylvia, because I talked to one of the managers of one of
49 the parks and he talked about some incidents of
50 designated hunters that they had this year and it was

00201

1 based on one had a tumor taken out and was recovering
2 from that and those kinds of things and I agree with you
3 that I'd be more comfortable to put that in here, too.
4 It's just the fact that we have those kind of things and
5 as long as it's recognized that they're temporary
6 disabilities, not just the fact that you don't want to go
7 hunting. It is a judgment call, but we're going to have
8 to leave it up to the managers to make that kind of a
9 judgment call and they'll either issue it or not issue
10 it, so there's no problem with enforcement because
11 enforcement doesn't have to make any decision on it.
12 They either have the designated hunter permit or they
13 don't. I'd be comfortable with it.

14

15 MS. LANGE: So I'm not putting a
16 percentage on it.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. What you're saying
19 is what.....

20

21 MS. LANGE: Just temporary disability is
22 allowed.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, just temporary
25 disability.

26

27 MS. LANGE: Correct.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's left up to
30 the discretion of the manager.

31

32 MS. LANGE: Correct.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion on
35 this? If not, the question is in order.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: Do we have a definition
38 of disability in this?

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The State uses it all
41 the time.

42

43 MR. CHURCHILL: I know the State does,
44 but are we ruled by the State definition?

45

46 MS. WELLS: Question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The question has
49 been called. All in favor of this fourth amendment
50 signify by saying aye.

00202

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by
4 saying nay.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: Nay.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries six to
9 one. Okay. Now we have a proposal in front of us with
10 four amendments. Do I hear any other amendments to this
11 proposal? Fred, do you have an amendment?

12

13 MR. JOHN: I'd like to call the question
14 on the proposal.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd like to call the
17 question on the proposal as amended?

18

19 MR. JOHN: As amended.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I need to read it or
22 do we all understand it. We have the proposal before us
23 that's found on Page 88. On that proposal we have added
24 after Federally-qualified subsistence user that is blind,
25 70% disabled, temporary disabled or over 65 may designate
26 another Federally-qualified subsistence user to take
27 deer, moose or caribou on his behalf. And then we go
28 down to the bottom here and we add the designated hunter
29 may hunt for any number of recipients but may have no
30 more than one harvest limit in his or her possession at
31 one time. And the rest of it is as it stands. That's
32 understood? Fred.

33

34 MR. JOHN: I'd like to have a roll call
35 vote on this.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Roll call vote on
38 this. Who does that? Ann does that.

39

40 MS. WILKINSON: Sylvia Lange.

41

42 MS. LANGE: Yes.

43

44 MS. WILKINSON: Fred John.

45

46 MR. JOHN: I vote no.

47

48 MS. WILKINSON: Robert Churchill.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.

00203

1 MS. WILKINSON: Ralph Lohse.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

4

5 MS. WILKINSON: Fred Elvsaas.

6

7 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

8

9 MS. WILKINSON: Susan Wells.

10

11 MS. WELLS: I'll vote yes.

12

13 MS. WILKINSON: Gilbert.

14

15 MR. DEMENTI: Nay.

16

17 MS. WILKINSON: The motion passes as

18 amended.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The motion passes as

21 amended. Now, the thing we have to remember on this

22 motion is specific areas can exclude or add different --

23 I mean this doesn't cancel the other proposals because it

24 says right in here unit-specific regulations in

25 Section____.26. So unit-specific regulations can be made

26 to either expand or subtract from this proposal. With

27 that, we've made some progress. I'm giving warning right

28 now that we may end up having to have a meeting this

29 evening if we run too far behind and it looks like we

30 won't finish tomorrow. So it behooves us to stay a

31 little bit on track. If you see your chairman getting

32 too far off track, you can call your chairman to task.

33

34 Okay. This brings us to Proposals 15, 16

35 and 55. They're lumped together. They basically deal

36 with Unit 6(C). We'll let Pat present them to us.

37

38 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chairman. Proposal

39 15 was submitted by George Covell of Cordova and requests

40 that designated hunting be prohibited for Unit 6(C)

41 moose. Proposal 16 was submitted by Virgil and Charlette

42 Carroll and a request that designated hunting be allowed

43 for Unit 6(C) moose or deer. Proposal 55 was submitted

44 by the Native Village of Eyak and it requests that

45 designated hunting is allowed for any wildlife in Unit 6.

46

47 I guess in light of the extensive

48 discussion we had on Proposal 02, I'll just do the

49 highlights of why these proposals were submitted just

50 briefly. Part of Unit 6, why there was so much activity

00204

1 is because of the -- the one thing they had in common was
2 Unit 6(C) moose and we already discussed the idea of the
3 drawing permits, five cow permits and 15 bull permits
4 that have 100 percent success. There's over 2,400
5 residents in Cordova and there's close to 900 households
6 that all like moose.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat, could you explain
9 one more thing and that is that the only people eligible
10 for these 20 permits are Cordova residents, right?

11

12 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. For the moose, the
13 customary and traditional use determinations for moose
14 are residents of Unit 6(A), (B) and (C) and the only
15 community in those areas is Cordova. So, for Unit 6(D),
16 there's an appendix that deals with the full Unit 6
17 wildlife regulations that would be covered by Proposal 55
18 and that's on Page 118 and 119 and those are all the
19 wildlife species that would be covered by Proposal 55.

20

21 With Proposal 15 and asking to prohibit
22 it, Mr. Covell expressed the opinion that the limited
23 number of available permits continued to be highly
24 coveted and the drawing method of permit allocation was
25 regarded as the most equitable and appropriate for local
26 circumstances. He felt that designated hunting
27 provisions could lead to abuses of the drawing system,
28 such as those with large extended families or those
29 willing to sponsor proxies as a way of increasing their
30 chances of being drawn for a permit.

31

32 Because of these three proposals, there
33 was a meeting in Cordova, which Ralph and Sylvia and I
34 attended. It was hoped that all the proponents would be
35 there, but only Mr. Covell was able to attend. Mr. and
36 Mrs. Carroll were out of town and the Native Village of
37 Eyak had reviewed the analysis and then they just
38 submitted the modification in writing that you already
39 have for their proposals, but then the residents that did
40 attend expressed concerns similar to Mr. Covell's about
41 the unfairness of additional chances for proxy permits
42 and the concern about making sure whatever moose is
43 harvested stays in Cordova and just the idea of
44 participation in the hunt being important to the
45 residents of Cordova.

46

47 When there was discussion about the
48 division amongst the residents and other criteria, we all
49 realized that the only eligible users are the residents
50 of Cordova and the drawing system is there to stay for

00205

1 Unit 6, but we'll be discussing those issues under
2 Proposal 19.

3

4 So, for the designated hunter provisions,
5 that covers Mr. Covell's proposal. He would like to
6 prohibit designated hunting for Unit 6(C) moose because
7 he perceives that it would create an unfair advantage in
8 the drawing permit for Unit 6(C) moose.

9

10 Mr. and Mrs. Carroll submitted their
11 proposal to allow the provisions because they felt that
12 those proxy provisions were available through the State
13 system and they should be available through the Federal
14 system. I guess you've agreed also because you've passed
15 them under your approval, so you can sympathize.

16

17 The Native Village of Eyak, we're
18 considering the designated hunting provisions and they
19 testified their reasons for supporting designated hunting
20 for all wildlife. They had originally supported it just
21 for another member of their family, but they changed that
22 once Chenega mentioned that might create a hardship.

23

24 In applying the designated hunting
25 provisions to all wildlife though, in reviewing that,
26 looking at the regulations that would be involved and the
27 fact that a designated hunter would have to get a permit
28 for each of those species and the fact that there's
29 fairly generous provisions, it was felt that the practice
30 of harvesting other wildlife species where others and
31 sharing could occur under the limits that are in place.
32 With the Staff recommendation for these proposals, what
33 we did was -- of course, it was opposing 15 and 55. Then
34 I said for 16, if 02 is adopted by the Board, no action
35 would be necessary on 16. If the Board doesn't adopt 02,
36 then 16 should be adopted to allow designated hunting
37 provisions for moose and deer in Unit 6(C) and that would
38 be on Page 116. And I think I changed it instead of just
39 moose 6(C) to just Unit 6 to apply for the whole unit
40 rather than just Unit 6(C). But just to allow for
41 designated hunting provisions for the whole Unit 6 for
42 moose and deer. So that's basically the recommendations
43 to deal with these proposals.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Pat?
46 Susan.

47

48 MS. WELLS: After going through Proposal
49 No. 02, was the terminology saying that unless otherwise
50 specified in unit-specific regulation, so this could be

00206

1 added for the Cordova area 6 for the non-ungulate
2 wildlife.

3

4 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I guess there's
5 different scenarios. If the Board adopted 02 as written,
6 then they would allow statewide designated hunting
7 provisions for all ungulates, then 16 wouldn't need to be
8 adopted because then moose and deer would be provided
9 for. If the Board didn't adopt the statewide provisions,
10 then this proposal would have to be adopted because
11 there's unit-specific regulations throughout the state
12 now in 21 different hunts. In Unit 6, Proposal 16 asks
13 to allow a moose and deer hunt in Unit 6(C) and the Staff
14 analysis is to recommend it just for Unit 6 for moose and
15 deer.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does that answer your
18 question, Susan?

19

20 MS. WELLS: Yes, but maybe I'm a little
21 confused. If we were to pass 16, we're not muddying the
22 waters? There's no conflict then?

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

25

26 MS. PETRIVELLI: If the statewide
27 proposal was adopted, you could consider supporting
28 Proposal 15 that would deny designated hunting
29 privileges. I think I glossed over the reasons for
30 Staff opposing it, but it's in the book. Just the idea,
31 even though it causes a perception of unfairness, to
32 support 15 denying the provisions would deny
33 opportunities for subsistence use of the resource. But
34 you have a number of options.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have that option.

37

38 MS. PETRIVELLI: You could support any of
39 these proposals.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They could be in
42 addition to or subtracting from the other proposal. The
43 other proposal makes room for that kind of a thing. Any
44 other questions for Pat?

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pat.

49

50 Before we go on, I'm going to have to

00207

1 apologize and I'm going to have to ask the Council's
2 leeway. We have a member of the advisory committee that
3 wanted to testify on Proposal 13 that has to leave for
4 another meeting and I told him that we would have him on
5 right after lunch. In a hurry to pass the other one, I
6 forgot about him. With the Council's permission, I would
7 like to let him testify so that he can leave and get to
8 the other meeting he needs to go to. While we've already
9 passed this proposal, he just would like to give us some
10 information and put it on the record and then we can go
11 on. If that's okay with the rest of you, we'll do that.
12 John, sorry.

13

14 MR. CHANDELAR: Sorry I wasn't able to
15 attend yesterday. I made a judgment call that you guys
16 would be handling this proposal today. The proposal I
17 would like to address is the Nelchina caribou, which I
18 think is Proposal No. 14, I believe. The proposal, as
19 written or as proposed by CRNA, I thought had a lot of
20 merit as it was. Our advisory committee wasn't real keen
21 about the take of cow caribou. As you guys passed it,
22 the proposal that you guys passed I guess was what was
23 recommended by the Staff or whatever. I don't think this
24 addresses what they were trying to accomplish. I think
25 this proposal doesn't even come close to accomplishing
26 what CRNA intended or what we discussed as a Paxson
27 Advisory Committee.

28

29 What the proposal was doing was looking
30 for additional opportunity for the subsistence take of
31 caribou to meet subsistence needs in Unit 13 or for some
32 of the Unit 13 residents. I think this may do exactly
33 the opposite of that. It's going to bring a large number
34 of motorized hunters into the area and could potentially
35 -- the take of 30 cows could be taken in one afternoon or
36 could be far exceeded in one afternoon either on the
37 Denali Highway around Mile 13 when the caribou are
38 crossing there in the fall or March when it's really
39 accessible by snowmobiles or by vehicle in October. It's
40 also going to bring maybe an additional number of hunters
41 in there with the thought that they could take a cow
42 caribou or any caribou for that short period of time. So
43 I think you may actually increase the harvest, which, in
44 effect, will decrease the opportunity for some of the
45 Unit 13 residents that aren't as mobile.

46

47 I think the solution to this or at least
48 one solution to this is to close the Denali Highway
49 corridor to motorized access at least during the
50 vulnerable portions of year, something that I mentioned

00208

1 during the designated hunter comments. Because that's
2 the area where this is open where these cows are going to
3 be taken quickly. In the other areas, the other Federal
4 areas that these caribou are available in October and
5 March are along the Richardson Highway mostly between
6 Sourdough and Paxson in the Federal hunting areas along
7 there.

8

9 Most of this area has already restricted
10 motorized vehicle use, so the opportunity to take caribou
11 for someone who doesn't have an off-road vehicle or
12 doesn't have a snowmobile is much greater because the
13 caribou -- it's wooded and the caribou are just crossing
14 the road. They're not real visible. They're only
15 visible for a very short time, so the opportunity to kill
16 a lot of caribou in a hurry doesn't really exist as much.
17 But when you're on the Denali Highway, there's a couple
18 of little areas along there where the herd passes through
19 and congregates, namely Tangle Lakes, which is all
20 Federal area, and Mile 13. There are sometimes a lot of
21 caribou available there at a given time and I think the
22 take of 30 cows would happen in an afternoon.

23

24 Again, that does just the exact opposite
25 of what this proposal was attempting to accomplish and
26 that was provide opportunity to subsistence hunters.
27 It's going to be taken by a very highly mechanized group,
28 not the group that this proposal was aimed at. That's my
29 big concern with this particular proposal the way it was
30 passed, is it doesn't answer the concern. It just makes
31 it worse. So that's kind of what I wanted to go on
32 record with on this proposal.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: John, can I ask you a
35 question. If your concern was that you couldn't allow
36 unlimited take of cows, how would you have handled this
37 proposal then?

38

39 MR. CHANDELAR: I guess, if we felt that
40 we needed to allow some take of cows or that we could at
41 least stand some take of cows, it would be as I said. We
42 would close the extremely vulnerable areas to motorized
43 vehicle hunting during -- you know, actually, I would
44 close it to motorized vehicle hunting for the take of
45 cows for the whole season. I wouldn't allow any cows
46 taken in that Denali or Tangle Lakes Wild and Scenic
47 Corridor. Again, a very easy regulation to implement and
48 enforce because that's snowmobile basically only. Right
49 now the Federal enforcement there can't cover the
50 Richardson Highway and the Denali Highway because he has

00209

1 to go on a snowmobile on the Denali Highway most of the
2 time and when the enforcement officer's truck is parked
3 at Paxson, you can do anything you want anywhere else.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because you know he's
6 out on a snowmachine somewhere.

7
8 MR. CHANDELAR: Yeah. The enforcement
9 officer cannot be on the Denali Highway without the
10 people that are out there knowing about it. The abuse is
11 there. We like to think that people don't do that, but
12 that's not the case. The enforcement officer on the
13 Denali Highway, everybody's legal out there. When he's
14 not, they're not. We see that locally and it's really
15 hard to convey that, but that's the case. The only way I
16 see of addressing that problem is to limit motorized
17 vehicle use in the open country, the high country
18 corridor that you have on the Denali Highway where the
19 caribou are extremely visible and extremely accessible.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Mr.
22 Churchill.

23 MR. CHURCHILL: This is just a
24 generalization. The people that seem to be most abusive,
25 are they long-time or relatively short-time residents of
26 the area?

27
28 MR. CHANDELAR: I would say they're, as a
29 general rule, short-time residents. We're going to see
30 more of that because we have an influx of short-time
31 residents or new residents who have a customary and
32 traditional use determination for this area. Our permits
33 have been on the increase every year and have made a
34 dramatic increase in the last few years since the
35 addition of more areas per customary and traditional
36 determination.

37
38 MR. CHURCHILL: That fits with my limited
39 experience up there. It seems to be relatively short-
40 timers.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
43 John? John, thank you. I'm sorry I forgot what I said I
44 would do at lunchtime. I think it's on the record that
45 way. I think it goes along with the kind of worry that
46 we were trying to express in what we did. We were
47 recognizing that 30 caribou is a problem more than a
48 solution and it brings up other problems, so I'm hoping
49 that when the Board handles this that you're there to
50 testify.

00210

1 MR. CHANDELAR: Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, Susan.

4

5 MS. WELLS: So when we do our summary at
6 the end, that could be one thing that we can send on with
7 that proposal, concern about the motorized vehicles.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Okay. With that,
10 we will go back to where we were. We just finished with
11 Pat, so that brings up Terry, Alaska Department of Fish &
12 Game.

13

14 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
15 Department's comments on the original proposals before
16 you are on Pages 102, 106 and 109 of the Council meeting
17 book. I won't repeat those comments here, but I will say
18 that the Department supports the preliminary conclusion
19 to oppose Proposals 15 and 55. We believe the
20 preliminary conclusion for Proposal 16 is a step in the
21 right direction. For example, we support the recommended
22 action to limit designated hunting in Unit 6 only to
23 moose and deer. However, the Unit 6 moose hunt is one
24 instance when additional guidelines governing
25 participation might be needed, such as limiting
26 participation to one drawing permit application per
27 household. So our comments on these proposals is not
28 taking into account your action on Proposal 02.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
31 questions for Terry?

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll ask a question if
36 nobody else is going to just to put some things on the
37 table. If I understand right, currently, there can be
38 only one permit issued per household, right?

39

40 MR. HAYNES: That's correct.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what you were
43 suggesting is that each household only put in one drawing
44 per household. In other words, every household is
45 entitled to put in for the drawing but only puts in one
46 application instead of multiple applications.

47

48 MR. HAYNES: That's what I'm
49 recommending, yes, as something to consider.

50

00211

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you see any problems
2 with that? I see some head shaking in the back, so I'm
3 sure we'll get some problems in the future.

