

**SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL  
PUBLIC MEETING**

March 6, 1996  
Centennial Building Meeting Room  
Cordova, Alaska

**VOLUME III**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

Helga Eakon, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Call the meeting to order. When we left off yesterday, we were still on proposals, so we'll start this morning with Number 25, I believe. Am I correct? Number 25?

MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Proposal 25 was submitted by the Ninilchik Traditional Council, would create a season in all of Unit 15, extending from September the 11th to September the 30th, with a harvest limit of one antlered bull.

Since we just reviewed the status of the moose population down on the Kenai, I won't go into that again, except to reiterate that the harvest dropped significantly during the 1995 season because of the severe winter which preceded it. The winter killed almost the entire calf crop which produces the bulls that would be yearlings during the fall hunting season. This emphasizes the fact that the younger the over-all population, the more susceptible it is to be affected by severe winters.

The warm, rainy weather that we had during the hunting season was also a contributing factor to the low harvest, and kept a lot of people from going hunting at all.

In managing any hunted moose population, it's necessary to maintain adequate numbers of bulls after the hunting season to assure breeding and thereby maintenance of a healthy population. On the Kenai, a minimum of 20 bulls for 100 cows is considered to be a healthy -- is considered necessary for normal breeding. A minimum of 25 bulls per 100 cows is the refuge management objective in most areas, since it isn't wise to deliberately shoot a population down to the minimum needed to maintain its health. Setting the objective a little above the minimum allows the population to remain healthy in those years when something unexpected, such as a severe winter or a harvest which is higher than expected due to weather or numbers of hunters takes more bulls out of the population than is expected. It also allows hunting seasons to continue in a normal fashion in the years following those events, whereas setting the population objective right at the minimum would create an unhealthy population following those unpredictable events, and thus require restricting or closing the season until the bull:cow ratio claimed into the healthy range once again.

Whenever the number of bulls harvested by hunters exceeds the number available above the minimum management objective, the harvest has to be regulated in some manner that produces a bull component of the population which is adequate in size and preferably well distributed throughout the various age groups. This can be done in a number of ways. The number of hunters can be limited through a permit system, a quota of bulls which can be taken can be set and the season closed when that number is approached, the length or timing of the season can be changed. You can restrict access or hunting methods, or you can restrict the take to specific age or size groups of the population.

The spike fork, 50-inch plus regulation currently in place on the Kenai was selected because the any bull regulation in place at the time had driven the bull component of the population to a low level, and also shifted the age structure to

a very young level, making the population susceptible to high mortality during severe winters. Spike fork, 50-inch plus strategy is a self-limiting strategy, because the number of bulls that can be harvested is controlled by the number that are available. There's no reason to limit the number of hunters or set quotas on the harvest, because the number of bulls that can be taken is automatically limited by the number of legal bulls in the population.

The majority of two and three-year-old bulls, and about half of the four and five-year-old bulls are protected under this system. These age groups, particularly the older age groups, comprise a significant percentage of the breeding class of bulls needed to maintain a healthy population. These age groups are critically important, because they are the ones most likely to survive during severe winters as opposed to the yearly age group, which is normally the largest part of the bull population under an any bull harvest regime.

Also, the spike fork, 50-inch plus strategy isn't dependent on annual counts to establish harvest quotas and make season adjustments, as are the other regulatory alternatives. This is important on the Kenai, because weather conditions and snow cover don't often allow accurate accounts. In years when these data are not available, harvest opportunities have to be set conservatively in order to assure maintenance of a healthy population. Alternatives which don't have the self-limiting feature thus require frequent changes in season dates and lengths or in harvest quotas.

Any bull limits are generally used for relatively lightly harvested populations. As harvest pressure increases, the proportion of bulls in the population declines, and the age structure of the bull component shifts toward the younger age groups. Reduction in season length and timing are usually the first management responses to declining bull:cow ratios, and if this isn't sufficient to reverse the trend, then harvest quotas or drawing permit hunts are the next step. A reduction in the number of hunters allowed to hunt moose slows the effect of an any bull harvest limit on a moose population, as does shortening the season and thereby reducing hunter opportunity -- hunter

success by limiting hunter opportunity.

In the case of the case of the current proposal, reducing hunter success by limiting hunter opportunity is expected to, excuse me, reduce the estimated success rate, the first-year hunter success rate from what we estimated to be about 70% for an August 10th through September 20th any bull season as proposed last year, to an estimated 45% in a September 11 to September 30 any bull season. Even at this level, however, and assuming that non-subsistence hunting is eliminated on the refuge, we expect that enough bulls would be harvested in the first year to push the bull:cow ratio below healthy levels, thus necessitating a quota to limit the harvest. Hunter success would be expected to drop after the first year, and probably stabilize at about 25% over a period of years.

The reduction in hunter success from that anticipated under the longer hunt proposed last year would significantly reduce the loss of middle age class bulls, but would not prevent it from happening over a longer period of time. The number of hunters in the communities determined to have customary and traditional use is large enough to cause a reduction in the breeding class of bulls under an any bull harvest limit, although at a slower rate than would be the case with the longer season.

Of even greater importance in the long term is the fact that the number of moose hunters in those communities has been growing at a rate of 12% per year in recent years. Not only is the number of hunters increasing, but the rate of increase is also increasing with each passing year. Even using the average rate of 12%, the number of hunters is expected to double in the next six years.

At some point during that period, additional restrictions on subsistence harvest would have to be initiated in order to protect sufficient bulls to maintain a healthy population, even at the lower success rate expected after the first year or two. We ran the moose population model using these projected harvest rates to see what the impact to the over-all moose population would be over time. I'd hoped to have

some graphs made up like the ones that we had yesterday for the cow hunt to show the results rather than just explaining it to you verbally, but there simply wasn't time to construct them for this meeting. What they showed was that a quota would be necessary to limit the harvest during the first two years. Then as the success rate declined, the harvest would drop below the maximum permissible level for two or three years, so that no quota would be necessary, barring a severe winter during that time. After that two to three-year period, the number of moose hunters would have increased to the point that even with a success rate of only 25%, too many moose would be harvested to allow unrestricted harvest, and we would be back in a quota situation, unless the season was shortened still further.

Without additional restrictions, both the bull:cow ratio and the total moose population would begin to decline. This would be true for Subunit 15(A) and that portion of Subunit 15(B) which has a road system. Subunit 15(B) East, which is the trophy area, is remote enough so that a quota probably wouldn't be necessary there. Subunit 15(C) has only a small area of refuge land with a limited number of moose on it, and it would require a quota every year from year one under an any bull regime, because there's only about 30 harvestable bulls that can be taken off of that area on an annual basis, and that could easily be accomplished under an any -- in any year and exceeded under an any bull regulation.

Now, these projections are based on the refuge being closed to non-subsistence hunters and on all of the subsistence hunters using some part of the refuge at some time during the season.

Out of curiosity, I decided to have the model run with a reduced number of subsistence hunters since that question came up last year, so I arbitrarily cut the number of hunters by one-fourth. Now, I have nothing whatever to base that figure on, and it wouldn't be a valid assumption in any scientific evaluation, but I wanted to see what effect it would have if we did have some reason to assume that some lesser portion of the hunters would participate. The result was that the reduction in participation extended for six years the period in which

additional restrictions would not be required. But after that, the harvest once again begin to exceed the maximum allowable to maintain a healthy population, and so the same additional restrictions would be required that would have been required earlier under full hunter participation.

Another thing to consider about this proposal is the timing of the hunt. Bull moose begin to exhibit rutting behavior during the latter part of September. Their harems are formed in late September, and the peak of breeding occurs during the last few days of September through the first week or so of October. Shooting a breeding age bull in late September may cause a delay in breeding while the cows look for another breeding bull. Since the cow is in estrus for only 24 hours, this delay may result in the cow cycling out of estrus. A second estrus period doesn't occur for approximately 28 days. thus cows not bred until the second estrus or the third estrus would bear their calves a month later in the summer or two months later. This produces calves which enter the following winter smaller and less able to survive than those born from a first estrus breeding, and may result in the lowered productivity of the moose population.

So in summary, you can have an any bull hunt if you're willing to pay the price, and the price is quotas on the number of bulls that can be harvested in most years, severe restrictions on hunting opportunity in years following severe winters, displacement of 2,000 or so hunters onto State and private lands, and significant restrictions on hunting opportunity on those State and private lands under State regulation, because of the large number of hunters that will be displaced there.

Our preliminary conclusion is that this proposal should be rejected. We don't believe that this is the best option for management of moose on the Kenai Peninsula. This type of hunt would be difficult to administer, it requires population data that we often can't get. It requires shifting regulations on a regular basis to match changing populations. There's a risk of population damage during and following severe winters. And shooting bulls during the rut can cause lowered production

through second estrus breeding and subsequent late-born calves. We don't believe that this would be beneficial to either the moose population or the subsistence user over the long term.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay Thank you. Did you have .....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't have anything to add, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Do you have public comment?

MS. EAKON: Yes. The program received 12 comments in opposition to this proposal.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes this proposal. They feel that the need for the antler restriction is vitally important for the well-being of population. A hunting season open later than September 20 disrupts breeding activity. Harems form in late September, and the peak of breeding occurs in the last week of September and the first week of October. When herd bulls are removed at that time, it may take several days for the cows to find other bulls, and may miss fertilization if in estrus during this interval.

The Central Peninsula Fish & Game Advisory Committee in Ninilchik opposed liberalizing the bull restrictions, because they think that the spike fork, 50-inch restrictions work well to maintain a healthy breeding population of bulls, and they oppose extending the hunting season beyond September 20th.

The Kenai-Soldotna Fish & Game Advisory Committee unanimously voted to oppose this proposal.

An unidentified Ninilchik resident said Proposal 25-dash-caps-no-exclamation point.

Gail Presley of Anchor Point opposes this, feeling that it is against the best interests of the moose population.

Lynn Kennedy of Ninilchik also opposes this.

The Kenai Peninsula Outdoor Coalition in Soldotna opposes this. They feel that if hunters from the selected Peninsula communities are given an antlered bull hunt during the rut as proposed, the number of breeding age bulls will be significantly reduced, and would be counter to the objectives of maintaining a healthy moose population for the future. And it goes against the wildlife oriented recreation purpose of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.

Dan Presley of Anchor Point opposes this proposal, as does H. Davis, Junior, of Clam Gulch, as does Dr. William O. West of Soldotna, as do the members of the Kenai Peninsula Chapter of the Safari Club International in Soldotna. And finally as does Bill Gill of Kasilof, who doesn't want -- he said no antler restrictions.

That concludes the written comments.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. We're down to the Counsel -- no, any public comment from anyone? They've heard it on the .....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I might be the only one .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: ..... no public comments. I guess we'll go ahead and decide what we want to do with this proposal here. Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Do we need a motion on the floor to accept it?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: I so move.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion. Second?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you second? Do you second?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'll go ahead and second it, but you'll see why I wouldn't in the first place.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I would like to divide this proposal into two components as we did with the other one. There are really two questions here. One is the any bull question, and the other one is the question of timing of the hunt, which we discussed at the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: On that point could I ask, did you have any comment on that? To extending -- extension of time?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, he made a comment regarding the .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You did .....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: ..... timing of the season.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You .....

MR. WILLIS: Yes. We did have problems with having the hunt late in the -- running to the end of September, because of interference with rutting, breeding of the cows. Yeah, you can separate them if you'd like. That obviously moving -- backing the season up would remove that objection. It would not change the objections that we have to going to an any bull hunt, because of the impact on the over-all population either with or without the loss in production.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't know if I understand you. What you -- are you opposed to just extending for spike fork-50 also?

MR. WILLIS: Well, we're opposed to going back to an any bull regulation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, I understand that.

MR. WILLIS: And we're also opposed to having a hunt

that extends to the end of September, because of interference with breeding.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. There's a motion on the floor. Discussion?

MR. ROMIG: Is it -- which one are we discussing?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, .....

MR. ROMIG: Gary wanted to break it in two parts. Are we going to do that?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, if that's a consensus. Is there an objection to doing it -- splitting this proposal into two parts? Okay. The motion then should be .....

MR. LOHSE: On the -- The motion is .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Changed.

MR. LOHSE: ..... that we accept the proposed regulation to -- let's see. Unit 5, one antlered bull.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. This is any bull proposal. Okay. That is all that's being considered, not the season.

MR. ROMIG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Did you have any comment? I thought you were going to comment now?

MR. ROMIG: Yeah. Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on the restriction. The -- of course, we heard quite a bit about this last year, and I know that it was kind of deemed as restricting the subsistence use in some way, but, you know, I kind of see that as a relative, you know, restriction. In other words, I think the first couple of years, you know, that the antler restriction came out, it was a restriction, and there was

a lot of opposition to it. I think now it's pretty much accepted as a way of hunting on the hunting on the Kenai for moose. It's kind of like driving down the road and going through a town that had a speed limit of 55 and they changed it to 35. For instance, Moose Pass. And now, you know, when you go down through the town, even though there's no people around, you still slow down to 35. It's just the way it is.

And I really think that the program with the antler restriction has been working on the Kenai, and I think with some additional time on the front of the season, it gives the subsistence user ample time to go out and practice his traditions.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you're speaking .....

MR. ROMIG: I'm speaking .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: ..... in opposition of the motion?

MR. ROMIG: Yes, I'd be speaking opposed to the motion.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Anybody else? Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, the one thing we have to take into consideration any time we do anything is basically the fact that if we don't maintain healthy herds, there's nothing for anybody. And the couple things that were brought out in this is that by having a spike fork-50, you can do away with a lot of other regulations, and a lot of other research, simply because it's self-limiting. No matter what you do, there's going to be sufficient bulls left for breeding.

When you go to an any bull moose area -- or any bull moose, or any antlered moose, whatever you want to call it, you can actually hammer an area hard enough that there wouldn't be sufficient bull moose in that area to breed. And maybe over all there's still sufficient moose, you know, bulls on the whole Kenai, but a local herd or a local area could get hit to where those cows didn't breed, which cuts down your production. And the one thing that's needed both for subsistence and for the

general hunt is you need animals. And if you don't have animals, there's nothing left for anybody, and dead moose is a dead moose, whether it was shot by a subsistence hunter, or whether it's shot by a general hunter. And if a bull's dead and it's not there to breed, those cows either like it said, either don't get bred, or they have to go some place else and look for a bull. And then the odds are that the survival rate of their calves is going to be low the next year.

I think the additional time, or maybe even finding a different time or something like that, but by sticking with the spike fork-50, you're going to have breeding stock, and any good rancher knows you have to have breeding stock, too. I mean, it's just there. So I'd be against this -- I'd be against the proposed regulation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Thank you. I do want to ask, you know, I'm always wondering about -- you talk about beasts, like you're talking about just the bulls that are under 50. I don't know, what I've seen in movies made of bull moose, the harems are by the largest bulls, which are usually over 50-inch.

MR. WILLIS: That's correct. Those movies are usually made in places like Denali Park, where you have .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'm trying to figure out, .....

MR. WILLIS: ..... a non-hunted population.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: ..... you're trying save this middle bulls, so that they will .....

MR. WILLIS: The middle .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: ..... they will become that age later on, is that what you're trying to do? I'm just trying to understand this.

MR. WILLIS: Right, Roy. They do so -- they will start breeding in those middle aged classes, and breed for as long as they're alive. They don't live as long as the cows, because of

the stress of breeding, but by protecting that middle component of your bull population, they're the ones that are going to survive these severe winters. You're always going to have that component there, and they do a lot of the breeding. They don't do all the breeding. The older and the bigger a bull gets, the more he'll breed up to a point where he becomes too old to be very effective. So, yeah, you're -- a lot of your breeding or some -- a significant portion is done by bulls that are well over 50 inches, and therefore legal to hunt. We don't shoot all of those. We get a pretty good percentage of them, but some of those survive, too. But the most important thing is that you're protecting these young, vigorous, middle aged animals so that when a severe winter comes along, it's going to kill all your calves, it's going to kill a lot of your old bulls, because they can't hack it any more either, but those middle bulls are going to survive, and they're going to be there to breed the next year.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Very good. Any other comments?  
Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Well, now, in the absence of a big dominant bull, those young adults and teenagers are very capable of doing the breeding, aren't they?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct. I don't know if very capable is right way to put it. As somebody remarked last night, you don't put a yearling bull out in the pasture to breed your cows, because it will take him all day to get the job done. The younger animals don't breed as effectively.

There's a reason that nature has created a situation where your most aggressive, largest, strongest animals do the breeding. And if you go into a system where you remove that, that component of the population, and force the younger, weaker, less effective animals to do the breeding, then genetically you're hurting your population. There's research going on right now to try to determine exactly what the effects of that are, and I know on elk it's been shown there's a significant difference in the survival of calves that are produced by breeding with yearling animals as opposed to the large,

dominant, harem-forming bulls that would normally do the breeding if they were around to do it.

MR. LOHSE: But aren't spike fork-50 -- I mean, the spike forks are the yearlings, aren't they?

MR. WILLIS: Right.

MR. LOHSE: So what you're dealing with is you're dealing with actually mature bulls, just not dominant bulls, when you're dealing with the ones that aren't being hunted? Unless I'm wrong. What I was under the impression, .....