4
5 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. As I
6 understand it, I have other concerns about how that hunt
7 is administered. I would argue that it should be
8 administered as an 804 hunt. The assumption by issuing
9 drawing permits is that everyone in Cordova is similarly
10 situated and I would argue that maybe they are not and
11 not everyone should have equal opportunity for permits
12 for that hunt. Setting that aside, it seems to me that
13 given there are more people interested in the hunt than
14 there are animals available to be harvested that by
15 limiting opportunity to participate by one per household,
16 you're giving each household in the community an equal
17 opportunity. Whereas if there are six people in your
18 household versus one in another household, if everyone in
19 the household can submit an application, then certain
20 households have a better chance of being drawn than
21 others. It looked to me as though some people were
22 looking for more equity in how permits were distributed.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I guess that's one
25 way of looking at equity, but if you have six people in
26 your household, you've got six times the need of one
27 person also. It's one of those darned if you do, darned
28 if you don't situations. I was just wondering if you
29 were seeing that as ease of administration. One per
30 household versus one per person instead of a fairness
31 issue. Any other questions for Terry? Fred.

32
33 MR. ELVSAAS: As I see it, if you have
34 six in one house and one in another, you're still only
35 allowed one permit per household. You may have six
36 people applying, but if all six of them were to be drawn,
37 you'd still only get to hunt one moose, right?

38
39 MR. HAYNES: As I understand it, yes.

40
41 MR. ELVSAAS: So even allowing six
42 applicants for permits, in the drawing it looks weighted,
43 but in the actuality, the six people are sharing one
44 moose when the one person, he gets a permit, he's got a
45 whole moose to himself. Just discount the sharing
46 concept, one person would certainly be sharing and all
47 the other things that go with it, but I think to restrict
48 the six people from each putting in their name would not
49 be fair because, like Ralph says, you do have the need
50 six times greater than one.

00212

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. I
4 don't think anybody was arguing with you on that. It's
5 just I was looking at it from the standpoint where that
6 would be easier to administer. For one thing, it would
7 automatically address this whole idea of who gets to hunt
8 for it. If you have one permit per household, I would
9 think anybody in that household could take that moose.
10 This way, at least the person that gets drawn is the
11 person that's supposed to take the moose. Anybody else
12 have any questions for Terry?

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Although I do like that
17 idea. Okay. Other Federal, State, Tribal Agencies.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any Federal
22 Agencies?

23

24 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair. Ken Holbrook
25 with the Forest Service. On this drawing numbers per
26 household, just straight numbers very briefly. Say you
27 have 2,500 residents in town and four people in a family,
28 you'd have a chance of .16% of drawing. If you had 800
29 households, one application per household, you'd have
30 .12%.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, basically, what
33 you're saying, statistically, there's not much difference
34 in your percentage of chance to draw.

35

36 MR. HOLBROOK: That's correct. With
37 those two scenarios.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have 1.2 per
40 household, but you have 1.6 for four-person household.

41

42 MR. HOLBROOK: Yes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
45 Federal? Any other State? Any other Tribal? Mike. You
46 can speak to all three of them.

47

48 MR. LAMBERT: I guess my comments on this
49 for Native Village of Eyak is pretty simple and
50 straightforward. We strongly oppose this proposal. We

00213

1 think it denies an opportunity for subsistence.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This must be for
4 Proposal 15.

5

6 MR. LAMBERT: Correct.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So this wasn't talking
9 to the idea that there was one drawing per household.

10

11 MR. LAMBERT: No. This is referring to
12 Proposal 15 in regards to designated hunter.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On no designated hunter.

15

16 MR. LAMBERT: On no designated hunter for
17 moose in Unit 6(C).

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think, if I remember
20 right, we've got all three of them -- we haven't got any
21 on the table, but Pat went through all three of them and
22 Terry spoke to all three of them. So, if you can speak
23 to some of the concerns that you've seen come up that
24 deal with the other two or comments on the other two, it
25 would sure be appreciated.

26

27 MR. LAMBERT: Mr. Chair, Council. If
28 you'd like me to speak to all three, I could start by --
29 just for the record, I'd like to read a letter by our
30 Tribal Council president Robert Henrichs, who isn't here
31 today, but I wanted to get it on the record and it's not
32 too different than what's in comments under other agency
33 comments.

34

35 It says the Native Village of Eyak
36 supports Proposal WP03-55 as submitted to the Office of
37 Subsistence Management to allow a designated hunter for
38 any wildlife in Unit 6, with the modification to exclude
39 the wording to be in their family as recommended by OSM
40 staff, based on the comments that Chenega provided, but
41 our council would support either option in that sense.
42 NVE believes there are no biological concerns in regards
43 to this proposal. NVE views the designated hunting
44 provision as a means of meeting both the needs of users
45 who cannot harvest the resource themselves as well as
46 recognizing traditional practices of the members of NVE.

47

48 Native Village of Eyak is a Federally-
49 recognized Tribe with a membership of over 500 people.
50 Although this proposal may cause perceptions of

00214

1 unfairness in the local community, there is no reason for
2 denying Federally-qualified subsistence users or Tribal
3 members opportunity for subsistence of wildlife. The
4 designated hunter permit system provides the opportunity
5 to monitor harvest levels and potential abuses and allows
6 for future adjustment to these provisions. So that was
7 more specific to Proposal 55 of all wildlife.

8

9 One thing I wanted to add, over lunch I
10 was kind of looking through the wildlife regulations to
11 somewhat answer Ms. Wells' question earlier about what
12 separates this wildlife proposal versus ungulates. I
13 guess I just wanted to touch base on that so that it's
14 somewhat clear why the village specifically would put in
15 a proposal of this nature. What was submitted in the
16 additional comments in regards to Staff analysis, the
17 Native Village of Eyak does recognize the fact that most
18 of the bag limits in the wildlife section under those
19 units are pretty liberal as far as covering needs in that
20 area for subsistence users.

21

22 A couple species in question was black
23 bear that there would be a need for designated hunter.
24 If you look under the current harvest limits of one bear,
25 one bear may not be enough for someone that may need a
26 designated hunter. It may not be enough meat for an
27 individual family if just one member could harvest.

28

29 Another was beaver, which is a species
30 that is actually pretty liked by Tribal members. That in
31 regards to one per day, one in possession, kind of
32 referring to two in possession issue, if an individual
33 Tribal member was out harvesting beaver, that could come
34 into play under harvest limits.

35

36 I'm just kind of bringing up individual
37 situations and why we tried to simplify it by including
38 all wildlife instead of just ungulates in that area.
39 With one per day, one in possession, you would only be
40 able to harvest one beaver on a given day and if you were
41 designated hunting for someone, then you would not be
42 able to bring -- if there was the opportunity given you
43 as a person out hunting. Some of the testimony that was
44 shared earlier about how the animal presents itself to
45 you, if you're beaver hunting and there happened to be
46 two available and you were designated hunting, you could
47 harvest maybe both, one for yourself and one for who you
48 were designated hunting for. So that's just an example.

49

50

00215

1 Most of the other limits are fairly well
2 off as far as harvest opportunity for subsistence users.
3 In order to simplify the regulations, submitting an all
4 wildlife, that was the background behind that on top of
5 the ungulates.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mike, can I ask you a
8 question. Are ducks and geese included under wildlife or
9 do they come under a separate set of regulations?

10
11 MR. LAMBERT: Those are under separate
12 regulations.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So ducks and geese
15 wouldn't be considered in this.

16
17 MR. LAMBERT: Although there was some
18 discussion at lunch that a designated hunter would be
19 great for goose and duck.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I could see where that
22 would probably be the one they would want the designated
23 hunter for. But that comes under separate Federal
24 regulations.

25
26 MR. LAMBERT: Yes, it does.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know they do in Unit
29 11, but do they have beaver hunting down there? Is there
30 a beaver hunting season or are they still just trapping?
31 I thought they had a limit of 10 on trapping.

32
33 MR. LAMBERT: Yeah, I think under State
34 regs they probably have a more liberal amount under State
35 regs.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. Mr.
38 Churchill.

39
40 MR. CHURCHILL: I just double checked,
41 but there's actually no limit on trapping beaver in all
42 of GMU 6. Is that your understanding as well?

43
44 MR. LAMBERT: I don't know if there's no
45 limit, but I'm sure it's less strict than the Federal
46 guidelines in our area.

47
48 MR. CHURCHILL: Do you have a lot of
49 beaver trapping in this area?

50

00216

1 MR. LAMBERT: Yes. I'm not aware of it
2 as much. Just lately, in the last few weeks, in visiting
3 with some Tribal members, I'm realizing that it's going
4 on more than I knew before and that's why I brought it up
5 today. It just happened to be something on my mind.
6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: Is there any coordination
8 between the trappers and those that want to use the
9 beavers as a food source?
10

11 MR. LAMBERT: No, not at this time
12 through the village, but I will make a note and actually
13 pursue that.
14

15 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.
16

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

20 (No comments)
21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mike. Oh,
23 you've got another question for him?
24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: We had some earlier
26 testimony about the sharp increase in the number of black
27 bear being taken and it appears mostly from folks out of
28 the area. Any thoughts on how we might address that?
29

30 MR. LAMBERT: Actually, in some
31 discussions with Mr. Carpenter as far as his
32 representation on the local advisory committee and the
33 decision that you made today as Council on the ungulate
34 proposal on limiting it to one in possession, the Native
35 Village of Eyak would not be against limiting that
36 possession to one in regards to addressing that concern.
37 In fact, the idea of harvesting one animal -- you think
38 about it as a subsistence user and the wanton waste of an
39 animal. Normally a hunter is not going to go out and
40 want to kill two or three bears on a given day by
41 themselves or even with a couple individuals. The amount
42 of work that would go into that would be tremendous,
43 including other species, such as goat. So I think
44 limiting that to one in possession would certainly go a
45 long ways in doing that. An individual could still come
46 back and he could either hunt for himself on another day
47 or hunt for another individual as a designated hunter on
48 a given day.
49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. If we were to

00217

1 take the limit off beavers for hunting purposes, would
2 that be helpful or do you think it might create a
3 conservation concern? Not with the folks that live
4 there, but do you think it would be helpful?
5

6 MR. LAMBERT: No, I think the wildlife
7 idea of submitting a proposal to address all wildlife was
8 just a simplification. We could probably get more
9 specific and include black bear, include beaver. That
10 would probably address all the concerns of the village if
11 that was an option you would like to pursue as Council,
12 to include ungulates and black bear and beaver. I'm
13 looking at the species. I didn't see any other concern
14 at this time under regulations.

15
16 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

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

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mike.

24
25 Okay. Fish & Game Advisory Committee
26 comments.

27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you once again, Mr.
29 Chairman, Members of the Council. Tom Carpenter, Copper
30 River/Prince William Sound AC. I guess, first of all, a
31 comment -- I'll do the same thing, just comment on all
32 three proposals. The first one, Proposal 15, I think,
33 for the record, it shows that our advisory committee is
34 in favor of some form of designated hunter program and I
35 think you addressed that earlier with the adoption of
36 Proposal 02. So we are not in favor of Proposal 15 for
37 that reason.

38
39 Proposal 16, the was put in by the
40 Carrolls. They were actually one of the families that
41 drew one of the moose permits last year. She's an elderly
42 lady and she didn't have the ability to go out and
43 harvest the moose, so her daughter and son-in-law put
44 this proposal in to try and address some of the concerns
45 they had with that. I think you also addressed that
46 concern that they had. We were in favor of adopting this
47 proposal at the time with regards to moose and deer, but
48 there should be some restrictions with the elderly and I
49 think you addressed that with Proposal 02 also.

50

00218

1 Proposal 55 from the Native Village of
2 Eyak. When we voted on this proposal, we had an
3 informational meeting in which Ms. Lange, Mr. Lohse and
4 OSM were there. I was in attendance at that meeting. We
5 had voted on this proposal after that meeting because we
6 had the Board of Fish going on at the same time. It was
7 quite a hectic schedule. We were not in favor of this
8 proposal as written in regards to all species. So we
9 went through the list of wildlife that would have been
10 included in that and we agreed that moose and deer ought
11 to be included if there were going to be a designated
12 hunter program adopted. We had some concern with black
13 bears and goats because of the bag limit and you somewhat
14 addressed that concern when you -- well, actually, you
15 haven't addressed that concern because you adopted the
16 proposal earlier that would only include moose, deer and
17 caribou, which black bear and goats weren't proposed. We
18 are not in favor of all wildlife if the bag limits are
19 going to be kept where you can have two in possession.
20 That's the big point. I listed those concerns earlier
21 and most of those were biological in our estimation,
22 particularly with regards to black bear and goats. Those
23 were the two main species we were concerned with. If you
24 were to go and amend the proposal to include some of
25 these other species, we would not be against that if you
26 also took into consideration remedying the bag limits
27 that this proposal requests.

28
29 I guess just one final comment in regard
30 to Mr. Churchill had some questions about beavers.
31 There's no shortage of beavers on the Copper River Delta.
32 I think there's more beavers per square mile than just
33 about anywhere in the world. There really is no per se
34 coordinated effort in regards to trappers bringing the
35 quarters off the beaver. I have done it. I trap. I do
36 take some beaver to some elderly people, but that could
37 go on a lot more. We did not discuss this at our
38 committee, but I don't think there would be a problem if
39 you were to adopt something that required only one bag
40 limit in possession. I don't think there would be a
41 problem with our committee having you increase the beaver
42 bag limit to two or three or whatever you decide is a
43 reasonable number.

44
45 Other than that, I think that's basically
46 all I have. If you do adopt some of these proposals, for
47 chance that the Federal Board doesn't adopt your Proposal
48 02 as amended today, I think it's very important that you
49 include some of your amendments with these proposals if
50 you do decide to take action on them.

00219

1 I guess the last thing would be with
2 Proposal 02 this morning you put some stipulations as to
3 who could participate in the designated hunter program.
4 We still feel very strongly as an advisory committee that
5 you've addressed the disability issue and you've
6 addressed the protection of the elderly with the 65 year.
7 We also feel that you should address the minimum age
8 requirement in regards to the big game species in Prince
9 William Sound. We do not feel that youths under the age
10 of 10 should harvest one of those animals by themselves.
11 So we feel that if you would follow the State
12 requirements and place the minimum age at 10, we think
13 that that address the issue, but it also allows that
14 person, if they are under 10, if their parent does have
15 the fortunate luck of winning the lottery as we call it,
16 they could allow their child to go out and harvest that
17 moose with them. That's all I have.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom?

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.

24

25 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we have a lot of
28 mulling to do. Okay. We now have any other advisory
29 committees.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
34 public comments. Ann.

35

36 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, there were
37 no written comments for Proposals 15 and 16. We have two
38 written comments for Proposal 55, one of which was the
39 letter from the Native Village of Eyak, which Michael
40 Lambert read already, and the other is from Chenega IRA
41 Council. A resident of Chenega, through the Chenega IRA
42 suggested a modification to Proposal 55 to allow one
43 Federally-qualified subsistence user to designate another
44 Federally-qualified subsistence user in their location or
45 area to hunt for them rather than a family member. It
46 may be that the subsistence user who is unable to hunt
47 does not have a family member available but may have a
48 neighbor who could perform that service. That's the end
49 of the comment.

50

00220

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Public testimony.
2 I just went through the blue cards and didn't find any.
3 Is there somebody out there that submitted one? You have
4 one? Would you like to read it in?

5
6 MR. JOHN: This is from Joe Hart. It's
7 on 15, 16 and 55. Chitina supports this proposal if
8 fails. This is a unit-driven request. The concern of
9 overharvest or potential due to harvest in same household
10 of husband and wife. Husband gets one moose, then would
11 be able to harvest wife's permit. Same as caribou.
12 Overharvest. Would this still be able to be done if
13 violation occurred? Hunters who have a pending
14 investigation should not be allowed to harvest another
15 permit. It should be for the past three or five years.
16 Another one is it should be a minimum 21 years of age to
17 perform hunt if hunting the permit alone. For a
18 violation, when a person is hunting another permit, both
19 persons should be responsible when violation occurs.
20 First-time hunter could be required to participate in a
21 hunter safety course prior to hunting. The State system
22 now is like this.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Fred.
27 Sylvia.

28
29 MS. LANGE: I have a question. I'm
30 intrigued by the violations for the designated hunter.
31 Did it say if there had been a violation in the previous
32 five years? Is that what I heard?

33
34 MR. JOHN: I'll just read it for you.
35 Hunters who have a pending investigation should not be
36 allowed to harvest another permit. It should be for the
37 past three or five years.

38
39 MS. LANGE: Okay. Thank you.

40
41 MR. JOHN: I can't add or subtract from
42 that.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Fred. Yeah,
45 I talked to Joe a little bit on that too. The two things
46 that he brought up on the violation, one I found very
47 interesting, if the designated hunter gets a violation,
48 the violation goes both to the designated hunter and the
49 recipient. While that looks like that would not be
50 possible to be done, I know that it works in the

00221

1 commercial fishery all the time. If you have a transfer
2 of your permit and somebody fishes it and they get the
3 violation, they get the fine, but the points go on you.
4 So he's not talking about something that's not a
5 possibility. Those are both thoughts that are worthwhile
6 for us to think about.

7
8 We don't have any more public testimony,
9 so now we can go on to Regional Council deliberation. We
10 need a motion to put one of these on the floor.

11
12 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to move that we
13 put WP03-15 on the floor.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wp03-15 on the floor.
16 Do I get a second?

17
18 MS. WELLS: Second.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
21 seconded to put WP03-15 on the floor as written on Page
22 99. This is the one that says the designated hunter
23 system may not be utilized for this hunt, Unit 6(C)
24 moose. Discussion. Mr. Churchill.

25
26 MR. CHURCHILL: Since two of our group
27 are from Cordova, I've been trying to figure out what's
28 driving all this concern. Is it the thing you tend to
29 see when you've got one or two lucky households tend to
30 repeatedly win and everybody is just about ready to fight
31 themselves? I'm not being facetious. Is that what's
32 going on? You just can't regulate luck.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll let Sylvia answer
35 that one.

36
37 MS. LANGE: It just seems that way. The
38 truth is, there already exists a designated hunter system
39 in that hunt. No one talks about it. Somebody came
40 forward and tried to be clean about it and said I need a
41 designated hunter, but I can't tell you how many wives I
42 know of who have shot moose in the last 20 years. And
43 something should be said about having regulations that
44 reflect really what goes on. So I think we do need a
45 designated hunter stipulation. One of the elderly women
46 who needed a designated hunter and got the special
47 provision this last hunt was my aunt and she has
48 literally subsisted on fish and game her entire life.
49 I'd hate to see her not have that opportunity. Also, she
50 shouldn't have to jump through that hoop every time she's

00222

1 lucky enough to get that permit or somebody in her
2 family, so I really see a need for it.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: I've had a lot of
7 interest and there's been a lot of emotion on statewide
8 permit drawings. This really is what this seems to be.
9 I just don't believe we can ever hope to regulate it.
10 I've been hoping for a buffalo for 20 years and I read
11 the same guy gets one about every three years and there's
12 five of us that put in hoping to get one and we haven't
13 gotten one, but I don't see anything we can do about
14 that. To deny a designated hunter system would really
15 create some inequities. As I understand 15, I intend to
16 vote against it.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill, I'll just
19 speak for a second to this, but I also intend to vote
20 against it. I know the intention of the person that put
21 it in. There probably is no community in the state that
22 does as much sharing as Cordova, especially when it comes
23 to moose meat. If you get drawn for a moose in Cordova,
24 and I've told this to my council so many times, you've
25 got the whole community trying to help you get that
26 moose. I mean you can be in town sitting at your desk
27 and you'll get a phone call that says, hey, there's a cow
28 standing by such and such a pond at Mile 9. You know,
29 you've got a permit. Everybody in town knows who has the
30 permits. Everybody in town knows within two hours after
31 the permits came out who was lucky enough to be drawn.
32 So I know the person that put this one in didn't see a
33 need for it when you have that kind of situation already.

34

35 Just like you though, I recognize the
36 fact that a lot of wives in Cordova got drawn for moose
37 that were awful good shots and some of them were awful
38 good shots when they were not anywhere near the moose.
39 That doesn't need to go on. I'm with you, Mr. Churchill.
40 We need laws that reflect what goes on so that the next
41 generation gets in the habit of obeying the laws. In
42 this case here, we have no biological reason not to have
43 something in place, but at the same time we want to make
44 it in such a way that it doesn't invite abuse, it doesn't
45 cause biological problems. So I plan on voting against
46 this one also.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd call the question
49 then.

50

00223

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. All in favor of
2 Proposal 15 signify by saying aye.

3

4 (No aye votes)

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
7 saying nay.

8

9 IN UNISON: Nay.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
12 unanimously. Okay. Now, we don't have any proposal on
13 the table. Is there anybody out there that wishes.....

14

15 MR. JOHN: Mr. Chairman. This is in
16 Sylvia's home area. I would like to know what your
17 preference is. If we do one of these and we get into the
18 discussion of designated hunter being in the family, is
19 that a concern? I would like to hear your version of
20 what you'd like to see for the area.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think he's asking you
23 to put a proposal on the table so we can discuss it.

24

25 MR. JOHN: Right.

26

27 MS. LANGE: I would move for Proposal No.

28 55.

29

30 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
33 seconded for Proposal 55 on the table for discussion.
34 That's as found on 107. I think Fred asked you a
35 question. Did you catch the question he asked you?

36

37 MS. LANGE: I chose No. 55 because I
38 think it's more inclusive and we can work with it to
39 address some of these other concerns that have come up.
40 I recognize a need for a designated hunter in that
41 particular hunt. I don't think there's a conservation
42 concern. I think there's some viable concerns that were
43 brought up about maybe it would attract more people
44 putting in for the hunt, but I think that could be
45 mitigated. In the discussions we've had here about the
46 limit on the possession, there doesn't seem to be any
47 problem with black bear and maybe goat if there was a
48 limit on possession, so I chose this one because it
49 includes those as well and we could address those
50 concerns at the same time. I suspect it's going to get

00224

1 amended.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Sylvia.

4 Fred.

5

6 MR. ELVSAAS: Proposal 55 says the

7 designated hunter has to be in the family. Is that

8 something that is necessary.

9

10 MS. LANGE: If I could address that. I

11 don't think it would hurt anything in 6(C) if it said in

12 the family. I know there was a comment earlier from the

13 Native Village of Chenega, but since they're not from

14 6(C) -- personally, I don't see any problem with 6(C)

15 requiring it to be in the family, especially with that

16 extended family definition.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

19

20 MS. WELLS: While we're discussing 55 and

21 this covers the whole unit, so I'd personally like to see

22 that in the family taken out to accommodate for Chenega.

23

24 MR. LANGE: Mr. Chairman. I didn't think

25 they were covered. I thought this was just 6(C). It's

26 for the whole unit?

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This one is for the

29 whole unit.

30

31 MS. WELLS: Which includes Chenega.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is for all the

34 hunts in the unit, not just the moose hunt.

35

36 MS. LANGE: I see. Pardon me. I

37 misspoke. Well, they say it would cause a hardship for

38 them. I wouldn't see it in our particular area, but if

39 they recommend against it, it wouldn't conversely maybe

40 cause a hardship to pull it out either.

41

42 MS. WELLS: Mr. Chair. If I could

43 address Sylvia. In your area, is there a need for having

44 it only in the family in 6(C)?

45

46 MS. LANGE: Not stipulating that, off the

47 top of my head, I don't know why that would be a burden.

48 I think it was put in there because there was concern

49 that this would open it up to people who ordinarily

50 wouldn't participate in that hunt, who would suddenly

00225

1 start stuffing the ballot box so to speak or getting
2 hunters in that didn't ordinarily -- I don't know why
3 it's in there. I don't think taking it out would be a
4 burden.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan, to answer one
7 question, biologically, it can't make any difference
8 because we're dealing with 20 animals. One of the things
9 that Mr. Churchill brought up is perception. The larger
10 the pool of people putting in for the drawing, the
11 smaller your chances, but in the end there's 20 animals
12 taken. From that standpoint, I could understand where
13 family got in there, it's not going to make much
14 difference one way or the other because unless you're
15 relatively new there you've got such an extended family
16 that they don't have any problem finding somebody to go
17 hunting for them. That would be one if somebody wants to
18 offer an amendment to it, it could be done. Fred.

19
20 MR. JOHN: I have a problem with any
21 wildlife. I don't believe that we should just put
22 everything on the table. I think we should go over it
23 individual. Moose, caribou, individually with the
24 biologist and all the experts here and tell us year by
25 year what's good to hunt, the population and everything.
26 I don't go by any wildlife. It seems like it's kind of a
27 lazy way to do it instead of going to study it and
28 working for it.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Mr.
31 Churchill.

32
33 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to offer an
34 amendment and then speak to it. On Page 107, 55, is to
35 delete the phrase in their family so it would read may
36 designate another Federally-qualified subsistence user to
37 take any wildlife on his or her family in Unit 6. All
38 other parts remain the same.

39
40 MS. WELLS: I will second that.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a second. So we
43 have an amendment on the table to strike in their family.

44
45 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to speak to it.
46 I believe we had comments from the proposer that they
47 would not object to this and they had been in receipt of
48 the concerns from Chenega. Although we don't do this, it
49 would be like a friendly amendment. I haven't heard any
50 testimony that really speaks against it and I think all

00226

1 of us have asked most of the people who testified. I
2 think this would be consistent and remove one of the
3 concerns of Chenega.

4
5 MS. LANGE: Second.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan has already
8 seconded it. You can call the question if nobody has any
9 discussion. Any discussion?

10
11 MS. LANGE: Question.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
14 called on striking in their family. All in favor signify
15 by saying aye.

16
17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
20 saying nay.

21
22 (No opposing votes)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
25 unanimously.

26
27 MR. ELVSAAS: Can I make a comment?

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

30
31 MR. ELVSAAS: In looking at that, I
32 recognize this as a very restricted area, restricted to
33 certain people and so forth, but from my personal
34 experience, if I had to have a designated hunter, I sure
35 wouldn't rely on my family. I wouldn't get the meat.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have one amendment to
38 this. Does anybody wish -- Susan.

39
40 MS. WELLS: I think we should address the
41 wildlife issue as we did in the other one, but also
42 taking into consideration the issue of the black bear and
43 beaver bag limits and I don't know how to do that.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The one way you could do
46 it, Susan, is you could just list the wildlife that you
47 prefer to have on here. You could say moose, deer,
48 beaver and bear if you wanted to. That's one way you
49 could do it.

50

00227

1 MS. WELLS: If we did that, would we keep
2 the two harvest limit?

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, it wouldn't. It
5 wouldn't have any effect on that.

6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: It wouldn't increase or
8 decrease.

9

10 MS. WELLS: But this reads two harvest
11 limit.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's another whole
14 section that we could address as a separate point if we
15 wish to. So you're moving what?

16

17 MS. WELLS: We could take out wildlife
18 and add moose, deer, bear and beaver. Would that
19 suffice?

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know if that
22 would suffice, but they can always add some more with
23 another proposal. The thing you have to remember is
24 this proposal is not done when we're done with it. It
25 goes to the Board and this proposal is open every year
26 for additions or subtractions.

27

28 MS. WELLS: My concern is the people that
29 brought it forward, that they have a designated hunter
30 for the species that they subsist on.

31

32 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a clarification.
33 Are you intending that to be black bear instead of all
34 bear?

35

36 MS. WELLS: Black. Nice catch.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

41

42 MS. LANGE: We're changing wildlife to
43 ungulates, black bear.....

44

45 MS. WELLS: No. To take any moose, deer,
46 black bear or beaver on his or her behalf.

47

48 MS. LANGE: You're not including a bag
49 limit yet, just discussion?

50

00228

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just a discussion. Mr.
2 Churchill.

3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: I thought I did hear a
5 concern, just for the record, about black bear due to
6 increased harvest and I'd just like that clarified.

7
8 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. Tom
9 Carpenter. In my testimony on Proposal 02 earlier, I did
10 speak about there is a concern biologically for black
11 bear in 6(D). 6(D) is Prince William Sound. That is the
12 area that currently had an average harvest of 150 or so
13 bears a year for about the last 20 years. That's the
14 area that has risen to about 400. That's the area where
15 there is some concern. There is no real biological
16 concern in 6(A), 6(B) and 6(C). The committee's opinion
17 is that if you were to include black bear that
18 potentially you really consider what you're doing in
19 Prince William Sound because that's the area where
20 there's concern. Most of the people in Cordova who are
21 going to go get a black bear, most of them are going to
22 get it in either 6(A) or 6(B) or 6(C) where there's not
23 really a problem. I guess that's all I have.

24
25 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Just as
28 a comment, I noticed there are a bunch of black bear
29 proposals to limit black bear in the Board of Game
30 manual, so this concern is extended farther than just
31 subsistence. It's extended into the State Board of Game
32 on black bear. Mr. Churchill.

33
34 MR. CHURCHILL: Looking at this proposal,
35 it says a Federally-qualified subsistence user may
36 designate and what I'm hearing is a lot of the Prince
37 William Sound take is from folks coming out of Anchorage
38 and, like it as I would that we could qualify, we don't.
39 That may not be an issue in 6(D) given that it's
40 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have a tendency to
43 agree with you, Mr. Churchill. I don't think that the
44 subsistence user designated hunter will have a large
45 increase on it. I'm hoping that we do go along like we
46 did to make it more uniform with the one that we passed
47 and we passed a one harvest limit and I don't see any
48 problem at all. I think we could leave it in there.

49
50 MR. CHURCHILL: If there's no more

00229

1 discussion, I'd call the question on the amendment Ms.

2 Wells offered.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For moose, deer, black
5 bear and beaver to replace wildlife. Okay. The question
6 has been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

7

8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by
11 saying nay.

12

13 (No opposing votes)

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
16 unanimously. Do we have any other amendment that we wish
17 to offer? Mr. Churchill.

18

19 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to offer an
20 amendment to replace two harvest limits with the phrase
21 one harvest limit in his or her possession.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Discussion. Do
24 we have a second first of all?

25

26 MS. LANGE: Second.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been seconded by
29 Sylvia. Do we have any discussion on that? It's putting
30 it back in line with what we did on the other one. Fred.

31

32 MR. JOHN: I call the question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
35 called. Somebody wants to get out of here on time. One
36 harvest limit replacing two harvest limits. All in favor
37 signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by
42 saying nay.

43

44 (No opposing votes)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
47 unanimously. Do we have any other amendments you'd like
48 to add?

49

50 MS. LANGE: I'd like to call the question

00230

1 on the main motion.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The question has
4 been called. All in favor of the motion as found on 107
5 as amended signify by saying aye.

6

7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
10 saying nay.

11

12 MR. JOHN: Nay.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll add nay to that
15 one. I think we should have stuck with what we did on
16 No. 02 and limited it to 65, 70 disabled, blind and
17 temporary disabled.

18

19 MR. JOHN: I oppose this because it's a
20 pretty big area and I haven't heard anybody from Chenega,
21 Tatitlek. Those areas are pretty much involved in
22 hunting. That's why I oppose it.

23

24 MS. WELLS: Never mind. I was thinking
25 that maybe we could reconsider this for that, but the
26 vote went for, so I don't know that we can.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Only somebody that voted
29 on the winning side can put it back on the table.

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair. I'd like to
32 bring 55 back up for reconsideration.

33

34 MS. WELLS: I'll second that. And
35 apologize for not catching that.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have to have a
38 vote to bring it back up for reconsideration?

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any discussion? There
43 is no discussion. Just reconsideration, no discussion.
44 Okay. All in favor for bringing it back up signify by
45 saying aye.

46

47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
50 saying nay.

00231

1 MS. LANGE: Nay.

2

3 MR. JOHN: Nay.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries 5/2.
6 Okay. Do we have another amendment?

7

8 MS. WELLS: I'd just like to speak to
9 that. I think that what you said earlier about being
10 consistent with what we did before and having the
11 definition of the recipient for a designated hunter. So
12 adding the terminology of the temporary disabled, 70%
13 disabled, elderly and the blind would clarify that more
14 in that area and specific to those hunts. I would make a
15 motion to mirror that. I don't have it written down. I
16 think it was to add after subsistence user who is
17 elderly, disabled, blind or temporary disabled. Is that
18 correct?

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we had over 65.

21

22 MS. WELLS: Over 65.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: And they don't have to be
25 all five.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

28

29 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
32 seconded. Discussion on this amendment.

33

34 MS. LANGE: Mr. Chairman.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

37

38 MS. LANGE: I speak against the amendment
39 just because I think it further limits subsistence
40 opportunities in the area. It just seems like such an
41 additional layer that I don't think is necessary because
42 it tries to curtail a problem that doesn't exist yet. If
43 there were abuses or something happened that we had to
44 put this layer on, at that time I think it would be
45 warranted. Right now it's just a possibility this could
46 happen, but it hasn't shown up statewide and I don't
47 think it would show up in this area, so I speak against
48 the amendment.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

00232

1 MR. JOHN: Is that the same?

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's the same as what we
4 did on the other one.

5

6 MR. JOHN: I support it.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion?
9 Susan.

10

11 MS. WELLS: I'm not sure how that's
12 adding another layer when we've already done that on
13 Proposal 02.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think I can explain
16 that and you can correct me if I'm wrong, Sylvia. It
17 adds another layer to this proposal right here. There's
18 no guarantee No. 02 will pass and if No. 02 doesn't pass,
19 then they'll be dealing with a specific proposal for a
20 specific area, so it does add another layer to this
21 proposal. If No. 02 passes, this proposal is moot, other
22 than it adds bear and beaver. It doesn't add anything if
23 No. 02 passes. If No. 02 fails, it adds another layer to
24 this one here that we haven't included at this point in
25 time. Sylvia.

26

27 MS. LANGE: Also, I spoke against the
28 amendment as originally presented the first time. I did
29 amend it to soften it up a little and open it up a little
30 by including temporary disabled, but I spoke against it
31 originally as well.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Sylvia. Any
34 further discussion?

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
41 called. All in favor of the amendment signify by saying
42 aye.

43

44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
47 saying nay.

48

49 MS. LANGE: Nay.

50

00233

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 6/1, unless there's an
2 abstention. Motion carries. With that, we have an
3 amended motion in front of us again. Do we need further
4 discussion on the motion as amended?

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
9 called. All in favor of the motion as amended signify by
10 saying aye.

11

12 IN UNISON: Aye.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
15 saying nay.

16

17 MR. JOHN: Nay.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

20

21 MS. LANGE: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. One
24 nay. With that, let's take ourselves a 10-minute break.
25 I have 3:15. When this clock says 10:25, I'm going to
26 hit the gavel.

27

28 (Off record)

29

30 (On record)

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been brought to my
33 attention and I'll just bring it up. We need a consensus
34 from our Council that the action we took on 15, 55 and 02
35 precludes the need for taking action on 16. Is that the
36 consensus of this Council?

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: It is.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, with that in mind,
41 we don't have to take up No. 16. Let's go on to No. 17,
42 which is moose. It's require hunter and firearm
43 qualification. Chuck. Page 147.

44

45 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Council. I'm
46 Chuck Ardizzzone. I'll be presenting the draft analysis
47 for WP03-17. This proposal was submitted by Robert
48 Berceli from Cordova and it would create a new regulation
49 for moose hunting in Unit 6(C), would document residency
50 and establish hunter qualifications, marksmanship

00234

1 competency and minimum firearm specifications.