MR. WILLIS: Right. Okay.

MR. LOHSE: ..... is you're taking out your yearlings, and you're cropping your extremely mature dominant -- maybe even dominant bulls, .....

MR. WILLIS: Uh-huh.

MR. LOHSE: ..... but you've still got this component that is -- well, I guess you have to -- like I said, I'd have to put them as teenagers and young adults. I mean, they are not -- they're not yearlings any more. They are adult bulls. They just -- in the absence of a dominant bull, which would prevent them from breeding, they're very capable of breeding?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct. They do .....

MR. LOHSE: It's not .....

MR. WILLIS: ..... they do a significant portion of the breeding in a hunted population especially, where a lot of your older bulls are taken out prior to the breeding season. They do a significant amount of breeding.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'm once again putting in -- put in a position of discussing what our mandate is here.

And one of the tenets by which we work from the regulations speaks to the fact that if we can't achieve a reasonable allocation, then there must be some restriction placed on other users of the resource. We went through an exercise yesterday with regard to cows which is a very good example. We found that there weren't enough cows for there to be a hunt for subsistence hunters. There was all kinds of discussion, great logic used by the staff, and I appreciate that. But then in the end we came to a situation in which we voted for no hunting by subsistence hunters to meet that customary and traditional use. No one argued that that wasn't customary and traditional, that it hadn't been done in the past. And yet we allowed three other cow hunts to occur without really batting an eye on those. And one of those hunts, particularly in 15(A) is an area we had discussed now twice and voted twice to allow subsistence hunters to use from those four villages.

I'm concerned that the biological information is somewhat maybe good for right now. It seems to work. The logic of these charts and whatnot seem to work right now, but we ended up, for example, in a situation yesterday where Ted Spraker was able to show us the amount of hunters on his chart, and how that pressure had gotten to a situation with an any bull hunt in which we now had to go to a spike fork-50 rule. Upon doing that, there was a reduction in hunters. We all saw the dip in the graph. And then the number of hunters came back up. And it seems to plateau for a few years as the people build up. And eventually what you'll have is the same situation arise again. That is, the spike fork-50, simply because of the density of population of hunters is not adequate, just as the any bull harvest wasn't adequate, just as before that the any moose harvest wasn't adequate. And eventually we'll end up with more and more restrictive hunting.

At some point, I wonder, and what point it is, for us members of this committee that we will say, listen, that's not a reasonable opportunity for someone who needs their meat on a yearly basis, and relies primarily on moose meat, when not having the alternative for the caribou and what not, simply because of the low numbers down there.

I'm wondering -- I know it's very difficult, the most difficult part of this job is to turn around when you determined that there is not enough and restrict some of the users, and move in that direction. But the only thing I've seen us do so far is when we hear that there is not enough, instead of restricting any other user or suggesting that it be restricted or suggesting a change in some other regulation take place so that the subsistence user can have a fair share, we instead are restricting the subsistence user as we did yesterday. And as a trend in individual cases, I can make a very good argument for it, I suppose.

But as a trend, I think at some point you're going to have -- you have 45,000 people now on the Kenai Peninsula. If these charts are based on realistic figures, we're going to have a continued growth rate that's going to get us up another ten years, we will probably be hovering around 70,000 people, maybe 15 years to get to that rate. That's a lot of people, and there's going to be a lot more demand for those moose. There's going to be a lot more killed on the highway. That's not going to slow down any I don't think, or not going to slow down much. We're still going to have bad winters. Those things are still going to occur. And with spike fork-50, we're still going to -- even with that regime, we're still going to eventually find it more and more difficult to get a moose.

And I'll let you go ahead and vote this proposal down I suppose, but I'm very concerned that -- and in the alternative we're not really looking out for the best interest of the subsistence hunters when we don't use any other form of restriction other than on the subsistence hunter, because eventually it's going to get to the point where we can't let them hunt at all.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just want to say that I agree with you, Gary. I think that there's something serious going on here about allowing -- I guess you said -- first of all, you said that we are allowing the cows to be hunted by others. That is not our doing I don't think. That's the State. We have no control over what they do. I'm just wondering why nobody here said anything about that, what is happening with the State

management on the cows and yesterday, why that was not addressed at all? I mean, getting back to Gary's point of restricting the subsistence hunters, yet we're allowing others to shoot cows. We're going back to the other proposal, but what he's talking about, that there is -- we're not restricting other hunters, we're not talking about restricting other hunters, we're just talking about restricting subsistence. Can somebody talk about that a little bit? Why aren't you recommending that we restrict other hunters rather restrict the subsistence hunters?

MR. WILLIS: Under the spike fork-50, we don't see a need to restrict anyone, because as Ralph pointed out, this is a self-limiting system. The number of hunters you put out there is not controlling really the number of bulls that are going to be harvested. It's controlled by the number of legal bulls that are out there to be harvested, and so you don't put yourself in a position of having to limit who gets to hunt and who doesn't.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I remember right, last year what we did is we extended this season so that the subsistence hunter would have an opportunity to hunt these same moose before anybody else hunted them. Am I correct in remembering that?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct. There was a ten-day extension of the season made in August for subsistence hunters only.

MR. LOHSE: Now, I recognize the fact that that's not the ideal time for a lot of people and it wouldn't always be the ideal time for me. What kind of participation did we have in that hunt? And what kind of success rate?

MR. WILLIS: I have those numbers if you'll give me just a second to pull them out.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: While you're looking, I just want to remind the Council members that we don't have that much time this morning. We should be out of here by 11:30 if we're going

to get to the airport, pick up our stuff and get to the airport.  
Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: (Indiscernible)

MR. WILLIS: Ralph, we had a total of 117 people who picked up Federal permits for the new August 10 to August 20 subsistence hunt. To date, we've had 72 who have submitted hunt reports. Of those 40 reported that they actually hunted. Only one legal moose was harvested. In addition, an illegal moose was taken on non-federal lands by mistake by a person who thought he was on the federal side of the land. And during the special cow and spike fork bull hunt, September 1 through September 14 on Skilak Loop, for which 20 transferable permits were issued to the Ninilchik Traditional Council, only five hunters participated and spent an average of two days each hunting, and no moose were taken.

MR. LOHSE: So there was a cow, spike fork subsistence hunt in Skilak Loop last year?

MR. WILLIS: There was. It was a special one-time deal in order to avoid a lawsuit by the Ninilchik Traditional Council, which was -- or an injunction I should say, which would have stopped the entire moose season.

MR. LOHSE: And the participation on that was .....

MR. WILLIS: Five people.

MR. LOHSE: ..... there were 20 permits given and five people hunted?

MR. WILLIS: Right.

MR. LOHSE: No, are subsistence hunters limited from hunting in any of these other special moose hunts?

MR. WILLIS: No, they can participate .....

MR. LOHSE: I mean, they can .....

MR. WILLIS: ..... anybody can participate .....

MR. LOHSE: They can participate .....

MR. WILLIS: ..... in the drawings.

MR. LOHSE: ..... in any of the other cow hunts, too?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct.

MR. LOHSE: Okay.

MR. SPRAKER: If that .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You had a comment?

MR. SPRAKER: Mr. Chairman, good morning. Ted Spraker with Fish & Game. I just wanted to make one quick comment in reference to Mr. Lohse's question about the early season. If you look at the general hunting season each year, the harvest is made up of about 35 to 40% successful hunters in the first week of the season, whether that first week starts on the 1st of September or not on the 20th of September. You still have that kind of the gold rush sort of mentality and the first part of the season will yield the highest percentage of the harvest. The next highest percentage is the last week of the season, and that's, you know, you better get one quickly, because it's about over with. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HENRICHS: I've got a question.

MR. JOHN: Me, too.

MR. HENRICHS: What was the success rate the last week?

MR. SPRAKER: About 25% the last week. It's very high. That's ending the 20th of September.

MR. JOHN: I just want to say something. There's -- I think in ANILCA there's a law that says that to have co-management, I think that's 809 in ANILCA. Has the Kenai, the federal people in Kenai ever tried to reach out to the villages in co-management like Mount Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Service? I believe that's a law.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't think we have anybody from Park Service.

MR. JOHN: Or it's mandated law. I mean, to involve subsistence hunters, and to me all I heard is that everything I see is -- goes for big game hunters, the 50-inch moose, whatever. I mean, and the bull season. It has -- those are not subsistence to me. And I -- as far as I see, I don't see anybody, any one in Kenai reaching out to the subsistence .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Hunters?

MR. JOHN: Yes.