2

3 Federal public lands comprise 80 percent
4 of Unit 6(C) and are managed by the Forest Service.
5 Rural residents of Units 6(A), (B) and (C) have customary
6 and traditional use determinations for moose in 6(C). In
7 2002, the Federal Subsistence Board received a proposal
8 from George Covell requesting 100 percent of the bull
9 harvest to be a Federal Subsistence draw permit and the
10 season opening date to be changed to September 1 to align
11 with the Federal and State harvest dates. After analyzing
12 the percentage of land in the Federal jurisdiction, a
13 compromise was reached allowing Federal subsistence users
14 to harvest 100 percent of the cow moose harvest
15 allocation and 75 percent of the bull moose harvest
16 allocation by permit for Units 6(C).

17

18 During the 1990s, local residents, Fish &
19 Game and the Copper River-Prince William Sound Advisory
20 Committee developed a Cooperative Moose Management Plan.
21 The current strategies in Unit 6 are a direct result of
22 the MMP. In Unit 6(C), the population is currently
23 estimated at 340 moose and it's considered stable.

24

25 On average, 80 moose are taken annually
26 in Unit 6 with 25 of them being harvested in Unit 6(C).
27 In 2002, 15 bull permits, five cow permits and one permit
28 for the Native Village of Eyak sobriety potlatch were
29 issued for the Federal Subsistence harvest by the Forest
30 Service office in Cordova. These permits were issued by
31 a random drawing of Cordova residents only. There were
32 683 applications received for this drawing, illustrating
33 the popularity of this hunt.

34

35 Effects of this proposal. If adopted, it
36 would make Federal subsistence regulations more
37 restrictive for subsistence users participating in the
38 Federal moose hunt in Unit 6(C) compared to the
39 corresponding State hunt. The proposal would cause
40 Federal Subsistence regulations and State regulations for
41 Unit 6(C) to diverge, which could cause confusion among
42 subsistence users.

43

44 This proposal consists of several
45 different proposed requirements. The first requirement,
46 that all subsistence users in Unit 6(C) be listed in the
47 Alaska Permanent Fund database to prove residency would
48 be more restrictive than the current Federal subsistence
49 regulations.

50

00235

1 The second requirement, that all
2 subsistence users present a State of Alaska hunting
3 license and a Hunter Education Safety Certification card
4 is also more restrictive than the current Federal
5 subsistence and State regulations. Currently,
6 subsistence users need only possess a valid State hunting
7 license to hunt or trap under Federal subsistence
8 regulations.

9
10 The final requirement included in this
11 proposal, a marksmanship competency test, which also
12 includes bullet/rifle requirements, is also more
13 restrictive than current regulations and could limit
14 subsistence opportunities. Currently, there are no
15 marksmanship requirements for any hunt in the State
16 except for restricted weapons hunts, which include
17 archery and muzzleloader hunts. These hunts do have
18 proficiency tests and bullet/broadhead requirements.

19
20 If this proposal was adopted, a totally
21 new program would have to be developed. The program
22 would have to be managed and conducted by the Forest
23 Service in Cordova. Bullet requirements under this
24 proposal would also be restrictive, only allowing
25 subsistence users who have rifles and bullets meeting the
26 requirements to participate in the hunt.

27
28 The biological/conservation effects of
29 this proposal would be minimal. The Federal subsistence
30 moose harvest in Unit 6(C) has occurred for several
31 years. Currently, the hunt is well managed and there are
32 no known resource issues, excessive wounding losses or
33 other problems with the moose population in the Unit
34 6(C).

35
36 Preliminary conclusion is to oppose this
37 proposal. Are there any questions?

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions of Chuck?

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does everybody
44 understand what this proposal does?

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No questions for Chuck.

49
50 (No comments)

00236

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Chuck.

2

3 Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

4

5 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
6 Department's comments on the original proposal are on
7 Page 150 of your meeting book. Regarding the preliminary
8 conclusion by Federal Staff to oppose this proposal,
9 Department supports opposing this proposal for the
10 reasons that Staff presented in their justification.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Terry?

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

17

18 Other Federal, State, Tribal Agency
19 comments.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other Federal Agency
24 wish to comment?

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Milo, do you wish to
29 speak to this at all?

30

31 MR. BURCHAM: No.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other State
34 organization. Tribal. Let's have it now.

35

36 MR. JOHN: He's got it written out, but
37 Proposal 17 is no. Firearm qualification should not be
38 required. Hunter safety course could be required for
39 hunters under 21. In the hunter safety course,
40 additional instruction should be given on land status,
41 easement restriction, regulation changes for current
42 season, basic map reading, learn how to use public office
43 to find this information in the future. Record of this
44 training can support hunter with current regulation and
45 cite it when violation occurs. But to require someone to
46 qualify with a firearm does not make sense.
47 Establishment of hunter safety course is very good, very
48 possible and should be done. Not just youths, adults
49 should have to do this also, but only required to renew
50 every three, four, five years. BLM and NPS both have the

00237

1 material to teach additional information, easement, land
2 status and have people working to address now. Chitina
3 does not support qualification. Chitina does support
4 hunter safety.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. That
7 was from Joe Hart. Fish & Game Advisory Committee
8 comments.

9
10 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 Tom Carpenter, Copper River-Prince William Sound. We are
12 opposed to this proposal as written. The reason we're
13 opposed to it is we feel it's more restrictive than the
14 State law. There's no State requirement in Unit 6 for
15 hunter safety, although we do agree that hunter safety is
16 important, as we've testified earlier, teaching of the
17 youngsters. There's been an unofficial hunter safety
18 program in Cordova for about 25 years. There have been
19 two gentlemen that have taught this class. As soon as
20 the youngsters get into 5th grade, they're eligible to
21 take it. They've been able to get a hunter safety card
22 for about the last 15 years. Basically, the moose hunt
23 that this is talking about is a community moose hunt. It
24 is something that people go out and do with their family
25 and enables the young kids to observe their parents and
26 see how the hunt takes place. So, restricting it any
27 further than that is just not prudent.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom?
32 Okay. Written public comments.

33
34 MS. WILKINSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there
35 are two. One is a resolution from the Kenaitze Indian
36 Tribe and they asked me to read the entire resolution.
37 This is a Tribal resolution in opposition to Federal
38 Subsistence Wildlife Proposal No. 17.

39 Whereas, the Kenaitze Indian Tribe, IRA
40 is a federally-recognized Tribe, pursuant to the Indian
41 Reorganization Act of 1934, as amended for Alaska in
42 1936, and in accordance with the preamble to the Tribal
43 Constitution is responsible for the social and economic
44 welfare of its 1,181 Tribal Members and 2,423 Alaska
45 Native/American Indians within the Kenaitze Indian Tribe,
46 IRA jurisdictional area;

47
48 And, whereas, the Kenaitze Indian Tribe,
49 IRA has established long-term goals which relate to the
50 collective and individual, social, economic and

00238

1 governmental concerns of its people;

2

3 And, whereas, the Kenaitze Indian Tribe,
4 IRA, for most of their history, pursued a way of life
5 dominated by subsistence hunting and fishing on the Kenai
6 Peninsula, and prior to Alaska Statehood depended upon a
7 subsistence lifestyle for their very existence;

8

9 And, whereas, even though many
10 regulations have been imposed upon the subsistence
11 users of wild, renewable resources, most Tribal Members
12 living on the Kenai Peninsula practice a subsistence
13 lifestyle as an important part of their cultural
14 heritage;

15

16 And now, therefore, be it resolved that
17 the Kenaitze Indian Tribe, IRA Executive Committee/Tribal
18 Council, at its regularly scheduled meeting on December
19 13, 2002, has reviewed the Federal Subsistence Wildlife
20 Proposals for 2003-2004 and is strongly opposed to the
21 wording of Proposal No. 17, Unit 6(C) moose, Item (c)
22 pass a marksmanship competency test, which, if passed,
23 will impose more hardship on those Kenaitze Indian Tribal
24 hunters who wish to practice their customary and
25 traditional lifestyle. That was certified by Rosalie
26 Tepp, Tribal chairperson, and Bonnie Juliussen, Tribal
27 secretary.

28

29 The second written comment is a letter
30 from Robert Berceli, the proponent. As the author of
31 this proposal, I wish to provide comments to clarify
32 several points. By the way, I tried to figure out a way
33 to summarize this better and I couldn't, so I'm just
34 reading them. Requirement that the successful applicant
35 be listed in the State of Alaska Permanent Fund database.
36 This was meant to provide an objective and efficient
37 method of determining residency. Lacking this
38 methodology, the successful applicant should have at
39 least to sign an affidavit of residency.

40

41 Requirement for minimum firearm
42 specifications. This was meant to eliminate .243 and
43 .264 caliber and lesser rifles, bullets, cartridges,
44 which generally shoot lesser-weight projectiles at
45 substantial velocities. Taking an animal as large as
46 moose with such cartridges, even with premium bullets by
47 the most competent marksman is little more than a stunt
48 accomplished on the edge of failure. Moderate
49 cartridges, such as 7x57 Mauser, 30-40 Craig and 30-30
50 Winchester would meet the specifications.

00239

1 I also wish to comment on the draft
2 analysis. The preliminary conclusion of the draft
3 analysis is to oppose this proposal. The justification
4 for this conclusion includes, one, Federal regulations
5 would be more restrictive than corresponding State
6 regulations. As 80 percent of the land where this hunt
7 occurs is Federal land and 80 percent of the moose are
8 harvested in the Federal hunt, the restrictive rationale
9 lacks substance. In my view, this reasoning equates to
10 trying to hide behind a fairly scant skirt.

11
12 Number two. Federal regulations would
13 diverge from State regulations, resulting in confusion.
14 This hunt occurs under the authority of permit. I expect
15 the Federal regulations could be summarized and
16 incorporated into the conditions of the permit.
17 Therefore, Staff would have an opportunity to review
18 these regulations with the successful candidate and,
19 thus, avoid confusion.

20
21 Number three. This proposal may limit
22 subsistence opportunities by requiring standards that
23 individuals may not be able to meet and may also impact
24 subsistence activities by requiring individuals to attend
25 classes when they could be gathering, hunting or fishing
26 for subsistence resources. The State of Alaska hunter
27 safety program provides a home study packet and the
28 individual only has to attend a one-day practical and
29 written test. A one-day commitment to not have
30 significant impact upon subsistence-gathering activities.

31
32
33 In regards to standards that individuals
34 may not be able to meet, the State of Alaska hunter
35 education training program was designed for an average
36 student aged 10 or above. An individual with a capacity
37 less than that should not be trusted with the independent
38 use of a firearm. Similarly, an individual who cannot
39 keep five consecutive shots within a 10-inch circle at
40 100 yards should not be trusted to provide a quick and
41 humane kill.

42
43 In the Moon of Painted Leaves, Alaska, A
44 Hunter's Paradise, Russell Anabel stated a bull shot
45 through the barrel will often travel for hours. In a
46 brushy country, will often make a clean getaway. This is
47 from Field & Stream Publishing Company 1936. I fail to
48 understand how regulations that promote education and
49 competence can be regarded as detrimental and
50 unnecessarily burdensome. The benefits of similar

00240

1 regulations applicable to moose in Finland should also
2 apply to moose in Alaska. The Federal Management System
3 could and should do more to promote conservation and
4 welfare of the resource.

5
6 In conclusion, this proposal was drafted
7 with the consultation of local, Federal and State
8 wildlife biologists as well as the hunter safety program
9 instructors. This proposal is founded on the fact that
10 this hunt is restricted to local residents and that local
11 resources are available to achieve its goal. I hope you
12 will consider this proposal in the best interest of the
13 wildlife resource and that it is even more applicable in
14 light of proposals to include this hunt under provisions
15 of the Federal designated hunter harvest permit.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Ann. Do we
18 have any public testimony?

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody want to say
23 that they were not consulted?

24
25 MR. CHURCHILL: Or that consultation was
26 misrepresented.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I can see what he's
29 getting at. There's no question. And the day may come
30 when that's necessary. It's an awful big step to take
31 for the first step. So, do we have any public testimony
32 that are speaking to this proposal right here? I guess
33 maybe what everybody needs to do is when they go home
34 they need to ask themselves whether they can pass this
35 themselves. No public testimony. We have an opportunity
36 to put a motion on the table to consider this and discuss
37 it.

38
39 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to make a motion
40 that we discuss Wildlife Proposal 03-17 on page 147.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you get a second?

43
44 MR. ELVSAAS: Second.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
47 seconded to adopt Proposal 17.

48
49 MR. CHURCHILL: I don't think any of us
50 are going to argue that we shouldn't be safe, ethical

00241

1 hunters that do our very best for a quick, clean kill.
2 However, another criteria that I was offered when I first
3 started in this process by an elder is that he advised me
4 in any of these things I have to determine if it's
5 necessary, if it's understandable and is it enforceable.
6 I've kept those to heart and I can't say that this meets
7 any of those requirements. At least my experience, I
8 think there's some real inaccuracies about the caliber of
9 weapons he's saying are necessary for catching these
10 animals. I think it's well-meaning, but I think it fails
11 on those three criterion that have always served me well.
12 I intend to vote against it.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have a
15 comment on it? I have to say that I disagree with Mr.
16 Churchill on a couple points. I do believe that it is
17 enforceable. I'll go along with you that it's not
18 necessary. I don't think it's in the best interest of
19 the subsistence hunter. I recognize that, you know, in
20 other places they do have things like this in place and
21 they have worked. I don't think we're at a point where
22 we need it and I plan on voting against it. I do like,
23 especially when I'm dealing with the Cordova hunt, I do
24 like the idea of having some kind of basis for
25 establishing residency.

26

27 Cordova is one of those places that,
28 again, we're dealing with a small number of animals, a
29 limited population of people and just as we've talked
30 about Delta growing, there's a real chance that in the
31 next few years things are going to change in Cordova for
32 a temporary basis. There's roads to be built, things to
33 be opened up and what's working today may not work at
34 that point in time, but at that point in time we can
35 bring proposals forward, so I intend to vote against this
36 one, too. Any other comments? Sylvia.

37

38 MS. LANGE: Just a quick one. I'm glad
39 to hear comments on the record about the excellent hunter
40 safety courses that are available in Cordova. My family
41 has been a part of that and it's been really helpful for
42 the kids.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I hate to always be
45 patting Cordova on the back, but the communication
46 between the management and the people of Cordova and
47 things like that are a real example for other places in
48 the state. They have worked together to come up with
49 management plans and everything from Fish & Game.
50 They've worked with management and they've worked with

00242

1 each other. Just like this hunter safety thing, there's
2 always something there to volunteer to put something like
3 that in place. Like I said, I hate to always be patting
4 it on the back, using it for an example, but there's a
5 lot of example that can be taken from it. With that,
6 Bob.

7

8 MR. CHURCHILL: One quick comment. I
9 fully understand you can enforce almost anything. I was
10 speaking on a more pragmatic basis. With that, I'll call
11 the question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
14 called on Proposal WP03-17. All in favor signify by
15 saying aye.

16

17 (No aye votes)

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
20 saying nay.

21

22 IN UNISON: Nay.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Proposal fails. Let's
25 go on to WP03-18.

26

27 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chairman, 18 was
28 withdrawn by the proponent.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 18 is withdrawn. So
31 we're on Proposal 19?

32

33 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, we are. Proposal
34 19 is submitted by Tom Carpenter and it adds a
35 requirement of residency for one year in either Unit
36 6(A), 6(B) or 6(C) prior to applying for a permit in the
37 Unit 6(C) moose hunt. I think we've heard a lot about
38 the Unit 6(C) moose hunt, so we know where the territory
39 is in Unit 6(C) and who has customary and traditional use
40 determinations. The change was proposed on Page 166 to
41 provide exact language to use for qualifying participants
42 in the 6(C) moose hunt and to prevent transient people
43 from moving to an area that is known to have trophy
44 animals and, thus, taking away subsistence opportunity
45 from the local residents.

46

47 This is a durational residency
48 requirement where you require someone to live in the
49 community for certain years and he cites similar
50 requirements for the Park Service. With those durational

00243

1 requirements, it's a proposed action by the Wrangell-St.
2 Elias SRC that would have a minimum residency of one year
3 for resident zone communities and then the Denali
4 National Park has recommended a minimum residency
5 requirement of three years in Cantwell for hunting
6 eligibility. They aren't exactly in regulation yet.
7 What is in regulation is on page 166 and that's our
8 definition of resident there. The way we qualify people
9 to participate in the 6(C) hunt is being a resident as
10 defined here because those residents have customary and
11 traditional use determinations.

12

13 So a resident means any person who has
14 his or her primary, permanent home for the previous 12
15 months within Alaska and whenever absent from this
16 primary, permanent home, has the intention of returning
17 to it. And then it lists the various factors that could
18 be used to determine that residency.

19

20 Because those are the criteria that our
21 program concurrently uses for residency, we would oppose
22 this proposal because those are the constraints we use.
23 Those constraints are in place because the way residency
24 has been used. This definition is used by our program.
25 It is a concession to the fact that rural Alaskans are
26 highly transient, traveling for purposes of earning cash
27 income, health reasons and educational purposes,
28 oftentimes involving the whole household in these
29 transitions. The adoption of this proposal would place
30 unnecessary burdens on the subsistence user and just
31 because it would change the residency requirement that's
32 in place.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Pat.
35 Mr. Churchill.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: I find it real
38 interesting your remarks about it's really common for
39 entire families to move or have extended periods of time
40 between communities, move long distances. Is it more
41 common in one area than another? Can you just give me
42 some specifics on what that's based on?

43

44 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think it's a left-over
45 from when the regulation was put in place in 1991 when
46 that definition was adopted. It's for health purposes
47 and income. I don't have statistics. I remember some
48 papers where people -- it's just a transitional
49 household. Right now I don't have any statistics. I
50 could find out any literature that supports it.

00244

1 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd be appreciative of
2 that because I'm not sure that's a major factor currently
3 or maybe ever was.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
8 Pat? I have a question, Pat. While this is the current
9 Federal definition of resident, there haven't been any
10 exceptions made to that, only exceptions proposed, right?

11

12 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And there are a couple
15 other exceptions on the table that are proposed to change
16 that for limited areas?

17

18 MS. PETRIVELLI: It's just for the Park
19 Service regulations, not our regulations. The Park
20 Service operates under -- we have our regulations and
21 then the Park Service has a whole set of different
22 regulations. As far as modifying our residency
23 requirement, there is none.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there are no
26 proposals before you to modify yours, but that doesn't
27 preclude the fact that proposals could be made for
28 individual isolated areas, such as Cordova, the same as
29 they're being made for the Park. It wouldn't change all
30 of your regulations if you had a unit-specific
31 regulation. Would a unit-specific regulation be a
32 possibility?

33

34 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, currently, that
35 resident definition is in the Subpart A portion of our
36 regulations.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you can't chance that
39 with a unit-specific proposal.

40

41 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think Bill Knauer
42 would have to answer that question.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, could you answer
45 that? If we can't, then there's no sense going on. If
46 we can, then we need to discuss this further.

47

48 MR. KNAUER: Would you care to repeat
49 your question, please.

50

00245

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question that I'm
2 asking, Bill, is since the Federal definition of resident
3 of an area is in Subpart A, do we even have the option
4 through this Board process of putting an exception in
5 place for a specific unit or specific area? Do we even
6 have the option to consider that or is it a moot point?

7
8 MR. KNAUER: It's moot because the
9 definition is a definition that's been established by the
10 secretary.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that's a
13 definition that's been established by the secretary that
14 we can't override.

15
16 MR. KNAUER: That's correct.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In that case, there's no
19 sense in us even dealing with this proposal, is there?

20
21 MR. KNAUER: You could certainly make a
22 recommendation to the Board and you could put a
23 recommendation, if you so chose, into your annual report.
24 That would be the prerogative of this Council no matter
25 what.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That's the
28 question I was trying to ask. When I got it out of
29 Subpart A, I thought there was just nothing we could do,
30 but we really can't do anything other than we can act on
31 this because that states our opinion.

32
33 MR. KNAUER: That's correct.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Any
36 other questions for Pat?

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

41
42 MR. CHURCHILL: This is more of a
43 procedure issue. Given the fact that we can't change it,
44 is this something we might want to defer to the end of
45 the meeting and put our thoughts as a RAC in letter form
46 to the Board? This might be something we could
47 deliberate and put some correspondence together, since we
48 don't have the authority to act upon it, to the Federal
49 Subsistence Board. Might that not be a way to handle it?
50

00246

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That would be a way to
2 handle it if that's the Council's wish. What's the wish
3 of the rest of the Council? Should we go through the
4 procedure on WPO3-19 or shall we put it on the end and
5 put it in our annual report. Sylvia.

6
7 MS. LANGE: Mr. Chairman. I'm just
8 concerned that we have the author of the proposal here
9 and I don't know if he's going to be here till the end.
10 Maybe we should contact people who are here to testify
11 based on this.

12
13 MR. JOHN: We could bring him forward,
14 sure.

15
16 MS. LANGE: There you go. Because I
17 would like to hear what they have to say on it.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As the Chair, my
20 personal opinion is we might as well just go through it
21 because if we go through it, then we've stated our
22 opinion and it's on the record. But if it's the wish of
23 the Council to not proceed any farther with this, we can.

24
25 MR. JOHN: I don't want to proceed any
26 further on this.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't want to
29 proceed?

30
31 MR. JOHN: Yeah.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's get a consensus.

34
35 MR. ELVSAAS: How much testimony are you
36 looking at here? The sponsor?

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The sponsor, the Fish &
39 Game and that's about it on this one here.

40
41 MR. ELVSAAS: Let's go through the motion
42 then and get it over with.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

45
46 MS. WELLS: I think we should also go
47 through it.

48
49 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll withdraw my request.
50 At this point, it would be much quicker probably to

00247

1 proceed with it even though we can't actually act on it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have one that
4 wished not to proceed. Fred, can we reach a consensus?

5 Can we run through it? We'll leave it up to you.

6

7 MR. JOHN: Let's go with the majority of
8 this Council.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. In that
11 case, we'll proceed with it. Terry.

12

13 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Department of
14 Fish & Game comments on the original Proposal 19 are
15 found on Page 164 of your Council meeting book. Several
16 proposals in your book deal with Unit 6(C) moose and,
17 obviously, there's some concern and interest about
18 management of that hunt. One idea that could be
19 considered to limit eligibility for the Unit 6(C) moose
20 hunt is to, as I mentioned earlier today, limit
21 eligibility to one application per household. Since
22 demand for drawing permits for this hunt is greater than
23 the allowable harvest, I also would repeat something I
24 mentioned earlier and that is that the Council may wish
25 to discuss if this hunt should be administered consistent
26 with the provisions, Section 804 of ANILCA.

27

28 As a general rule, the Department does
29 not support imposition of residency requirements as
30 proposed here beyond residency requirements already
31 required to obtain a resident hunting license.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
34 questions for Terry?

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Any
39 other Federal, State or Tribal Agencies that wish to
40 comment on this one?

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish & Game Advisory
45 Committee comments. Mike, I'm sorry, I was too fast.

46

47 MR. LAMBERT: My comment in regards to
48 this proposal would be to not address it, like you're
49 discussing, but the idea of supporting a limited entry, a
50 drawing in the moose hunt in Unit 6(C), since that's come

00248

1 up several times on record, even though it's not being
2 discussed in a proposal, the Native Village of Eyak does
3 not support that. I just wanted that on the record.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of public
6 written comments.

7
8 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, there are
9 no written comments.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are no written
12 comments. Okay, Tom.

13
14 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 Tom Carpenter, Cordova. I'll make this brief. As this
16 Council is quite aware, the Cordova moose hunt is a
17 luxury if you get drawn once in a lifetime. There's been
18 a lot of concern in the community there's going to be a
19 tremendous amount of construction, State and Federal
20 projects that are going to be taking place in Cordova in
21 the next five to 10 years. The reason this 6(C) cow and
22 bull hunt is a Federal subsistence hunt is Cordova came
23 to the Regional Council and the Federal Board three years
24 ago and requested that it be there because we did not
25 want the moose that were harvested in Cordova to be taken
26 out of town and that was a trend that was progressing and
27 it had gotten to the point where over 50 percent of the
28 moose that were harvested in this small hunt were taken
29 out of Cordova.

30
31 To get straight to the point, I
32 understand you cannot take any action on this proposal,
33 but I ask this question to the Council. If this is the
34 forum that public citizens have to come and request a
35 change, I guess I ask the Council or I ask the US Fish &
36 Wildlife Service what is the forum? Is it supposed to be
37 a political forum in which an individual writes a letter
38 to the Secretary of Interior requesting that he interrupt
39 his horrendous schedule to discuss something that happens
40 in a town in Alaska with a population of 2000? I think
41 very reluctantly the process would be put under the table
42 and it would never be discussed.

43
44 This is very important to the town of
45 Cordova, as many of the issues are important to the
46 places you live. I think it's very consistent requesting
47 a one-year requirement. I guess the point of contention
48 that I have is that we're dealing with Federally-
49 qualified users that have a C&T for specific areas and I
50 think the Federal regulation reads today a resident is a

00249

1 person where with primary residence for the previous 12
2 months in Alaska. Not all Alaskans have a C&T use. If
3 your house is in Anchorage, you do not have a C&T for
4 moose in Cantwell or Seldovia or Cordova. I think it is
5 pertinent and I think it should be addressed that if you
6 have a C&T for a certain specific herd and if it's a
7 requirement that a town be part of the C&T, that there be
8 a minimum requirement for that community.
9

10 Our contention is that if there is not a
11 minimum requirement for residency in a community like
12 this, that when these transient people from Anchorage and
13 Fairbanks and wherever else around the state decide
14 they're going to take the job in Cordova and they walk
15 into the U.S. Forest Service building and say I want a
16 drawing permit, they're going to give them one. When 25
17 percent of those animals start being taken out of the
18 town, then we, as subsistence users on a herd of animals
19 that we brought to town, when we ultimately lose from
20 both the State system and the Federal system, what's the
21 point of having any system at all? That's where my point
22 is. That's all I have.
23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom?
25 Mr. Churchill.
26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Tom, I couldn't agree
28 more. My impression is that you're at the right place
29 and we ought to take this issue on to the Federal
30 Subsistence Board. You're not alone in this concern with
31 folks moving within Alaska and from outside of Alaska. I
32 guess, more specifically, are these folks that are coming
33 in, does it include people that are theoretically moving
34 in from the south 48 or other places? Does that make up
35 a significant part of the population?
36

37 MR. CARPENTER: Well, there is a Federal
38 regulation as written that you must be a resident of
39 Alaska for at least 12 months. There has been in the
40 past few years and there will continue to be for quite
41 some time these large projects that are going to bring
42 construction companies and what have you in from around
43 the state and, legally, under the law, those people would
44 qualify to hunt a moose herd that they don't have a C&T
45 use for because they're not a permanent resident of
46 Cordova.
47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Follow-up, Mr.
49 Churchill.
50

00250

1 MR. CHURCHILL: The reason I asked that
2 is I'm familiar with some projects up towards Northway
3 and Delta where people will come in and it's a two or
4 three-year project and once they hit that magic 12 months
5 -- and that's been a noticeable problem in those areas
6 and I'm just wondering if part of this we may be able to
7 address on that piece, but I'm hearing no. The big
8 concern is mostly people from within Alaska who already
9 have that 12-month living here that you're concerned
10 about.

11
12 MR. CARPENTER: Primarily that's the
13 problem. Just one other point to bring up is Cordova
14 looks upon this as a meat hunt. This is putting food in
15 the freezer. If you ask anybody else around the state,
16 this is the ultimate trophy area for moose hunting in
17 Alaska. We have the biggest bulls in the state with the
18 biggest racks and that's a point of contention. We
19 don't consider it a trophy hunt. This is about
20 subsistence for us and that's all it's about.

21
22 MR. CHURCHILL: If this Council was able
23 to write a letter to the Subsistence Board with your
24 concerns maybe addressing some of the Cantwell concerns,
25 would that meet your need? Would that be what you would
26 like us to do?

27
28 MR. CARPENTER: I would be in favor of
29 this Council addressing this issue in any way possible.
30 If this Council doesn't take up the issue for myself and
31 people of Cordova and, likewise, people of Cantwell, then
32 who is going to? So I think if you would draft something
33 and present this that it's a serious concern for some of
34 these communities in Alaska to the Federal Subsistence
35 Board, if they request that the Secretary address this
36 issue, there's a lot more likelihood that it's going to
37 be at least looked at.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

40
41 MR. CHURCHILL: Tom, for the record,
42 could you share with us your involvement in fish and game
43 issues both in the Cordova area from positions you've
44 held and the time you've been involved in those.

45
46 MR. CARPENTER: I've been the co-chair of
47 the Copper River-Prince William Sound Advisory Committee
48 for 10 years. I was a part of the committee when we
49 developed a moose management plan for the entire unit, as
50 requested by the State Board of Game. I believe Mr.

00251

1 Lohse might have been on the Advisory Committee at that
2 time. It's a very important thing. It was developed by
3 a biologist from the region, both Federal and State and
4 numerous local participation. It's a very important
5 issue and I think it needs to be address.

6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: For the record, how long
8 have you personally participated in this hunt?

9

10 MR. CARPENTER: I've participated in this
11 hunt about as long as I've lived in Cordova, about 15
12 years.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. No more
15 questions.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

18

19 MS. WELLS: I have no doubt what your
20 concerns are, but you made a statement if I were to move
21 to Cordova come fall time I could go to the Office of
22 Subsistence Management and want a moose permit and get
23 it. This Federal Register says that subsistence means
24 the customary and traditional use by rural Alaska
25 residents of wild game. I currently live in what is
26 labeled an urban area. If I'm moving from an urban to
27 rural area, you're saying the 12 month is not in effect.

28

29 MR. CARPENTER: Basically the way it
30 would work is that an individual who has lived in Alaska
31 for 12 months qualifies. To participate in this hunt,
32 you must be a resident of Cordova. You must call Cordova
33 your domicile. Say you've lived in Alaska for 12 months
34 and you move to Cordova with a construction outfit, you
35 could walk into the Forest Service building, tell them
36 that you are going to have Cordova become your permanent
37 residency, as long as you've lived in Alaska for 12
38 months, they have to give you a permit application. Four
39 months later when the construction project ends and
40 you've already harvested the moose, where is the moose
41 meat going? Back to your regular residency. It's a
42 loophole in the law and we think it needs to be addressed
43 and I think your point is the loophole that we're talking
44 about.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

47

48 MS. WELLS: Maybe Pat or Bill can help us
49 on this. I wonder why it is not something that this
50 Council can address.

00252

1 MR. CARPENTER: If you go to the Federal
2 manager and tell them that Cordova is your home of
3 residency, theoretically, as long as you've been in
4 Alaska 12 months, you do have a customary and traditional
5 use.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat.

8
9 MS. PETRIVELLI: I know it sounds odd,
10 but we make C&T use determinations based on community use
11 patterns. It's not done in an individual basis. When
12 you walk into Cordova, you have to say you intend to be a
13 permanent resident, much like when you do a Permanent
14 Fund Dividend application. The law only recognizes the
15 intent of the individual. Once you say you intend to
16 become a resident of that community, we take it on faith
17 that you're a member of the community and thereby you're
18 eligible to have the C&T uses.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: It may not be right, but
21 it's legal.

22
23 MS. WELLS: That's the focus of this
24 Council, to try to stop some of these loopholes or to
25 clarify questions that come up. If you look at the
26 resource as well, you're increasing the impact on that
27 resource. I think having a loophole like this is
28 detrimental, not only to the resource but to the
29 subsistence user. I find that really frustrating sitting
30 here on this side of the table not being able to do
31 anything about this atrocity.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan, I'm going to call
34 Bill Knauer to explain it. My understanding is we can do
35 something. It won't happen through the Board, but we can
36 forward our opinion on this and it could start something,
37 but I don't think the Board itself will handle it. Bill.

38
39 MR. KNAUER: The Board would handle a
40 recommendation to the Secretary, but there is something I
41 need to point out. Let's say Mr. Carpenter took a job
42 and moved to Fairbanks. After being up there he decided
43 that, no, that job was not to his liking and he moved
44 back to Cordova. He would not be eligible to participate
45 in this hunt. Mr. Lohse, who lived in the area for many,
46 many years, if he moved back, would not be eligible for
47 the first year. An elder in the Eyak Tribe moved to
48 Anchorage to be with a son or a daughter. The elder
49 moved back to Cordova to be with friends and family
50 there. That individual would not be eligible.

00253

1 When we first were developing these
2 regulations, we looked at local residency options. We
3 were advised by Council that Alaska residents, both
4 Native and non-Native, move on a regular basis throughout
5 the state for various reasons. To restrict Alaska
6 residents to one particular location would deprive valid
7 subsistence users of the opportunity to participate and
8 that's why the regulations have a definition of residency
9 and also a requirement that requires they be an Alaska
10 resident. That does qualify for the one-year residency
11 in Alaska, but it does not restrict the customary
12 subsistence users from participating in hunts where they
13 and their family may have participated for many, many
14 years.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any
17 questions for Bill?

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill.

22
23 I think you explained something between
24 you and Pat that C&T doesn't go with the individual. One
25 thing you forgot to add was except in Park Service
26 regulations where an individual can have C&T. All the
27 other times it goes with an area or community. I know
28 this is something that Cantwell has brought up and the
29 SRC in Wrangell-St. Elias has brought up. If I remember
30 right, I think part of it was even over Park Service
31 employees who can move into an area and actually be
32 eligible to hunt in the park once they move there and I
33 think that was one of the reasons it was suggested to
34 just not have that kind of stigma. So it's a problem.

35
36 We can act on this proposal or we cannot
37 act on this proposal, we can state our opinion on it if
38 we think it's something that needs to be addressed. A
39 motion to put the proposal unless Tom's got more to say.

40
41 MR. CARPENTER: No. I'd just like to
42 thank the Regional Council for the chance to testify
43 because I do think it's important that we, as individuals
44 in these communities, have a place to come and voice our
45 concerns. The way the Federal process is set up, this is
46 the first point of origin for my concerns. I think it's
47 important that the concerns be brought to the Federal
48 Subsistence Board. They can do what they want with them,
49 but a recommendation from you voices very highly your
50 opinion that we need to have a process that works. I

00254

1 think this is the right format and the right time to
2 change something like this.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Do we
7 have any other public testimony? I don't have any slips
8 in front of me.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, we'll go on
13 to the Council. Oh, you've got one, John?

14

15 MR. JOHN: Yes, this proposal should be
16 like the State system, match their requirement. Lots of
17 discussion at recent Board of Fish meeting in Cordova.
18 What is currently in State regs, fair and what will work.
19 If a problem arises, we can address, amend, in a year.
20 Chitina supports this proposal.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Susan.

23

24 MS. WELLS: There is the option, if I
25 understand, to put this proposal on the table and vote it
26 up or down or we could make a motion to recommend that
27 the Board take up the issue of residency as it applies
28 locally and globally.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The Board will take this
31 proposal up one way or the other, with or without our
32 recommendation. This is a proposal that's going before
33 the Board. This is our opportunity to either state
34 support or opposition to it or make a different request.
35 Ann.