MR. BRELSFORD: Let's answer that in two steps. Taylor Brelsford. The first part is what Section 809 in ANILCA provides. It refers to cooperative agreements in which different parties could work together to serve the purposes of conservation and the subsistence priority. So we have provided funding in several parts of Alaska. We're working with tribal associations on community studies and on cooperative management plans, like the Kilbuck Caribou plan and so on. We have not initiated cooperative agreements on the Kenai Peninsula to date. However, I believe that have been some cooperative management programs to identify management goals on the Kenai among the land management agencies. And maybe Robert or Ted could provide a bit more detail about that.

MR. JOHN: I was thinking there's different tribes down there, there's Ninilchik Tribal Council. There's different tribes down there, and is there any reaching out to them about management?

MR. BRELSFORD: Well, let me -- let's not lose sight of

the fact that the BIA under its ANILCA funding provided a contract to the Ninilchik Traditional Council to conduct a community study and bring together information regarding traditional harvest practices, so I would say we haven't done all the things that are possible, but there's been a starting point in some of the cooperative agreement funding.

MR. JOHN: I'd like to say up in our area, we're pretty encouraged by the National Park, that they come -- they reach out to the villages and they try to work together with them, and we -- and, you know, both ways. And I think it's working pretty well.

MR. BRELSFORD: That's all. Is there any merit to describing a cooperative management plan that you guys have done on the biological part?

MR. WILLIS: That's a federal/state.

MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair, I have some information that you should be aware of. The Ninilchik Traditional Council lawsuit against the Federal Government on the antler restriction is still alive. Okay. And what they're saying is that imposition of this regulation on subsistence users without first curtailing other uses is an illegal restriction on subsistence under Title VIII of ANILCA. And when we sought guidance from the Solicitor's Office on this, should this Regional Council go forward and make a recommendation on this proposal, he said, go ahead, even though this lawsuit is on-going. Everything goes forward at the same time. Which is certainly very contrary to what I learned in law school, which is when you have an issue under litigation, everybody in the world stops action on it until the Court speaks. But for some reason, the Solicitor has chosen to let you as the Advisory Council go ahead and proceed with this.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah. Helga, do I understand that under normal procedures, that we would not take action on a proposal like this, but that under the current Solicitor, he says we should? Is that -- did I understand that correctly?

MS. EAKON: Well, normally agencies don't do anything when an issue like this is under litigation. They wait for the Court to speak. But for some reason, our Solicitor's Office said that's not a bar, the Regional Council can -- should proceed to deliberate on this. And it -- I don't know, it's very .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think that's a good decision. You don't know how long these court cases will last, you know. In my experience, some cases last years.

Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Lee? I'm trying to move this along if we can.

MR. BASNAR: Well, I understand that, but I'd still like to address the issue.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead.

MR. BASNAR: I think that what we have here is we do have some alternate means. We've got some cow permits that everybody can apply for. It's the luck of the draw. We've got an earlier season for subsistence users. And I think subsistence users should be the foremost conservation-minded people in Alaska, because without proper conservation of the resource, the adverse impact on down the road subsistence harvest, it's just a self-defeating situation. And I always have a great deal of concern for the resource, because the people depend upon the resource. So I think we have to -- we have to look at a situation here that is working. We've got nine years of data on this spike 50-inch situation. In my area, we've got a spike fork-50. Do I like it? Not particularly, because it makes me hunt a little bit harder. Last year it took me 12 hard hunting days to get a moose, but I got one.

When I see that five people out of Ninilchik went hunting and they hunted an average of two days, I'm mean, I really don't think we can expect to step out the back door of our house and kill a moose with no effort. I think if the proper effort is applied, the success rate would go up. I also don't -- again, I just don't see anybody else on the Kenai

Peninsula complaining about this situation. It's only the Ninilchik Council. If Nanwalek, Port Graham, Seldovia and other areas were in here putting in proposals or testifying before us that they also are hurt by the current situation, that they're deprived of their take of the moose, hey, I'd be very receptive. But it's only the Ninilchik Traditional Council who have demonstrated a very low hunting effort, at least last year.

And so I would have to vote against this proposal, because I just don't think that the situation as it currently exists -- Gary said at some point we're going to reach a situation. That point has not been reached yet. We have a population increase in this country in subsistence and non-subsistence users just by the fact that we're human beings and we increase. And, yes, all resources on earth come under pressure as populations increase. And we have to accept that. Things cannot go back to the way they were when Columbus sailed the ocean blue. And I think a good conservation approach to this will in fact ensure that the subsistence user down the road is going to have the resource, and at the point where the subsistence is truly deprived, I will lead the charge to cut off non-subsistence users from the resource, so that the true subsistence users can. But I don't think we've reached that point yet. And I want to see maximum effort on the part of the subsistence user before I would give up and say we've got to do something else. I will not vote in favor of this.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: One more -- I have one more question, and then a comment. I wish -- I still wish we had kind of put this together, because I can understand the lack of interest in the August, the early August hunt, and I could see giving that same opportunity at the tail end instead of at the beginning, although preferably -- I guess I would prefer to hunt animals that hadn't been hunted, if I really wanted to hunt.

But my question was, when was that Skilak Loop hunt that they had 20 permits available for? What was the timing on that?

MR. WILLIS: That was September the 1st through the

14th.

MR. LOHSE: So that was basically right in -- was there other hunts going on at the same time there?

MR. WILLIS: Not in that area. That's -- no, there was a later hunt in the Skilak Loop by the general season hunters under State permit, and this started the day after, or shortly after the subsistence hunt ended.

MR. LOHSE: So basically Ninilchik had access to the Skilak Loop hunt first and had 20 permits, but only five people made use of their permits?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct.

MR. LOHSE: Then I'd have to say I don't -- my problem is, if there's a need, I can see filling a need, but when you've got access, and you don't make use of that access, it must not be a pressing need.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, could I speak to that?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah. Pardon?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Could I speak to that .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: ..... issue? It's been brought up and it's been hammered around left and right, and it makes it sound like everybody's sitting on their back side waiting for somebody to deliver meat to the door. The fact is is that this decision wasn't made until the -- just before the actual hunt was let out. The tickets -- or we did not know as a council, since we were the ones actually distributing the tickets, that we would even have them for sure. Promises had been made, and we finally received those right before the hunt. We still had to have in the middle of summer, our summer, our harvest season for salmon and whatnot, we still had to have a council meeting to decide how these things would be distributed. That took a couple days.

By the time all this stuff transpired, it was very difficult to get everything together. You can't expect that to just drop out of the sky on you, and all of a sudden it works. That may be true in other places where people have perhaps a little more leisure time available, or resources available in which they can just jump on this thing and go and do. That's not the case. A lot of our people are out of contact range at that particular time.

So the reflection of the effort in this one-time shot should not reflect upon the whole tribe, nor on the need nor on the hunt. It's aberration. It came out of the blue. People weren't prepared for it, nor was the tribe, nor, frankly were anybody else. Even getting the permits was some difficulty.

The other thing to keep in mind is that the tribe asked myself, my brother, my brother-in-law in fact, and a couple of other hunters to see what was up there. To actually go take a quick look. We wanted to assess the situation, and my brother and brother-in-law had the best experience perhaps by meeting a ranger who, (a) all but frisked them, because he didn't even know such a hunt was going on. When the permits were produced, he asked for I.D. and went beyond probably what he really needed to do it. But then he informed them, I don't know what you're doing here, there's no moose here this time of year, which seemed to be the indication that we got, that the moose were very, very, very scarce in that area at that particular time.

And thus the discussion which goes into our next -- the next part of this proposal, which is changing the actual timing of the hunt, so I would hope that we could dispense with the kind of concern that's been relayed. If this were -- another 20 permits were relayed again, and the timing were a little bit different, and we had enough time to prepare for it, I think you would see a much improved effort over what you saw before.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Robert, you had your hand up?

MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, I was just curious. You said they hunted in that area after this deal. What kind of success -- that was a permit hunt, too, right?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct.

MR. HENRICHS: And what kind of success did those people have, and did any of these five people that went out in this earlier one go hunting in that last one also or what?

MR. WILLIS: In answer to your second question first, not to my knowledge, Robert. It was a drawing hunt held by the State, and I don't -- Gary, I don't think anybody of .....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. WILLIS: ..... your group hunted that -- no. As far as the success, that second hunt, as I said, the Ninilchik Traditional Council hunt was September 1 through 14. September 15 through 30, in the same area, there were a total of 32 non-subsistence hunters who had -- who drew cow permits, and they harvest seven cows for a 22% success rate.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other comments? Questions?

I do have one question. That is, have you thought about how you would handle this if the Court decision went in the favor of the Ninilchik Village here?