36

37 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. I would
38 just like to point out it isn't an either/or matter. You
39 could take action on this and make a recommendation
40 through this proposal and write a letter and make note in
41 the annual report or however you want.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Ann. Sylvia,
44 did you have your hand up? If you didn't, Fred John did.
45 I'll get him first.

46

47 MR. JOHN: I'd like to make a motion and
48 vote in favor of this proposal and write a letter to the
49 Board.

50

00255

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So right now what you'd
2 like to do is make a motion to put this proposal on the
3 table, right?

4

5 MR. JOHN: Yes.

6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
10 seconded to put Proposal 19 on the table. Now we can
11 discuss it. Fred, I'll let you continue since you made
12 the motion.

13

14 MR. JOHN: What I'd like to do is without
15 any addition or anything, just vote on it the way it is
16 and then write a letter, too.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion?
19 Susan.

20

21 MS. WELLS: I appreciate what Mr. Knauer
22 said about protecting the rights of the subsistence user.
23 It's seemingly protected in the regulations so that if I
24 make a choice to move from one location to another, I
25 don't have to wait a year. The potential for abuse of
26 that seems to me to outweigh the problem. The abuse
27 becomes a major problem. So I would like to see
28 implementing some type of requirement in favor of the
29 subsistence user just in access alone to the resource. I
30 would vote in favor of this and hopefully it will go
31 forward.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

34

35 MS. LANGE: Mr. Chairman. I speak in
36 favor of the motion, recognizing it's probably advisory
37 in nature after listening to the advice of Council. I
38 would hope that the Board would look at some sort of
39 mechanism on an area by area basis that they can create
40 exceptions to this residency requirement as long as it's
41 more stringent as opposed to loosening them up on an as-
42 needed basis. I think there are hot spots in the state
43 that would like to look at this and come up with their
44 own requirements that tighten the rules up for the very
45 reasons that Mr. Carpenter brought up. It is a serious
46 concern in this limited harvest in 6(C) and it definitely
47 has to be addressed. I speak in favor of the motion.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What you're saying is
50 you recognize there are areas of concern where more

00256

1 stringent regulations are in order.

2

3 MS. LANGE: Correct.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anyone else wish to
6 speak to the motion? Fred.

7

8 MR. ELVSAAS: I always thought to be
9 eligible you had to be there a year. I agree it has to
10 be residents of Cordova, not somebody that is a resident
11 of Alaska and moved to Cordova two days before the season
12 started and said I'm eligible for C&T and get in on the
13 drawing. I really have to support Mr. Carpenter. If you
14 haven't lived in Cordova a year prior to getting the
15 permit, I don't think you should be hunting. I think it
16 should be for the people of the area.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: I am in favor of this.
21 However, I think it's a really unique sort of situation
22 where it's fairly geographically isolated, it's a limited
23 hunt and I would be really concerned with broader
24 application where we'd end up essentially branding moose
25 populations. I'm not being facetious. I was raised in
26 an area where there were issues of shots fired over deer
27 populations. I think this speaks to a real need. I'm
28 just concerned with a broader application. I intend to
29 vote for it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have to say that I
32 agree with Sylvia. I don't think this is something that
33 needs to be broadly applied everywhere, but I do
34 recognize that there are certain situations either for
35 appearance or for need that something like this may have
36 to be done. At this point in time, I feel what we're
37 doing is stating an opinion and it's advisory. I don't
38 expect to see anything come out of this, but it could.
39 With that said, I plan on supporting this proposal also.

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

42

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

45

46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
49 saying nay.

50

00257

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
4 unanimously. With that, it's 4:35. We're going on to
5 Proposal 20. We have a gentleman in the audience that is
6 here specifically to testify to this, so if we could all
7 go without a break long enough to get to public
8 testimony, we will do that.

9

10 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chairman, Proposal
11 20 was submitted by Timothy O'Brien of Kenai and he
12 requests a positive customary and traditional use
13 determination for moose in Unit 15 for residents of the
14 roadless areas of Unit 15. He lives in a roadless area
15 of Unit 15(A), which is just a little bit -- there's
16 three non-rural areas on the Kenai Peninsula and they're
17 on page 179. He is a rural resident, so he's requesting
18 a C&T for moose in 15.

19

20 There is positive determinations for the
21 residents of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and
22 Seldovia for Unit 15 moose. The Federal lands in Unit 15
23 are the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, which is about
24 52.4 percent.

25

26 In 1992, when the State adopted
27 regulations based upon existing State customary and
28 traditional use determinations, on the Kenai Peninsula
29 the State recognized the non-road connected communities
30 of Nanwalek and Port Graham as having C&T use of moose in
31 an area in the extreme southwest of Unit 15(C). The
32 road-connected portion of the Kenai Peninsula was
33 determined by the State of Alaska to be a non-subsistence
34 area. After an extensive Federal process involving data
35 gathering, public hearings and court decisions, in 1996
36 the current positive determinations for Unit 15 moose for
37 Nanwalek, Ninilchik, Port Graham and Seldovia were made.
38 Decisions on the remaining species and communities were
39 deferred. No decisions have been made since 1996.

40

41 For the communities involved, on page 177
42 there's a chart showing population numbers. The
43 communities that were looked at that could potentially
44 use moose were the communities -- for comparison
45 purposes, data is included about the poor communities
46 that do have C&T and then the ones who don't. I looked
47 at the use of moose by Whittier, which is located in
48 6(D), Cooper Landing, Hope and Sunrise, which is located
49 in Unit 7, and then in Unit 15 I looked at the uses by
50 Fritz Creek East, Voznesenka, Happy Valley, Halibut Cove,

00259

1 well, under Factor 4, it's discussed with the permit
2 history and then -- but where we do have matrix questions
3 in 1998, they ask questions for just one year when they
4 looked at Federal and non-Federal areas and that's shown
5 on Table 4 on Page 193 and that's just for those study
6 communities. When they just asked about the use for one
7 year, a lot of the communities only showed non-Federal
8 use and limited use of Federal areas, but when they
9 showed 10 years, there was a more broadening of the use
10 and that kind of highlights the problem with some of
11 those household surveys, is you're capturing one year of
12 use and that doesn't reflect a pattern or a community's
13 actual use.

14

15 When you actually look at the permit data
16 for those communities in Table 6, it shows -- of course,
17 it's only A, B and C, but it shows a more broad
18 participation throughout the unit, but there's still a
19 general pattern that could be shown. It's broader of the
20 sub-unit they're in and then they use the neighboring
21 sub-unit and then very minimal unit of the very farthest
22 sub-unit away. The basis of looking at those patterns of
23 use, I made the recommendations of the following by a
24 sub-unit basis. Because Cooper Landing showed --
25 Whittier was left out completely, so I'll just start with
26 them and you won't see them in the recommendation at all
27 because they just had minimal use of 15(A) because in
28 permit data it just showed that one permit was issued for
29 15(A) and one permit was issued 15(B) over a 17-year
30 period and the mapping was just a slight sliver of use,
31 so they were just left out completely for the
32 determinations.

33

34 For 15(A), I recommended residents of
35 Units 15(A) and 15(B) and residents of Hope, Cooper
36 Landing, Ninilchik and Seldovia. For 15(B), I
37 recommended residents of 15(B) and 15(A) and residents of
38 Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia. For
39 15(C), it's residents of 15(C) and 15(B). Ninilchik,
40 Nanwalek and Port Graham and Seldovia are in 15(C) and I
41 just included them for the purposes of comparison with
42 the original C&T determinations.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Pat?
45 Mr. Churchill.

46

47 MR. CHURCHILL: Pat, thank you. I'm
48 looking at Table 2, when you say per capita pounds,
49 you're saying per capita per household rather than per
50 individual?

00260

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's per capita per
2 individual.

3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: So, in Nanwalek, each
5 individual averaged the consumption of 254 pounds?
6

7 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's harvested. It's
8 per capita harvested. That's an average per capita
9 harvest.

10
11 MR. CHURCHILL: So the same holds true
12 with Table 3?
13

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Per capita pounds,
15 that's all subsistence resources, so that's when -- in
16 the household use studies, they estimate -- that's a per
17 capita pounds harvested on an annual basis. In Table 2,
18 it's all resources and Table 3 is moose only.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: So I'm correct in
21 understanding that Table 2 tells me that each individual
22 in the household in Nanwalek harvest 254 pounds of
23 subsistence resources annually.

24
25 MS. PETRIVELLI: Not that they harvested,
26 but per individual in a community. Every man, woman and
27 child, that many pounds of subsistence resources were
28 harvested for that individual. Not that they harvested
29 it themselves.

30
31 MR. CHURCHILL: I understand that. And
32 the same is true limited to moose in Table 3.

33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

35
36 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat, can I ask you a
39 question. When you say residents, you're not just
40 meaning residents, you're meaning Federally-qualified
41 residents, right?

42
43 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. And I meant to put
44 that in. But our regulations only apply to rural
45 residents, so it would be just the rural residents.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it doesn't apply to
48 the urban residents that are in those units. The fact
49 that they live in Unit 15(A) or 15(B), if they live in an
50 urban area, then they.....

00261

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: If they live in a non-
2 rural area.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Non-rural. That's
5 right. If they live in a non-rural area, then this
6 doesn't apply for them.

7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: No.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

11
12 MR. CHURCHILL: So I'm looking at Table
13 1. That figure under Nanwalek it says 2001 population is
14 177. Is that limited to the rural folks that we're
15 talking about?

16
17 MS. PETRIVELLI: All the residents of
18 Nanwalek are rural.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: So if I took 177, used
21 that as a multiplier with either Table 2 or Table 3....

22
23 MS. PETRIVELLI: Then you would know the
24 estimated pounds of moose harvested by the community.

25
26 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any
29 questions for Pat? Pretty quiet, Pat. Alaska Department
30 of Fish & Game.

31
32 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33 The Department recommends that action on this proposal be
34 deferred until after the revised rural/non-rural
35 determinations are made for the Kenai Peninsula. For
36 this reason, we're taking a neutral position on the
37 preliminary conclusion as presented. We do have several
38 comments on the preliminary conclusion that I'd like to
39 provide you.

40
41 First, as you've just discussed, the
42 proposed C&T findings should be modified to apply to
43 rural residents of the various sub-units since not all of
44 the Kenai Peninsula is a rural area. The proposed
45 finding for Unit 15(C) could be revised to read rural
46 residents of 15(C) and 15(B) since the forenamed
47 communities are located in this sub-unit. Information is
48 presented in this analysis showing that Whittier has used
49 a small portion of Unit 15(A) for moose hunting, as Pat
50 pointed out. However, Whittier is not included for

00262

1 inclusion in the C&T finding. We question that.
2 Evidence presented to support a positive C&T finding for
3 Seldovia in Unit 15(A) and 15(B) and for Nanwalek and
4 Port Graham in Unit 15(B) is very limited. So those are
5 suggestions we'd have for strengthening the content of
6 this analysis because the information that has been
7 presented in our judgment doesn't constitute recommending
8 a positive C&T finding for some of these communities.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Terry?

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Do we
15 have any other Federal, State or Tribal Agencies that
16 wish to make comments on this proposal?

17

18 MR. JOHN: Chitina.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chitina.

21

22 MR. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is from
23 Chitina, handed to me by Joe. 20 we'd review carefully.
24 Whenever considering a new C&T, think of what the
25 standard of C&T by the historic people of that resource.
26 Simply because someone resides in a community for a few
27 decades does not make a C&T user of a resource. Native
28 traditional ceremonies and specific uses for different
29 parts of animal. Do these new residents do this? No.
30 It is not a part of their culture. They simply harvest a
31 resource and are asking for the same priority to the
32 resource during a time of shortage. Consideration should
33 be given to create another level of designation for this
34 type of resident, one that affords them a better location
35 and priority during a time of shortage. Better than
36 sport and recreational use, but not as high as a C&T
37 harvester. Do not give C&T simply because someone lives
38 in Alaska since 1920-something. Think of the standard of
39 historic use for C&T. If a new level is considered, a
40 complete review should be done statewide, unit by unit,
41 community by community and reclassification issued.
42 Chitina opposes this proposal.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Fred. Fish &
47 Game Advisory Committee comments.

48

49 MR. STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman, Council
50 Members, Staff Members. My name is Bill Stockwell and

00263

1 I'm the chairman of the Cooper Landing Fish & Game
2 Advisory Committee. When we took up this proposal, we
3 had eight members and we had six that were available that
4 evening to vote. On the original proposal we sent you a
5 letter of our meeting of December 2nd and this is the
6 comments that's in your book. We opposed this proposal
7 unanimously, six opposed. At that time, of course, we
8 were only taking up the original proposal as written by
9 Mr. O'Brien. Our concerns, and we have expressed these
10 before in letters to you and to the Board, that we needed
11 to address the Kenai Peninsula not piecemeal, but once we
12 know what's going to happen and we need to do that after
13 the new rural determinations come in. There is a new
14 study being done by the Department for subsistence for
15 the Federal Board that's basically based on fishing, but
16 issues on the Kenai Peninsula, but it may also hold some
17 information that would be valuable to wildlife. Seeing
18 the study is still in progress, we can't say.

19
20 We recommended at that time that this
21 proposal not be acted on because it should wait until
22 such time as the rural determination is made from the
23 Kenai Peninsula. The Kenai Peninsula has grown about
24 10,000 people in the last 10 years. However, that growth
25 is uneven, so there is no way to determine at this time
26 what will be the next rural determination and what places
27 will be rural and what won't be. With all these things
28 in mind, this is why we opposed the proposal. We also
29 put into our letter that we opposed it because they made
30 it roadless and roadless is not a term to be used and
31 that was picked up by the Board. That was on the
32 original proposal.

33
34 We also have some comments on the draft
35 analysis. The draft analysis came out after we had a
36 meeting, so we weren't able to actually have a meeting on
37 this. I did talk to some of the other members of the
38 committee and we have discussed these issues in the past
39 and I'll bring those up later. I'll only talk about the
40 Unit 7 determinations and Unit 15 and not those places in
41 Unit 15.

42
43 In the beginning, it says that
44 determinations on a community basis occur when
45 communities are not located within a unit and the only
46 ones that are being recommended in the proposal by Staff
47 are Hope and Cooper Landing. If you look on the table on
48 Page 177, you'll notice that Sunrise has 18 residents and
49 that is not being named. Also, on the bottom, you'll
50 notice that there's 22 people in Unit 7 that are rural

00264

1 population that are not included in this proposal and
2 that is important to us because one of the members of our
3 committee, he and his family, are one of the ones that
4 live there. They live by Summit Lake and have for years
5 and years. The way this proposal is written, they would
6 be denied a C&T. It may be that they weren't picked up
7 because they get their mail out of Moose Pass.

8

9 It also states in here that Cooper
10 Landing had shown use in Units 7 and 15, but the proposal
11 would be only C&T for Unit 15(A) for Cooper Landing.
12 You'll note on the map that one of the more important
13 areas to Cooper Landing is the Russian River and the
14 refuge side of the Russian River happens to be in 15(B).
15 In here it does show some use for Cooper Landing. It
16 shows some use in 15(B). That takes care of my comments
17 on the proposal itself.

18

19 I'd like to now bring up some ancient
20 history. In February, 1995, the meeting in Anchorage of
21 the Southcentral Council met and made several C&T
22 determinations for the Kenai Peninsula, which included
23 Cooper Landing, with a determination of 15(A) and 15(B)
24 for moose and there was a bunch of others and I won't go
25 into that. If those that are still on the Council
26 remember that there was some controversy over that and
27 after a period the Federal Subsistence Board went to both
28 Hope and Cooper Landing, along with Soldotna and some
29 other units and towns in Unit 15 to get local input on
30 those. In the cases of Hope and Cooper Landing it was
31 fairly unanimous. I've got the note here that somebody
32 in the Federal office wrote. Hope had 15 people signed
33 in, eight testified and eight were against. I looked in
34 the minutes and Cooper Landing had 50 people signed in,
35 10 testified and reading through the comments it appeared
36 that almost all were opposed and I can state that I was
37 at the meeting and testified at the meeting and that's
38 true, they were basically opposed.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was opposed to C&T,
41 right?

42

43 MR. STOCKWELL: Right, they opposed the
44 C&T findings. The people in Cooper Landing were opposed
45 to the C&T finding for Cooper Landing.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They were opposed to
48 finding a C&T for Cooper Landing.

49

50 MR. STOCKWELL: That's correct. Then in

00265

1 July the RAC met again and postponed -- Council tabled
2 any C&T use for other species or other communities in the
3 Kenai Peninsula in Units 7 and 15 except those that are
4 now in regulation that have C&T's. On the next day, the
5 Federal Subsistence Board upheld that finding. Since
6 then, there has been no indication by anybody in Cooper
7 Landing that has requested any C&T. We've held meetings
8 on Federal subsistence since then. The last one we held
9 was on May 2, 2002, which Mr. Churchill attended and Ann
10 was there and Pat. We had a large turnout. We had a big
11 presentation on rainbow trout. We talked about the
12 Cooper Landing issues. What we were really looking for
13 was C&T's for fisheries in the Kenai River; however, all
14 the various issues came up. I went back and talked to my
15 members again and looked at the minutes and basically our
16 opinion is that the people in Cooper Landing do not want
17 to have C&T findings for subsistence at this time.

18
19 Ann's note, I'll just read that, she sent
20 this to you. A general agreement among attendees and
21 Cooper Landing residents do not want any subsistence
22 fishing and will make this known to the Board. Actually,
23 they do not want any subsistence designations for their
24 area. Attendees expressed the feeling that this was
25 forced upon them. The chairman reminded them that in
26 1995 the Board heeded their request not to establish a
27 subsistence moose hunt. The local people do have an
28 influence.