MR. WILLIS: Other than to write up the -- some alternatives, you know, kind of in rough form, we haven't, Roy. A lot of things we haven't done this year, especially being shut down for a month. So my answer to that is, you know, you have -- as I mentioned earlier, you have a number of options that you can look at if you go to an any bull hunt. And you've got the first year for sure, because of the expected high success, you're going to have to set a quota in some of those areas, and probably shut your hunt off early, and then that's one option. Short seasons. We'd have to get together with the State and the refuge people and try to figure out, you know, how to handle it depending on what the Court said.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just want to say, again repeat it, I know it's been said time and again, I think there's

inconsistency in game management. On one hand you allow for cow moose hunting, and when a subsistence group wants cow moose hunting, we recommend against it. That just -- I know it's not your department, it's the State allowing a cow moose hunt. I want to be sure that it's on the record, and maybe some kind of future cooperation happen on that. To get that -- to respond to that?

MR. SPRAKER: Mr. Chairman, I understand what you're saying, and I sympathize with your request for the Department to reach out more to subsistence hunters. I'd like to say though for the record at the last Federal Subsistence Board I personally recommended that since there's only one cow hunt being conducted on federal lands on the Kenai, that people should take a look at that. That is an opportunity. There's never been a proposal by this Council or any other members of the public or a village or whatever for those cow permits in Skilak Loop. And again, those are available, they're available only following years when we have at least 130 countable moose, and they will probably be available in the future as long as we have a healthy and high density moose population there. And I would encourage you to make proposals for those cow tags.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you.

MR. SPRAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee?

MR. BASNAR: Mr. Chairman, he about took the words out of my mouth, and I would support that type of a proposal, because it just makes good sense. Those cows are available, but your general comment that cows are available and they don't care about subsistence hunters, they're only available in just specific high density population areas. I don't think that comment would have -- you didn't mean it to apply to the entire (indiscernible, simultaneous speech), did you?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I understand. I understand how the State is looking at it. I understand that, yeah. But still there should have been, here are some excess cows, you

know, .....

MR. BASNAR: I think we need .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: ..... that you can .....

MR. BASNAR: ..... to look at that in the future.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MR. BASNAR: I think we probably have been remiss in not looking at that. And I'd certainly be glad to.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it's odd that now after we went through the proposal yesterday and turned down a cow hunt which could have been very easily by amendment to the proposal or amendment to the motion restricted down to that area perhaps if that was the desire of the State, that that wasn't made known to us at that time, and that wasn't doesn't. It would -- it's a relatively simple process once a proposal is on the table to make those movements within it to get the process moving and to get those things taken care of. And I think in the interest of the subsistence user, that ought to be something that we ought to do, certainly, and if the State is now suggesting that, that's something that we could go back and do very quickly. We've already had enough discussion on it to get that over and done with I think in a matter of minutes if we have the State's concurrence on it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary, could I stop you at that? I think we're getting off the motion here.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Well, I'm sorry, I'm .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The reason I brought it up, was just to make a point that we're kind of -- or that the way, direction we're going, that .....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: And the reason I brought this up again,

and I'm sorry if I'm using too many words to explain it perhaps, but we're in a situation here where it seems to be an all or nothing deal again. We're either going to have subsistence hunting or we're not, and we're either going to allow the non-subsistence hunters to use it -- use the resource or not. They have some restrictions. We're not -- we don't have to restrict everybody out of Unit 15. We may restrict a certain portion of 15. We may restrict a different size to the bulls and say on federal land you may not take a spike fork. You may only take a 50 or something -- or the reverse of that. We have all these options out there to look at, to meet somewhere in the middle, and my feeling is that if this comes up again, that's exactly what's -- if we keep staying that far apart and not bringing out those kind of points so we can take care of it somewhere in the middle, we're going to stay on two different sides of the street, and that's just the way it's going to remain. And the subsistence hunter is going to be the loser in all of this.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think basically that's what I -- the point I was trying to make, is the direction we're going, it seemed like we're against the subsistence hunter. That's my perception. That may be my own, but that's the way we're headed.

MR. JOHN: That's how I felt about -- I mean, this whole thing here. Yesterday I voted against cow moose. I felt awful about that. I didn't want to. It was against every -- anything grained in me, but I mean, -- and then looking back, I look at that in everything we do, we're -- we haven't given the subsistence user any way. The federal don't have anything for the subsistence user. The State gives subsistence user. I know that, I know the State is all the time.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any further discussion on the motion? We have a motion. Could we have that repeated? What is the motion again?

MR. BRELSFORD: Do you want me to repeat the motion?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

MR. JOHN: So I'm going to vote for this.

MR. BRELSFORD: Hold on.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I believe what -- if I can recall it, this was to allow for any bull hunt?

MR. LOHSE: Right. Unit 15 moose.

MR. WILLIS: Basically one antlered bull by federal registration permit only.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: In Unit 15.

MR. LOHSE: While we're waiting, can I ask Gary a question while we're waiting for the motion?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right.

MR. LOHSE: Why then have you not come forward with some more restrictive proposals? Your proposals always come in that you want to draw a circle around the world, and you want everything in the circle. If you'd come to us with perhaps more restrictive proposals, you'd get a better response from everyone.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I seem -- to answer your question in your own terms, we don't see it as drawing a circle around the world. We see it as that circle being already very restricted, because we're only dealing 15. We didn't include 7, we didn't include the other areas that are included in the map. We already see as making an overture towards this group or towards the State or towards the Federal Government to limit, to already have some limits. We're not -- if it were possible to know what to say, if we could discuss it with the State beforehand, if they were to reach out, if the Federal Government were to reach out and say, listen, this is what we can do. These are the kinds of things we can do, perhaps yes, then we'd have a chance to meet them half-way at that point. but right now it seems the cards are held pretty much until we get to this forum, so we end up in this situation.

MR. LOHSE: Did you discuss these proposals ever with Seldovia and the other two communities?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes, constantly.

MR. LOHSE: But they never respond to us or testify or send letters .....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Within .....

MR. LOHSE: ..... to speak of or anything?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Within the tribes of the Cook Inlet, we have essentially agreed amongst ourselves through the Cook Inlet Treaty Tribes and other contact that certain groups are -- we can't do everything all the time. Some are best dealing with the pollution problems, some are best dealing with health problems, some are best at other things. For instance, a lot of our health is handled by the Kenaitze Indian Tribe. RDPA situations and what not, those are actually handled by the Chickaloon Tribe. Each has its particular skill, and we try to rely on that, as we did in the past before these particular situations arose. So it tends to be one group taking up the charge at one time, and then it falls on others. In the past you had a lot of work by the Kenaitze, now you're having more work by the Ninilchik Traditional Council in this particular area.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, let me ask the question again, did you find it?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, my note about the motion, first there was a sort of straw motion offered by Ralph and Gary, and then a decision to divide it into two steps. And a second motion which dealt with the any bull limit alone, only that aspect of the proposal, and the motion was to adopt the proposal in the element concerning the any bull.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any bull in Unit 15?

MR. BRELSFORD: In Unit 15.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Very good.

MR. BRELSFORD: And I show Ralph as offering that second motion and Gary seconding it a second time.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Right. Correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. That's the motion. Is there further discussion on the motion? Ready to vote?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The question is called for. All in favor say aye?

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign?

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Ayes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. We'll have to show by raising your right hand? All in favor again?

(Ralph Henrichs, Roy Ewan, Fred John, Gary Oskolkoff raise their hands)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed?

(Ralph Lohse, Lee Basnar, Benjamin Romig raise their hands)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion carries.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess that takes care of that one, except for the season. Yeah. Oh, you already heard the recommendation on the season. Is there a motion on the season?

MR. JOHN: I'll make a motion, you know, that September 11/September 30 season for the Proposal 25 by Ninilchik Traditional Council.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second

CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion and second. All in --well, we're not ready to vote. Any discussion on the motion? Lee?

MR. BASNAR: Mr. Chairman, once again I'm going to speak to the biological data that was presented to us, and I see a danger in forcing cows to go through a second and third estrus here by disrupting the breeding process late in the season. And to me that's a pretty valid reason to not extend that season into the breeding season. And therefore I would be opposed to extending the season.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Just let me comment, since you commented on that. Actually this will bring the State and the Federal Government together, to start working together and trying to allow for some opportunity for the subsistence hunter. That's how I see it. Either you do that, or you're going to have some problems that you're speaking of. Ben?

MR. ROMIG: Yeah, I think that something a little more along the lines of splitting the -- having it on one end, either -- instead of having ten days after the general hunt, maybe having it five days added on there, and then five days prior to it. And I think that gives you a real big advantage over the other people, because generally after the 20th of September when the season closes and the bulls are moving, they're not -- they're still in pretty good shape on the 25th, but you don't have anybody else out there hunting. Plus it also gives you, if you've got real bad weather at the first of the season, or it might be unseasonably warm, you've still got the option of hunting at the end of the season. So I think by splitting that out, you serve a lot better purpose?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let me see if I understand, you're saying .....