29
30 So, I'd ask at this point that -- first,
31 we're opposed to the proposal because we think it should
32 wait until the rural determination and if you choose to
33 go forward with the proposal, we request that Cooper
34 Landing be deleted from the C&T. If you, for some
35 reason, need to accommodate Mr. O'Brien, I will leave
36 that to your discretion how you want do it. I have two
37 other things I'd like to bring forward. They're not
38 related to this proposal.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They're not related to
41 this proposal?

42
43 MR. STOCKWELL: Right.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you going to be
46 around?

47
48 MR. STOCKWELL: I'll give you about one
49 minute on each, okay?

50

00266

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bring them out then
2 because you won't be here for tomorrow.

3

4 MR. STOCKWELL: No, I won't be here
5 tomorrow.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With the discretion of
8 the rest of the Council, we can allow him a couple
9 minutes.

10

11 MR. STOCKWELL: The other two issues are
12 calls for proposals. Last year, when you had the call
13 for proposals for subsistence fishing, the proposal was a
14 generic one. We sent in proposals and then were told
15 that proposals were not being accepted for Cook Inlet
16 fisheries and our proposal was sent back. At that same
17 meeting that we talked about, we brought that issue up
18 and in Ann's letter it says that she took it to Staff and
19 Staff said that when they didn't want things, they would
20 remove them from the call. The call this year is the
21 same. We asked again whether fisheries was going to be
22 accepted and we were told that it was an unknown at this
23 point, so we'd just ask that you send on to Staff and the
24 Board that if an area is not going to be considered for
25 proposals, then please delete it from the call for
26 proposals. It saves the people the problem of looking
27 into something that's not going to be used at that time.

28

29 The other issue I have is the transfer of
30 habitat from the Department of Fish & Game to the
31 Department of Natural Resources. We took this up, we were
32 concerned about this and we wrote letters to the
33 governor, the boards, everybody in the legislature we
34 could think of. We'll talk to anybody that will listen
35 to us. We feel that we could lose our fisheries and
36 because of habitat concerns and whether we all agree on
37 how we should allocate our fish and wildlife resources, I
38 think we all agree that if we don't protect the habitat,
39 the argument is gone. We won't have any fish and
40 wildlife to deal with. I don't know what you can do. We
41 all have in our directions on how we operate that we will
42 discuss habitat and if the State Department of Fish &
43 Game is going to be completely removed from habitat
44 authority, then we need to be aware of it and we're going
45 to have to take up habitat issues ourselves in some other
46 way. Anything we can do to look at the situation and
47 work with it I think is very important to all of us.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00267

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I understand right
2 what you're talking about, the end is the transfer of
3 oversight of habitat from ADF&G to DNR, right?

4
5 MR. STOCKWELL: The Department of Fish &
6 Game, when this is done, will no longer have any
7 authority or responsibility for fisheries habitat.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

10
11 MR. CHURCHILL: Thanks, Bill. What are
12 you asking this Advisory Council to do regarding that
13 transfer? What would you like to see us do?

14
15 MR. STOCKWELL: I'd like to have it
16 overturned, but I don't think we have the -- I would ask
17 you to go through -- I'm not sure what this Council can
18 do as far as a State issue like that. I think letters if
19 you can and testimony before the Board of Fisheries and
20 the Board of Game, they're the ones that should be
21 responsible. They should be going to the governor and
22 saying no, no way in hell, because they're not able to do
23 their job as the State's managers of fisheries. They
24 have a sustainable salmon management policy, which many
25 of us in here probably worked on. If you read the
26 policy, it's all based on habitat. If you no longer have
27 authority over habitat, how can you have a sustainable
28 salmon management policy. They will no longer intervene
29 in land use plans and things like that. The Kenai area
30 plan we spent a lot of time working to get brown bear
31 protection for habitat for brown bears in the Kenai
32 Peninsula, which is a create of State concern.

33
34 MR. CHURCHILL: Then what I hear you
35 saying is that this transfer may have a negative impact
36 on rural subsistence users.

37
38 MR. STOCKWELL: It's going to have an
39 impact on everybody's resource and rural subsistence and
40 State subsistence has a priority, therefore they're going
41 to be the first impacted really.

42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I only had one question.
46 As far as the proposal that's in front of us, basically
47 what you're asking is -- and it's interesting to have
48 somebody ask that because everybody always wants to be on
49 the other side. You're asking that if we consider this
50 and if we take up the proposal as it's presented to us by

00268

1 the Staff that we leave Cooper Landing out.

2

3 MR. STOCKWELL: Correct. When Cooper
4 Landing wants a C&T, we'll come and ask for it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm glad to hear that.
7 I thank you for that.

8

9 MR. STOCKWELL: We realize we're rural.
10 We'll take care of that. That's fine. But we would like
11 to be asked if we want something and we will come forward
12 and ask or make a proposal or whatever needs to be done.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's interesting
15 because we brought that up last meeting, too. Thank you.

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: Bill, what do you feel
18 the negative impact of a C&T finding would be in the
19 Cooper Landing area?

20

21 MR. STOCKWELL: I think it's more of a
22 social issue than anything else. I'm not positive if
23 there was a positive C&T finding in 15(A) whether anybody
24 would participate in the hunt, I can't say one way or the
25 other. I think we can go back to the 1995 discussions
26 and that was not really resource-driven, it was not
27 biologically-driven, it was socially-driven and the
28 people in Cooper Landing like the way their lifestyle is
29 now and they don't want to be forced into something
30 socially that they're not comfortable with. So,
31 biologically, there's probably no issue here at all, but
32 there's a tradition issue in Cooper Landing. It's the
33 lifestyle of the people there. Since '95 we've gone up
34 80-some-odd people. Those people didn't come there for a
35 subsistence lifestyle, they came to live in the country.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Fred.

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: I can understand your
40 discussion on Cooper Landing. What is your feeling about
41 Hope? Did you want Hope out?

42

43 MR. STOCKWELL: No, I didn't say Hope.
44 The people in Hope in 1995 requested to be out of it.
45 And I talked to them and I said it was going to come up
46 again. I'm not going to speak for Hope. I just got the
47 history because I'm talking about Unit 7.

48

49 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you.

50

00269

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
2 any written public comments on this one?

3

4 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. The only
5 written public comment we had was from the Cooper Landing
6 Fish & Game Advisory Committee and Mr. Stockwell covered
7 it.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
10 any other public testimony on this proposal?

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. I guess
15 what I should say is if we wish to discuss this, a motion
16 to accept or oppose this proposal is in order.

17

18 MR. ELVSAAS: I would move that we
19 approve Proposal 20.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As written or as
22 modified by the Staff? Which would you prefer?

23

24 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, I think to get it on
25 the floor we should look at what's on Page 171. That's
26 the proposal.

27

28 MS. WELLS: The proposed or the Staff?

29

30 MR. ELVSAAS: Good question. I better go
31 with the Staff recommendation on that page.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?
34 Hearing none, the proposal dies. The motion dies.

35

36 MR. ELVSAAS: Good enough.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to move that we
41 defer this as recommended to our next scheduled meeting
42 on game.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second to
45 that one?

46

47 MS. LANGE: For clarification. Including
48 Cooper Landing? Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and

00270

1 seconded to defer this proposal until our next meeting on
2 game and that's whether or not we have Kenai rural
3 determinations done by that time?

4
5 MR. CHURCHILL: (Nods affirmatively)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we need
8 discussion on that? I don't think we need discussion.
9 The question can be called.

10
11 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor on
14 deferring this to our next meeting on game signify by
15 saying aye.

16
17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
20 saying nay.

21
22 IN UNISON: Nay.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're going to have to
25 have a show of hands. All those in favor of this motion
26 raise your right hand. (Lange, Elvsaa, Churchill) All
27 those opposed to this motion, raise your right hand.
28 (Wells, John, Dementi, Lohse) Motion fails. Do we have
29 another motion on the table?

30
31 MS. WELLS: I would just like to say that
32 I don't feel that I had enough input from other entities
33 on this particular proposal and if Mr. O'Brien so
34 chooses, he can bring it back to us. It was unfortunate
35 that he wasn't here to testify and give more information
36 himself on it. Just one community from the peninsula
37 wasn't enough information for me.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Susan.
40 Anybody else?

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll make a comment
45 since I can't make a motion on it. I would have deferred
46 until after we had rural determinations.

47
48 MR. CHURCHILL: How about if we defer
49 this until after we have a rural determination?

50

00271

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody going to second
2 it? Motion dies.

3

4 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Fred.

7

8 MR. ELVSAAS: I think the simplest way to
9 address this in view of her wishes, his wishes and
10 everybody else is we table it.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So all we've done is
13 allowed it to die. If that's the wish of the Council,
14 it's dead. We'll bury it unless somebody brings it back
15 up. Ann, are we doing something wrong?

16

17 MS. WILKINSON: It just makes it a little
18 difficult for the Board to know why you let it die. I
19 mean I can write up a summary or you can present it at
20 the Board meeting, but it does really help if you have
21 something clear.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As to why we let it die.

24

25 MS. WILKINSON: Uh-huh.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we have Susan's
28 comment that we didn't have enough information, we had a
29 speaker that said it wasn't being requested. A lot of
30 the things that were in the Staff was not being requested
31 by the people that want to receive it. We have my
32 comment that I feel this needs to wait until after rural
33 determination for us to deal with it. We have Bob's
34 comment that we should bring it up at the next meeting on
35 game, but there was no real reason why we should bring it
36 up. Sylvia.

37

38 MS. LANGE: Mr. Chairman. Is there any
39 reason that the individual who proposed this proposal
40 can't bring it up again?

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No reason. And he can
43 be here to present his case. And that was the other
44 thing that Susan brought up is that the person who
45 brought the proposal up wasn't even here to present
46 anything positive for it.

47

48 We are now on Proposal 45, Unit 12 moose.
49 I think we can find that on Page 199. Okay. Chuck.

50

00272

1 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. I've been
2 reminded that 45 is redone and there was a copy -- I
3 don't know if they got it.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That 45 has already been
6 taken care of?

7
8 MS. WILKINSON: No, Mr. Chairman. Just
9 give me a minute.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have it?

12
13 MS. WILKINSON: It's in a file folder.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's in the file folder
16 down here then. Okay. The proposal hasn't changed, just
17 some of the analysis has changed, right? Okay. Chuck,
18 would you like to get started on it.

19
20 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Council
21 Members. Chuck Ardizzone presenting Proposal 45.
22 Proposal 45 was submitted by the Eastern Interior Council
23 and would replace the 14-day spike/fork moose season with
24 a five-day any-antlered bull season in a portion of Unit
25 12.

26
27 Federal lands lie in the southeast
28 portion of Unit 12 and comprise approximately 58.5% of
29 the total area. Federal moose hunting regulations divide
30 Unit 12 into three areas. The first hunt area in the
31 Federal regulations is the Tetlin National Wildlife
32 Refuge and a small portion of the Wrangell-St. Elias
33 National Preserve. The second area is south of the
34 refuge and includes the majority of the unit's National
35 Park Service administered lands. This remote, non-road
36 accessible portion of Unit 12 is the one addressed in
37 this proposal.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a question?

40
41 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes, sir.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just for clarification,
44 Fred is not here, but this is actually out of our area,
45 right?

46
47 MR. ARDIZZONE: Correct.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this was submitted
50 by the Eastern Interior Council out of our area?

00273

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have people in our
4 area who have C&T for this area?

5

6 MS. WILKINSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do
7 and that's why it's a cross-over proposal.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does this proposal
10 affect them? I know we have a habit as a Council that if
11 it's in another area and submitted by another area,
12 unless there's something to bring opposition to it, we
13 usually just defer to that Council. I was wondering if
14 there was any reason why we shouldn't defer to that
15 Council in this case. If there are no adverse effects on
16 residents of our area, we could just defer this to
17 Eastern Interior, which we have done in the past.

18

19 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. I'm not aware
20 of any adverse effects.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are no adverse
23 effects on residents of Southcentral?

24

25 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm unaware of any.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I couldn't see any when
28 I looked through it either. I see Fish & Game supports
29 this proposal. So a motion to defer to Eastern Interior.
30 It could be done, couldn't it, Ann?

31

32 MS. WILKINSON: Would you like to hear
33 written public comments?

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In that case, maybe we
36 should let Chuck just synopsise this just as short as he
37 can do it and we'll go through the whole thing if you
38 feel like we should.

39

40 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. I'll just
41 read the effects of the proposal. The current Federal
42 season and harvest limits follow the antler that was
43 originally implemented by the State. Elimination of the
44 spike/fork season will provide some relief to the small
45 bull component of the population that is stable to
46 declining. Elimination of the spike/fork harvest would
47 also forego the need for a current three-day break that
48 exists for law enforcement purposes between August and
49 September seasons. However, the relief to the spike/fork
50 component of the populations will be minimal, as between

00274

1 1983 and 2000 only 31 moose have been harvested during
2 the spike-form season (none on Federal lands).
3 Furthermore, spike/fork bulls can still be taken under
4 the area's any-bull seasons. Some additional opportunity
5 and possible success would be afforded by the five-day
6 antlered bull season in August supplanting the current
7 14-day spike/fork season. Historically, however, the
8 number of animals taken in August for the entire unit is
9 less than 0.04% of the total harvest for the year. The
10 preliminary conclusion is to support the proposal.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
13 Fish & Game.

14

15 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 The Department's comments that appear in your proposal
17 book on page 201 in adoption of this proposal would align
18 the State and Federal regulations. The proposal, as
19 modified by Staff, would not align the State and Federal
20 regulations, but we don't anticipate that the change
21 would cause any difficulties. This is a very remote area
22 in Unit 12 and we don't anticipate that there will be too
23 much hunting effort take place there.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you're basically
26 saying the original proposal as put in by the Eastern
27 Interior aligns with the State regulations.

28

29 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Yes, it would
30 have.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any questions for
33 Terry?

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.
38 Federal, State, Tribal Agency comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish & Game Advisory
43 Comments.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
48 public comments.

49

50 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

00275

1 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission
2 supports the proposal with modification based on
3 conversation with Sue Entsminger concerning her
4 understanding of the intent of the Eastern Interior RAC
5 in submitting the proposal. Specifically, the SRC
6 supports the change in season for moose and change in the
7 type of animal to be harvested, as specified in the
8 proposal, with the modification that this change would
9 apply to all of Unit 12, rather than only the portion of
10 the unit east of the Nabesna River and the Nabesna
11 Glacier and south of the Winter Trail running southeast
12 from Pickerel Lake to the Canadian border. This would
13 fulfill the stated reason for changing the regulation of
14 aligning with state hunting regulations for moose.

15
16 And then we also have a comment from
17 Ahtna, Incorporated. Regarding 45, Ahtna supports the
18 proposal for Unit 12 moose to do away with only bulls
19 with spike/fork antlers, but does not support shortening
20 the season in Unit 12 for August 15 to August 28 to
21 August 24 to August 28.

22
23 Mr. Goodlataw is not here, so I'll read
24 the comment from Tazlina Village. They support the
25 proposal to do away with only bulls with spike/fork
26 antlers, but do not support shortening the season in Unit
27 12 from August 15 to August 28 to August 24 to August 28.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
30 public testimony on this one here? Okay. That brings us
31 to Regional Council deliberation.

32
33 MR. CHURCHILL: Based on the suggested
34 changes, might we get ADF&G's reaction to those?

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess that would be a
37 good idea. Terry.

38
39 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. What was the
40 question?

41
42 MR. CHURCHILL: There's been some
43 recommended modifications to include all of GMU 12 rather
44 than just that designated in the proposal and I'm
45 wondering if that would change ADF&G's recommendations.

46
47 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Yes, it
48 would. I'm puzzled by the Commission's comments because
49 I don't see where -- if I heard Ann correctly, the
50 comments said applying the proposed change to all of Unit

00276

1 12 would align the State and Federal regulations. In
2 fact, it would not. There would be additional
3 differences in the State and Federal season, so we would
4 not, at this point, support the Wrangell-St. Elias
5 Subsistence Resource Commission recommendations.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, Terry, it's the
8 proposal that was originally submitted by Eastern
9 Interior that aligns with yours and that you supported,
10 but not the modified one.

11

12 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The original
13 proposal would have aligned the State and Federal
14 regulations in that portion of Unit 12. We supported
15 that. However, when the Federal Staff recommended making
16 an adjustment to that, essentially having one long
17 season, we evaluated what we thought the effects of that
18 would be and we concluded that we had no problems with
19 that at this time, so we can support either the original
20 proposal or the Staff recommended version.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But not the part that
23 includes all of Unit 12.

24

25 MR. HAYNES: At this point, we could not
26 support what the Wrangell-St. Elias Commission is
27 recommending. In part because I'm not sure I really
28 understand what they're recommending.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. This is a
31 proposal that's submitted by Eastern Interior. It's up
32 to this Council to decide what they wish to do with it.
33 At this point in time, before we can discuss it any
34 further, a motion needs to be put on the table. Is
35 Mr. Goodlataw here? Mr. Goodlataw, would you like to add
36 anything to what was written?

37

38 MR. GOODLATAW: 45?

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, 45.

41

42 MR. GOODLATAW: They wanted to shorten
43 the season and we do not support shortening the season
44 from Unit 12 from August 15 through 28 to August 24
45 through 28.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you don't support
48 shortening the season. You do support doing away with
49 the spike/fork.

50

00277

1 MR. GOODLATAW: Yes. I say we do away
2 with bulls with spike/forks.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do you see where
5 that would increase the take if we did that or would it
6 just stay about the same?

7
8 MR. GOODLATAW: I think it would increase
9 it some.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You think it would
12 increase the take some?

13
14 MR. GOODLATAW: Some, yeah.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ray.