MR. ROMIG: Well, I'm saying that I wouldn't vote for this as it's written, because I think going into the September season .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: To leave it as the season?

MR. ROMIG: No, I'm saying as the motion was proposed, I would be against that. But I'm saying just personally that I think that in the future they should think about maybe having a little bit before and a little bit after, instead of like for instance now going into .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You're saying we should change this a little bit. Okay.

MR. ROMIG: Well, I think that it -- yeah, I think that would be a bigger advantage for the user.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, if Ben would make that in the form of an amendment to the motion, I would be agreeable to that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You want a two-minute break?

MR. ROMIG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let's take a two-minute break. Maybe we can come up with dates.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Call the meeting back together.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: We need to get together one of these days on all these projects instead of doing it here publicly.

MR. ROMIG: Yeah.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I think we're .....

MR. ROMIG: I'd like to -- Fred was just suggesting that maybe we actually read that for the record and say that we're willing to sit down and discuss it beforehand and work out something. (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. JOHN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I'll call the meeting back to order. The discussion is on the season. The original proposal here was that we -- that we had a motion on was to open the season I guess September 11th to September 30th for any bull.

MR. JOHN: I'd like to withdraw that motion.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: The second concurs, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Is there a new motion on the season?

MR. JOHN: I would like to make a motion with the recommendation that Ben had.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. What's your recommendation?

MR. JOHN: It's five days ahead and five days after?

MR. ROMIG: Yeah, five days ahead and five days after.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: It's a ten-day total. It would be .....

MR. JOHN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could you give me a set of dates? How it would work?

MR. ROMIG: I believe it would be August 15/ September 25.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is that we have a season August 15th through September 25th, giving five days on each end. Or is it?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify that, I thought Ben's idea was to go from the 15th through the 20th, and then from the 20th through the 25th, so there would be ten-days total of this season, and not, you know, through the entire sport season also.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Uh-huh.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Because there would be the differential possibly, except with the turn-down of the Board perhaps, that it may be no antler restriction on it at that point.

MR. LOHSE: So is that -- so, Ben, you're saying that -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Uh-huh.

MR. LOHSE: You're saying that the proposal is for a five-day subsistence season at the beginning, before the season, and a five-day subsistence season after the season?

MR. ROMIG: Yes. Is that what the understanding was? Am I getting that wrong?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was my understanding.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Well, that's -- it's the same thing, basically different.

MR. BASNAR: I still don't understand.

MR. ROMIG: Well, the concern, my concern was, and perhaps I shouldn't have brought it up and let it flow through

the way that it was, is that we have an any bull -- a possibility of an any-bull scenario now because of the last vote.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, could we handle it this way? Would the motion maker withdraw it again, so we can start over again? Is that acceptable?

MR. ROMIG: Yeah, I didn't make it, Fred made it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, Fred?

MR. JOHN: Okay. I withdraw my motion.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: The second concurs.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. The second concurs. We'll start over.

MR. JOHN: Let's correct it.

MR. BASNAR: No, let's talk about the dates. That's where I'm confused, because what I see here says September 11th to September 30th. Okay. We're going to back it up from September 30th to end on September 25, is that part of it correct? Do I understand that correctly? And then where does September 15th -- August 15th come into it? I don't see that here.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Ben had suggested that we have -- instead of having the ten days added to the tail end of the season, that we have, and I hope that I'm getting this correct, that we have five days before and five days after to try and stay out of the rut as much as the State has suggested.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: And I guess if I understand you correctly, Gary, what you're saying is that those extended time is the only time that we have any bull, is that correct?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: During those periods.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah. That's the way I understand it.

MR. ROMIG: Yeah. In other words, that during the general open season there wouldn't be an any bull.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So maybe if we made a motion, we could move forward. Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make the motion, that the subsistence season is from August 15 through August 20, and September 20 through September 25. Five days at the beginning of the regular general season -- prior to the general season and five days after the general season.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. HENRICHS: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion -- there's a motion and a second now. Any discussion?

MR. LOHSE: That's what I understood. I may be wrong.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, he's got the memo. Lee?

MR. BASNAR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Quickly, I am still opposed to the over-all proposal of the any-antler restriction, but in the interest of compromise and attempting to work this thing out, I will vote in favor of this date change.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other comment? Ben?

MR. ROMIG: Well, I'd like to concur with Lee on the fact that I still am against the restriction being lifted, but I am in favor of the seasons.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, the way I would put it, is I

view the spike fork-50 a shared responsibility of all users to provide a stable herd, and so I'm still against the any antlered moose part, but I, too, believe that what you do is you give opportunity, and one of the ways you give opportunity is you give opportunity with time. And therefore I'll support this proposal also.

MR. JOHN: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's called for. All in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion is carried. We're off 25. We on to proposal .....

MS. MASON: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, there are a series of other proposals which deal with adjoining regions, but also affect the Southcentral Region, so our plan was to give you very brief synopses of each of these and then the Council can vote to recommend -- to approve or express their -- what they want to about each proposal.

The first one is Proposal #3, and this was a c&t proposal that was submitted by the State regional advisory council, and also the Southeast Regional Subsistence Advisory Council, and it asks for a positive c&t determination for brown bear in 6(A) for residents of Unit 5. The Southeast Council did adopt this proposal, but with the modification of changing residents of Unit 5 to residents of Yakutat, with the idea that Yakutat is the only permanent community in Unit 5.

And briefly, the community harvest by Yakutat residents in Unit 6(A) have been very modest. There have been two bears taken by residents of Unit 5 since 1972. However, there is archaeological and ethnographic evidence that residents of Unit

5 or Yakutat residents did traditionally harvest bears Unit 6(A), and those harvest areas have been documented by ADF&G, Division of Subsistence Reports. So, because of that historical use, and because of the symbolic and practical importance in Tlinget culture of the brown bear, the staff recommendation was to adopt the proposal, and as I explained, the Council also adopted the proposal, but with the modification of Yakutat instead of Unit 5.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. You all understand this is out of our Southcentral area, so if you want to make any recommendation, that is up to you. Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Well, it does effect our area. Our Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee voted in favor of recognizing the customary and traditional use of residents of Unit 5 in Unit 6(A), which is part of our area. We didn't see any possibility that people who travelled back and forth through that area wouldn't have taken brown bear. And .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you did support?

MR. LOHSE: We voted to support this proposal.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Will you recommend- -- I mean, you make a motion that we support this?

MR. LOHSE: I make a motion that we accept Proposal #3.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second?

MR. JOHN: Second.

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

MR. JOHN: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The question is called for. All in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Proposal Number?

MS. MASON: Eight.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Eight.

MS. MASON: Robert will give you the .....

MR. WILLIS: Proposal #8 was submitted by a member of the Southeast Regional Council, and it would lengthen the goat season in Unit 5 from August 1 to December 31, to August 1 to January 31, and in Unit 6(A), which is the portion which we're concerned about in the Southcentral Region, would extend that season from August 20 to January 31, make it August 1 to January 31.

Roy Nowlin is going to present some information on the goat situation, so I'm going to defer most of this to him, except to say that goats occur in very isolated or semi-isolated populations without much interchange. They're a species with low productivity, live in areas of severe climate, and they're very susceptible to over-harvest, and so we have to be very careful about how we manage goats. There are very few goats on federal lands in Subunit 6(A), and this is another consideration in looking at this proposal. There are some possible problems that Roy will explain to you concerning how you would manage a hunt on federal land which is different from the State hunt.

We wrote this proposal up saying that we cautiously supported it, and this is one of those grey areas that I was uncomfortable with as a biologist, because the one goat population that's still hunted in that area is declining. All the other goat populations in that area have already declined to the point where the hunting season's been closed. And extending the season, which is what this proposal calls for on a declining

population just bothers me, although I can't say with any certainty that this would have an affect on the population. As I say, it's one of those grey areas where it makes you uncomfortable as a biologist, but you can't come up with any hard evidence that it's going to have an actual impact on the population.

With that, I think I'll turn it over to Roy in the interest of time. I hope he's sitting behind me today. Last time I said that, there was a resounding silence back there. So, Roy, if you don't mind coming forward?

MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Roy Nowlin with the Department of Fish & Game in Cordova.

On this proposal, I think Bob did a pretty good job of introducing it here, because for me here biologically with these goats, particularly down in Unit 6(A), that caution is -- should really be the order of the day, and, you know, biological caution with these goats, because they -- as Bob says, they have been declining, and I have a couple of graphs that I think you'll find interesting about the status. And maybe I'll put the first just for perspective.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Were you in their discussions when they were talking about this at the Southeast meeting?

MR. NOWLIN: No, I wasn't. I was at the advisory committee meeting here in Cordova when this was discussed, but not at the Southeast.

You saw a map similar to this one when Steve Zemke was -- first made the presentation for the Forest Service. This is what's going on currently with the State hunts in all of Unit 6. And what we've got right now down -- the area that would be affected that's 6(A) is from right about here, from Katalla down to Icy Bay, so I'll move this over and focus just a little bit in.

Actually, Bob, this year we had three hunts down there. This one, 202, in the state system, this is entirely on State

and private land, and there's federal land in 204, and there's federal land in 206, and most of that federal land is up near the upper end, it's BLM. And there's very few goats on that BLM land. It's up close to the glacier, there's a lot of permanent ice. Most of the goats are on State and private lands that are down closer to the coast.

What we have currently, and I'm just kind of -- I'll give you a little bit more background here for a minute about Prince William Sound. These hunts that are up here, you'll see closed on those. We closed those -- closed the state season in there when the State allowable harvest was reached. The federal harvest was never reached in those, so the federal subsistence season was never closed in those. So that's how these are being run. In -- we have -- they're all under registration permit. That means that we don't limit the number of hunters, and when we reach an allowable harvest, we close by emergency order. In the federal -- that's the state system.

The federal system is run exactly the same way, except the federal hunts were not closed, and I don't -- the only one that I know of that has been closed was one that Steve mentioned that's in the head of Port Fidalgo. See, it's right up in here. And that one was closed permanently, because the season -- the number of goats in there have declined to the point where you couldn't support a harvest, and the State season had been closed. That was done I believe in '9- -- what, '94? '93 maybe. And the state season had been closed in there since '88, because the population had been declining, so the first thing that closed was the state season.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: What do you call that area that you pointed to last? There's .....

MR. NOWLIN: This is Port Fidalgo. Let's see, right in .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: The one above there, yeah.

MR. NOWLIN: Right here.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Right there. Yeah.

MR. NOWLIN: Yeah, that's Port Fidalgo, and Tatitlek sits right up in here.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, I see. Okay.

MR. NOWLIN: Valdez is further north. There's Valdez Arm right here.

Well, what's been happening in 6(A) now, as I said, that's from Katalla on down clear to Icy Bay, this is a general look about -- at what's been happening with the goat populations there. You can see that -- and the red line is harvest, the blue bars are what we found during the surveys. Now, we don't have surveys every year in there, so I've had to extrapolate, you know, between the points when we do have surveys, and estimate what's between them. But you can see we've gone down from 791 to 532 is our estimate for '95, and we've been very conservative. The harvest in there is kind of hard to see. I've got the numbers on there, but as the population has declined, we have reduced harvest, and this is only a couple percent of what we counted in there. We closed a lot of areas. As populations have declined, we've closed them off, because we don't want to accelerate this downward decline in goats down there by having an excessive harvest. And as I say, some of those places down there, there was a lot of grey on that map. The grey that I showed you earlier is areas that are closed. And we've -- formerly we had a lot of hunt areas in there, and we've just had to close them as the population has declined.

Now, the two areas where there's Federal land down there, this is what's happened in those two hunt areas. They're lumped together. They were hunts 204 and 206. And you can see that I believe the decline here from '89 to '95 was about 40%. And we've -- the harvest in there still, the red line is harvest again. It's still been very conservative. And we're watching it closely, because of this concern over the decline.

Now, there's a couple of points here to kind of summarize. This is what our biological concerns are down there.

We've got this declining harvest that we've been talking about. One of the other thing that's happening down there is we have a loss of winter habitat due to logging. And we've got -- that's been going on since the 70s down there. One area on State land between White River and Icy Bay, we've had about a 60% decline in goats down there. Now, I'm not saying that's all due to logging, but certainly we've had that loss of habitat.

We're concerned about this one hunt area, 204. Dahlgren Ridge is the last, the largest remaining, and that's one of the areas that has some federal land in it with goats on it, is the last remaining concentration area of goats all the way from Valdez Arm to Icy Bay. And that one has been declining as well. I've reviewed some cutting plans down there. It's in -- the situation is in doubt right now, what's actually going to happen, but I suspect that we're going to lose more winter range in there because of settlements with the University and settlements with the mental health. There was a large legal battle that went on for a while over that.

The other thing, and Bob mentioned this earlier, and Ralph did as well, these animals are very sensitive to over-harvest, so we've got to keep a real close eye on that.

Now, if there is some sort of a season down there, if this proposal that you have in front of you passes, and actually winds up being put into place, I think again caution is the watch word here, because if it's put in place, what it will mean is that there will be a different season from the state season down there, because we don't open, as you see in the proposal there, we don't open until later on in August. So we're going to have a different season. I think what would have to happen is you'd have to have a federal registration permit system in place like the one that's in 6(D), and you'd have to have separate federal permits, and I would recommend that the federal and the state hunt boundaries be the same so that you can track that harvest better. You can understand how many goats are there and how many are being taken. I think that the local federal manager, some local federal manager needs to be appointed to administer this hunt. And currently in Prince William Sound, Dan Logan here with the Forest Service is the

person who does the federal administration. And the local federal managers should be given the authority to close that season if the harvest is greater than expected, because we're only talking a few goats here, and if you have a registration hunt where there's an unlimited number of hunters, if you have a real influx of hunters in there, you could take far -- you could double or triple an allowable harvest very quickly if you didn't have someone local and he didn't have the authority to close that season if necessary.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: These points are what you would recommend?

MR. NOWLIN: If there is a Federal season put in place down there, I think you're going to need some sort of system to make sure that harvest is monitored and make sure that there's a way to shut this harvest off so you don't injure that goat population. The primary concern here is the welfare of the resource.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Robert.

MR. HENRICHS: Yeah. I was just curious, you were mentioning loss of habitat and through logging, isn't that -- you know, goats don't spend a lot of time in timber except maybe in the winter when they get driven down there, don't they?

MR. NOWLIN: Most of the year they don't, you know, they're up higher and they're up in the alpine. But if you have a severe winter, one thing that we've found out about goats in these coastal areas is that old rural forest is critical for their survival, old growth forest that's near escape terrain so if you -- and on south facing slopes. So what's going to happen is if you get -- when you get a winter that's -- that's relatively severe, if they don't have that, they can't go down and shelter in that old growth forest, they're not going to survive well.

MR. HENRICHS: How about wolves?

MR. NOWLIN: Wolves are also a factor. We have a wolf

population that has become established in Unit 6 since the '70s. And when they moved in, first moved into Unit 6 we had a lot of goats and the goats that were living in places where there wasn't adequate escape terrain, cliffs for them where they could get away from wolves and I think they got pasted. The goats that were living in those places where there weren't -- wasn't escape terrain probably have been reduced. And as long as there are wolves present in the system, we probably will never get them back.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Roy, you brought up that basically the Federal land is all in the back of these units from the -- where you showed where the hunts are currently open that that's either State or private land until you get to the back of them. Now, when you get to the back of them, you say you're in more ice and rock country, do you still have goats back there or are the majority -- how would you operate a hunt, a special Federal hunt if the only access to it was through the goats to the back country where there wasn't many goats?

MR. NOWLIN: Well, you have to make sure that any hunters that get Federal permits have a map of Federal land, where it is so they can orient themselves because they're going to have to get back well away from -- I mean it's probably going to be an aircraft access only. Because it would take somebody that's certainly a heck of a lot younger and tougher than I am to walk up the ducktoe to get to those goats. But they'd have to be sure of where they were and they'd have to have a map of those locations.

MR. LOHSE: So currently they can hunt -- this is the current existing State regulations right now, August 20th through January 31st?

MR. NOWLIN: Right.

MR. LOHSE: So they have access to these hunts -- these goats on the land where the goats mostly exist?

MR. NOWLIN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: Between August 20th and August 31st -- if we change the season to August 1st to August 31st, that only applies on Federal land, right?

MR. NOWLIN: That's right, that's the way I understand it.

MR. LOHSE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah, I've only ever hunted goats one time and killed one goat so I don't know much about goat hunting. But I look at this January 31st and boy I don't know much about the climate down here, but what kind of effort would it take, would it take somebody landing on skis in there in January in order to be able to get to the goats or can a snowmachine get into this country? I'm wondering what the individual, the proposal maker, what his rationale is to want to hunt in January for goats?