17
18 MR. NEELEY: I just want to add that
19 shortening the season would be like taking the moose away
20 from the locals. There's a lot of elders that hunt. I'm
21 supporting the proposal, but not shortening the season.
22 If you shorten the season, you're taking away meat from
23 the elders and the locals there the way I see it. On the
24 stateside, you have the 50-inch or large, you have to go
25 20, 30 miles off the highway to get it. The elders,
26 they're not going to go that far off the road to get it.
27 That's why I'm not in favor of shortening the season, but
28 I'm in favor of any antlered bull.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
31 wondering, Ray, if you make it any bull, will having a
32 shorter season make up for the fact that you shortened
33 the season and had to have a spike/fork 50? Which way do
34 you come out gaining the best opportunity? If you have a
35 shorter season but it's any bull or if you have a longer
36 season -- what it looks to me is like you can't do both
37 without jeopardizing the moose thing. You can't take one
38 off and leave the other one on. So what Eastern Interior
39 is requesting is that you allow any bull to be taken, but
40 you have a shorter season.

41
42 MR. NEELEY: Right. I'm in Unit 13 and I
43 hunt Federal. I like the any antlered bull and the
44 longer season because it gives you a chance to at least
45 get your meat for the winter. That's what I'm saying. I
46 wish they'd do the same for Unit 12. That's what I'm
47 saying.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Ray or
50 John? Mr. Churchill.

00278

1 MR. CHURCHILL: If I'm understanding this
2 proposal correctly, the reason listed for proposing it
3 was to align the State seasons to eliminate confusion
4 and, as I remember it, to avoid any unnecessary or
5 harassment by law enforcement or stepping across the line
6 unintentionally. But what we've got here is something
7 that doesn't do what the proposal has stated as its
8 primary objective. Any reaction to that?
9

10 MR. NEELEY: Well, like I said before, I
11 like the antlered bull for the local people and the
12 elders I'm talking about. I'm not really speaking for
13 myself. It will give them a chance to go out and get
14 their meat. That's why I'm saying I'm not for shortening
15 the season. I know a lot of local people up there that
16 don't have off-road vehicles and stuff like that to go
17 out 20, 30 miles to get their meat.
18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you would just prefer
20 the longer season.
21

22 MR. NEELEY: And I'm for the proposal any
23 antler. I'm for it, but I'm not for shortening the
24 season.
25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm glad this is an
27 Eastern Interior proposal and not one of ours because I
28 don't know if we could answer both of those at the same
29 time because they're tied together. The makers of the
30 proposal tied them together. They were willing to take a
31 shorter season and have any bull rather than a longer
32 season and have an antler restriction. I don't know,
33 since we're not even in that unit, if we could go tell
34 them no, you need to have a longer season than any bull.
35 That's what I'm getting at.
36

37 MR. NEELEY: Yeah, I'm just requesting on
38 my part. That's my part. I wish they would have a
39 longer season just to give the locals a chance to get
40 their meat.
41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would your suggestion to
43 us be that maybe we should just leave it up to the
44 Eastern Interior since it's in their area?
45

46 MR. NEELEY: Well, I wish somebody from
47 that unit up there would be here to speak on it. Since
48 they're my neighbors and I know most of the people that
49 live in that area, that's why I'm speaking for this.
50 That's mostly in Fred John's area.

00279

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I don't know
2 where to go from here. I guess that's all our public
3 testimony unless somebody wants to put the motion on the
4 table. Fred.

5
6 MR. JOHN: I have another one from Joe.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

9
10 MR. JOHN: Joe Hart, representing Chitina
11 Council. He said yes, if it increases opportunity for
12 subsistence users to harvest. Yes, if it places
13 conservation in place, protection to the resource are a
14 must. Fed should not simply follow the action of the
15 State of Alaska. Different system qualification and
16 regulation. Don't do it just to be like them. Do it
17 because it would make the Fed system better. That's all.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
20 questions for Ray or John?

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. At
25 this point in time, if we wish to discuss this, a motion
26 is in order. If we wish to turn it over to Eastern
27 Interior, a motion is in order.

28
29 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to move that we
30 adopt Proposal 45.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As written? As
33 modified?

34
35 MR. CHURCHILL: The modification we have
36 in front of us that we've been handed.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. As modified on
39 Page 199 of the handout we just got. Do I hear a second?

40
41 MR. ELVSAAS: Second.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
44 seconded that we support Proposal 45 as submitted on Page
45 199, WP03-45. Mr. Churchill.

46
47 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to address this
48 because I think it's changed substantially. In looking
49 at the handout, I think speaks to the Chair's concern and
50 what I share. I'm looking at Page 208 and it says while

00280

1 there may be a short-term reduction in the moose harvest,
2 Federally-qualified moose hunters should benefit from the
3 conservation of a healthy moose population in the long
4 term and from the additional eight days at the end of
5 August to harvest any bull. The elimination of the
6 spike/fork harvest limit would provide some relief to the
7 small bull component of the population that is stable to
8 declining.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, correct me if I'm
11 wrong on this. Maybe Terry or somebody else can correct
12 me. So this elimination of the spike/fork harvest
13 doesn't change it to any bull, it just takes spike/fork
14 off of the bull that can be taken. Am I correct?
15 Anybody have an answer to that one for me?

16

17 MR. HAYNES: Can you repeat that
18 question?

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm looking at the
21 justification here and the justification doesn't match
22 the proposal to me. The justification on Page 208. It
23 says the elimination of the spike/fork harvest limit
24 would provide some relief to the small bull component of
25 the population that is stable to declining. I was under
26 the impression that what we were doing was eliminating
27 the spike/fork limitation and that any antlered bull,
28 including spike/forks could be taken.

29

30 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Page 208, the
31 preliminary conclusion indicates that the bag limit is
32 one antlered bull that's being proposed.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

35

36 MR. HAYNES: It's not limited to a
37 spike/fork 50 or anything like that.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's not a
40 legitimate justification down there where it says --
41 Chuck.

42

43 MR. ARDIZZONE: You would actually be
44 spreading the harvest over all the antlered bulls instead
45 of just taking spike/forks, so it would eliminate some of
46 the pressure on them.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm sorry. I still
49 don't follow that. If I eliminate the spike/fork
50 limitation, that spreads it over any bull, but as a

00281

1 subsistence hunter that means I could take the spike/fork
2 or any bull. I'm not going to eliminate pressure on the
3 spike/fork. I'm just going to -- the spike/fork is still
4 capable of being taken.

5

6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Correct. But you
7 wouldn't be focusing in on the spiked bull during a
8 certain portion of the season.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

11

12 MS. WELLS: I got that one.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just don't see where
15 it's going to provide any relief to the small bull
16 because you're going to take the first one that you see,
17 which means you're going to take a spike/fork if it's
18 there just as easy as the other one. I don't see where
19 it's going to cause a reduction in opportunity for -- and
20 that's the part that says there's short term reductions
21 in moose harvest. I think we'll have an increase in
22 moose harvest unless I'm missing something in this and
23 it's totally possible that I'm missing something. Terry.

24

25 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if you're
26 familiar with the hunt area in question, it's a very
27 isolated and remote area, not easy to access, so it isn't
28 going to get a lot of hunting pressure to begin with. In
29 terms of speaking to the specific question about antler
30 size, opportunity and so forth, I don't have a comment
31 for you.

32

33 MR. ELVSAAS: If it's got horns, it
34 legal.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If it's got horns, it's
37 legal. Am I correct?

38

39 MR. HAYNES: Correct.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's all I wanted to
42 know. So I can't see where that's going to cause a
43 reduction in hunter opportunity. That's going to cause
44 an increase in hunter opportunity hopefully. That was
45 the idea.

46

47 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. What perhaps
48 that statement is referring to is the fact that there is
49 a shorter season that would be on the books, so that, by
50 itself, could be perceived as reducing opportunity

00282

1 balanced by having a more liberal antler requirement.

2 So, six one, half a dozen the other.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Mr. Churchill.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: If I'm understanding

7 correctly, that's exactly what we're being asked to do is

8 essentially a proposal that aligns State and Fed, we're

9 being asked to shorten the season from the 15th through

10 the 24th and it will be one antlered bull, which, at

11 least in my experience, is a much easier hunt, and should

12 offset with the idea of making a healthier moose

13 population in this GMU in the long term. I'm in favor of

14 this as written, as supported by both Staff and ADF&G

15 rather than address the suggested modifications. Those

16 folks will have an opportunity to speak to the Board and

17 they'll have the benefit of an analysis.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Another other

20 comments? Any other discussion? Sylvia. Terry, I

21 didn't see you. I'll get to you as soon as Sylvia is

22 done.

23

24 MS. LANGE: Am I understanding you

25 correctly, you said that your motion is to the original,

26 unaltered proposal?

27

28 MR. CHURCHILL: My motion was to adopt in

29 the handout page 199 that shortens the season by eight

30 days, makes it an any bull hunt and applies it to a

31 limited portion of GMU 12, which will, in fact, align it

32 with state regs in that area.

33

34 MS. LANGE: Then you also said it comes

35 with the support of ADF&G, but my understanding was you

36 said that takes it out of alignment with the State. Am I

37 misunderstanding?

38

39 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The

40 Department indicated support here for the original

41 proposal. Our comments on Page 201 spoke to that

42 proposal and those comments said that the original

43 proposal, if adopted, would align the State and Federal

44 regulations. The Staff revised the proposal on Page 208.

45 We can support that, but it would not align the State and

46 Federal regulations. So we've commented on the original

47 proposal and we've commented on this preliminary Staff

48 conclusion, which is different. It can be a bit

49 confusing because you get lots of different variations in

50 proposals on the table.

00283

1 MS. LANGE: But the motion on the table
2 is for the new.....

3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: No. It's on 199. It's
5 the original proposal.

6
7 MR. HAYNES: That's what I was seeking to
8 get clarification on, to see what proposal was actually
9 on the table.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

12
13 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

16
17 MR. ELVSAAS: Do you know if the Eastern
18 Interior people have acted on this?

19
20 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. The
21 Eastern Interior Council meets the last week of March.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a question?
24 They did submit this proposal, right?

25
26 MS. WILKINSON: Yes.

27
28 MR. ELVSAAS: But did they act on it?

29
30 MS. WILKINSON: They haven't met yet.

31
32 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman. A little
33 concern. We may adopt something that they may want to
34 revise later and it's out of our area. I think we should
35 defer it to them and support their wishes.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's consistent with
38 what we've done in the past. We have a motion on the
39 table. We can vote that motion up, down, vote to defer
40 or whatever.

41
42 MR. JOHN: I'm just trying to think of
43 procedure here and I think probably the best way is to
44 move to amend the motion to the deference of the Eastern
45 Interior Board.

46
47 MR. ELVSAAS: Can we just make a motion
48 to table this, non-debatable and it's done, if in fact it
49 passed?

50

00284

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can do that.

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: Since I made the first,
4 I'm not going to table my own motion, thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you make a motion,
7 Fred?

8

9 MR. ELVSAAS: I think I will to get this
10 over with. On the other hand, I don't think we should be
11 bringing it up again after they've acted on it. I will
12 move to table.

13

14 MR. JOHN: I'd like to make a comment.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Fred.

17

18 MR. JOHN: The Eastern Interior and Upper
19 Tanana River Valley, they always work with us and they
20 bring it over to us and we look at it and we'll say we
21 defer it back to them and we'll support what they do.
22 I'd like to do that. It would be better than tabling it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm getting a little
25 confused. We have a motion to table, but has that been
26 seconded?

27

28 MS. LANGE: No.

29

30 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll second it and it's
31 non-debatable.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We now have a motion to
34 table. It's seconded. It's non-debatable. We have to
35 vote on it. We can either vote to table it or we can
36 vote to not table it. All in favor of tabling this
37 motion.....

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: Just a clarification. My
40 understanding is that if it's tabled and not tabled to a
41 time specific, once we adjourn it just goes away. It's
42 no longer in front of us. Is that not correct?

43

44 MR. JOHN: Right.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor of tabling
47 this motion, signify by saying aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

00285

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed to tabling
2 this motion signify by saying nay.

3

4 IN UNISON: Nay.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The motion is not
7 tabled. Sorry, Fred. Fred John, would you like to make
8 a motion? We still have a motion on the table that we're
9 going to have to handle first before we take another
10 motion, I guess. Can he make a motion to defer action?
11 Then we'd have a motion on the table.

12

13 MS. WELLS: Mr. Chairman. For the sake
14 of simplicity, I would suggest that if what the Council
15 wants to do is to lend support to the Eastern Interior,
16 what they should do is just go ahead and vote on this
17 one. It says motion to support as written. That would
18 support them. And that's what's on the table right now,
19 correct?

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what's on the
22 table right now.

23

24 MS. WELLS: Then I would call the
25 question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The question has
28 been called on the motion on the table, which is to
29 support Eastern Interior's motion as found on Page 199 of
30 the handout. All in favor signify by saying aye.

31

32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by
35 saying nay.

36

37 (No opposing votes)

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. So,
40 basically, we have voted to support them in their motion.
41 With that, I see all you guys folding your book up and I
42 looked at the next one and I know we can handle the next
43 one in two minutes. Let's take a look at what we've got.
44 We have a lot of things to handle tomorrow. We have two
45 proposals that hopefully won't take us very long, but
46 then we have a call for proposals, we have Subsistence
47 Resource Commission appointments, we have three
48 presentations on monitoring the TEK projects, we have all
49 the Agency reports, we have an annual report, we have a
50 review and comment on Alaska Board of Fisheries

00286

1 Proposals, we have to establish time and place of next
2 meeting. If what happens is that we run out of time
3 tomorrow, is everybody going to be able to stay late
4 tomorrow or should we try to finish these last two
5 proposals today and then call it -- three? Am I missing
6 something?

7
8 MS. WELLS: We have 49 and 50 and I think
9 we.....

10
11 MR. CHURCHILL: We have four according to
12 an unnamed source.

13
14 MS. WELLS: And 19.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We did 19, but this is
17 Fisheries Proposal 19. So we have 49, 50. 49 is a
18 cross-over proposal. 49 and 51 are both cross-over
19 proposals, aren't they, submitted by the Eastern
20 Interior? Could we handle 49, 50 and 51 by just
21 deferring to Eastern Interior? We can always make a
22 motion to defer the proposal as presented by Eastern
23 Interior, which is supporting them. Could we make a
24 motion to give deference to the proposal of Eastern
25 Interior?

26
27 MS. WILKINSON: Yes. That would be
28 better.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Unless anybody sees
31 anything in these proposals that they feel needs to be
32 addressed by our Council. I didn't find any. So we
33 could present a motion like and that would take 49, 50
34 and 51 and put it in the home Council's area and say that
35 we defer to the wisdom of the Eastern Interior. If
36 anybody so wishes. Otherwise, we could take these up one
37 at a time.

38
39 MR. JOHN: I make a motion to that
40 effect.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You make a motion to the
43 effect that we will defer to the wisdom of the Eastern
44 Interior on these proposals that are in their area, 49,
45 50 and 51. Do I hear a second?

46
47 MR. DEMENTI: Second.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
50 seconded. Do I hear any discussion?

00287

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

4

5 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. 50 and 51 I
6 can absolutely support, although it doesn't, I believe,
7 include it. I think this is aimed at increasing the
8 opportunity for coyotes. There were some studies done
9 that showed them the primary predator on Dall sheep in
10 these units and they were having an extremely negative
11 effect on the total population. However, I'm not quite
12 sure I understand 49 and I'm uncomfortable voting on it,
13 but I will. I'm more than happy to vote on 50 and 51.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 49 is on beaver, right?

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: Right. Firearm only
18 season.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The same as we put in
21 place in Unit 11. During summertime.

22

23 MR. CHURCHILL: This is September 20th
24 through May 15th season.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's some
27 discussion at this point in time. So we either need to
28 convince you on 49 or somebody has to be able to present
29 him with some information on 49 to change his mind or
30 we'll just vote on the other two.

31

32 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll be happy to keep the
33 remarks on the record in support of 50 and 51 and abstain
34 on the vote, which communicates what I wanted to and we
35 can move forward.

36

37 MS. WELLS: I would like to make a
38 comment on 49. Even though we see an extension of
39 broadening of the season up there, we also find something
40 I find refreshing. The last statement says meat from
41 harvested beaver must be salvaged for human consumption.
42 That, to me, is probably one of the most subsistence-
43 oriented actions that I've seen on our proposals yet. On
44 that alone I am very happy to lend support for the
45 Eastern Interior in this regulation change.

46

47 MR. CHURCHILL: Looking at the trapping
48 regs and re-looking at ADF&G's comments, I don't have a
49 concern. I can vote on all three.

50

00288

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's interesting, Susan,
2 because we've already done that for up in our area and
3 that was the idea, was to provide opportunity to take
4 beaver in the off season for meat and if somebody wants
5 to salvage the hides for crafts, that's fine, but the
6 primary purpose is to look at them as a meat animal. So,
7 with that, if there is no further discussion, the
8 question is in order.

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
13 called on 49, 50 and 51 to defer to the wisdom of Eastern
14 Interior on these proposals that take place in their
15 area. All in favor signify by saying aye.

16

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
20 saying nay.

21

22 (No opposing votes)

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
25 Council, we're on a roll. Do we take the last one and be
26 done with it?

27

28 MR. CHURCHILL: Roll, like dinner roll?

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ann.

31

32 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. The Park
33 Service Staff wanted to be present for this proposal, the
34 Fisheries Proposal 19.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we can put
37 this off till tomorrow then. It will be the first
38 proposal of the morning. I feel like we've done enough
39 work today that we can recess till 8:00 o'clock tomorrow
40 morning.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: 8:00 or 8:30?

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to say 6:30,
45 but I knew what kind of reaction I'd get there. Nobody
46 wants to come at 8:00, we'll come at 8:30.

47

48 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for
the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix
Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 130 through 288
contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken electronically by
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 5th day of
March 2003, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. in
Anchorage, Alaska;

 THAT the transcript is a true and correct
transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter
transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to
the best of our knowledge and ability;

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

 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 24th day of
March 2003.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 04/17/04