MR. NOWLIN: Well, our existing State season goes to the end of January in Unit 6, it doesn't in Unit 5. Down there I -- since I've been here, I haven't had any goats reported taken in January. The latest we get down there is November and that's a tough hunt. Snowmachine, I don't think you could get to them with snowmachine, although, those goats do move down lower at that -- if you've got snow, they're going to be down lower into the timber and in some cases in Prince William Sound, they'll move right down on to the beach, but there's no beach up there in those areas. You're away from the beach, there's a -- that didn't have any topography on it, that map that I showed you, nor does this one of Federal lands, it's posted up here. But you're probably a good seven or eight miles from the beach, the base of the cliff there, the base of the mountains. There's a flat between the beach and the mountains there and so you're a good seven or eight miles across some pretty rough stuff to even get to the base. The access in January would probably be by ski plane, maybe landing on a glacier up there or perhaps a

ridgetop, but it's a dangerous proposition.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have a question along those lines, too, about -- on Page 153, Bob, I don't know what this refers to, it says next to the bottom of the last paragraph, it says, however, hunters who wait until the snow falls might be able to take goats along the beaches instead of high altitudes. I was wondering which area they were referring to?

MR. WILLIS: Right. That's part of the cultural analysis. And speaking generally, there's a lot of goat harvest from boats in southeast Alaska because a lot of that country does have cliffs right at the edge of the water, areas where the goats do come down to the beach. And a lot of them are harvested by people in fishing boats, like, you know, 25 to 40 foot boats who take them when the snow forces them down close to the beach. There's only one area in Unit 5 and 6(A) that -- where that would be possible and that is the Icy Bay area, which is -- it was at the very end of that map. There's a line going up the middle of Icy Bay which divides Unit 5 on the south and east from Unit 6(A) on the north and west. And that area there is.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Federal land?

MR. WILLIS: .....some opportunity there way back in the back of Icy Bay there are some goats on Federal land. I'll let Roy point to it there on the map while I'm talking about it. I talked to the fellow who submitted this proposal at some length about what it was he was trying to get at when we had the southeast council meeting in. And he was mostly interested in Icy Bay, which is, parts of that are in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and part of it is State land. There's different regulations on opposite sides of the Bay and he said that his intent was to -- was to have the same regulation on both sides of the Bay. He wanted to try to access goats up in 6(A) when he was up there fishing. And it's still -- you know, Icy Bay is named that for a reason, it's full ice coming off the glacier, it's really a dangerous place to try to get into and opportunities to hunt there are somewhat limited just by the physical condition of the area.

But that is the one area where you do have goats that are on cliffs that are close to the water so that you can access them by boat.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: And the best time is probably when he's recommending, right?

MR. WILLIS: I don't know about that particular area in January. I don't know if anybody tries to hunt in there in January or not, but the goats are forced down lower by heavy snow during the winter months and are often seen on the beach in southeast in some areas.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You know to add to that I did talk with John Vale.

MR. WILLIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: He was at our SRC meeting in Glenallen and he did talk about this a little bit. I don't recall everything, but he did say that Icy Bay is a long ways from Yakutat and for a person to go up there for just one goat, it's hardly worth it unless you're assured of getting one. And that's what he's trying to do, I guess, for some people to be able to make that long trip to hunt and make it at a time when you could most likely could get one. I guess that's what he's trying to do.

Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, the only problem with that is he's not adding anything to the end of the season. They can currently go there all the way to January 31st, which is what he's picking for an end to the season here. I don't -- you know, I don't know whether extending it to August 1st in the front would make much difference as far as take is concerned. But if you were going to do something like this, the one thing that we have to keep in mind is that, you know, goat populations are extremely susceptible to over harvest and they're small populations. And one thing we may need to do in the future is

sit down and look at these populations and come up with for these different herds, come up with a minimum herd size so that when -- as Roy pointed out and I think that's something that maybe was missed, when he's talking about areas being closed, he's talking about areas being closed to the general hunt, a lot of the goat areas in Prince William Sound have been closed, like the one that he pointed out -- have been closed to general hunters since 1988. Currently there's one of them that's closed to subsistence hunters because the herd -- even after the general hunt was shut down and -- and as far as we know, the subsistence hunters didn't many goats out and the herd's still crashing. So somewhere along the line you've got to put a trigger mechanism or you got to recognize the fact that even with just subsistence hunters hunting on a declining population with predation, there has to be a point where you say we can't take anymore of them. You know, some kind of -- something in there that says, we don't want to let the herds get below 30 animals or 50 animals. Because once you get too small, you don't get good reproduction and you don't get, you know, a very big genetic pool. And goats don't move around like caribou and -- and sheep and everything to that same extent.

So I don't, like I said, I don't see much difference in this. Basically what it's doing is it's extending the subsistence hunt from August 1st to August 20th and currently they're already hunting on August 20th. Now, at that time of the year, there is a setnet fishery going on on the Kaliakh and so there are people down there -- does Kaliakh have a setnet fishery or does Kaliakh just have a camp fishery -- the -- I think the Kaliakh has a setnet fishery too. Kaliakh, the Sieu, the Seaduck, all of those down there, I think have a setnet fishery so there are people there for the silver season early -- early in August and that might mean that there would be people willing to go to the back of that -- and so that it -- it might actually impact those goat herds more than I think it would. But there is no lengthening of the end of it, the end of it -- the end of it in Unit 6(A) is already January 31st.

In 5 -- and I don't know if we even -- if we should even vote on Unit 5 because Unit 5 is out of our area. And he's asking for Unit 5 to go from -- it's currently August 1st to

December 31st, he's asking for Unit 5 to go from August 1st to January 31st, but that's not even in southcentral's region, 6(A) is. And so we just have to decide whether we want to tack 20 days subsistence hunt on the front of the regular hunt in Unit 6(A). And then like I said, if we're going to do that, maybe in the future or at least we should put it in our mind that we're going to have to be willing to look at these things and as goat herds decline or if they continue to decline basically shutting it down to everything. A lot of these herds are already shutdown to general hunt or some of them are anyhow.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You did say we -- what we're seeing here in that proposal is a 30 day extension, right?

MR. WILLIS: Yeah.

MR. LOHSE: Twenty day extension.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Twenty day?

MR. LOHSE: It's a 20 day extension at the beginning of the hunt.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't know is that?

MR. WILLIS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Am I seeing something?

MR. WILLIS: Currently it's August 20th, he wants to start.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, I'm looking at the wrong one, I'm looking at this one up here -- I'm sorry. Okay, I see now. I was looking at Unit 5 and mixing it up.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I don't know, I -- I'm fairly neutral on this. I don't understand the goat hunting down -- the situation down in southeast very well. Robert.

MR. HENRICHS: Yeah. One thing I'll just mention is there's quite a bit of logging activity down there and there's logging camps down there going too. They're shipping logs out of there pretty steady out of Icy Bay right now, so there's people that are down there quite a bit of the year and there's going to be more of it, too, because there's been more sales down there.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead, Fred.

MR. JOHN: I'd support this if, you know, the Federal people say that they -- they would shutdown if there's an over harvest and watch them real closely.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You have control?

MR. WILLIS: We have some control, you know, and Roy and I were talking about this yesterday. And currently the Federal permits have to go to Anchorage, they're stamped on a self-addressed envelope which comes to our office and that really needs to be changed so that they go to the local manager because he needs to know right away when these goats are taken. It takes time for the word to get back from our office. I didn't know about this until yesterday when Roy brought it up, so I'm going to investigate that when I get back and see if there's any reason that we can't do that. One other concern I probably ought to point out is the possibility of illegal harvest on State lands because, you know, the Federal lands are far from the coast, they have very few goats, all the good area has been selected and so it's -- certainly you're setting up the possibility for an illegal harvest on State lands if you create a season prior to the State season.

This is not something you can measure or know what the impact is going to be, but it is certainly a consideration, something we need to think about since we're talking about a very small area of Federal lands and a very large area of State lands, which has most of the -- most of the goats on it.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, that's a good point. Maybe that's

why John had his hand up. I didn't recognize you John, but did you want to make a comment?

MR. MORRISON: That was going to be my comment.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: I'm going to vote against this and I'll give you my reasons why. Not that I think that if.....

MR. BASNAR: Do we have a motion?

MR. LOHSE: Oh, we don't even have a motion on the floor?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No.

MR. LOHSE: My fault. In that case, I will put a motion on the floor that we accept the proposed regulation on Unit 6(A) goat.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second.

MR. HENRICHS: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion's seconded. Discussion.

MR. LOHSE: Okay, I'll give you my reasons why I'm going to vote against this. Bob brought one of them up, is the fact that we do have logging going on in that area, so we have an increase in people, we've got a declining goat herd. I don't like to use the word, but when you got a large bunch of people out in the middle of nowhere you also have poaching and that's definitely going to make an effect. There's going to be some impact on the goat herd that can't take much impact because of that. And I don't -- I don't think that -- and again, if that happens, it's possible that what we'll have to do is -- what will happen is the State hunts will be closed anyhow.

What we're going to do is we're going to setup a situation where it's going to be awful hard to go hunting from

August 1st through August 20th and go through all the State land where the goats are, a lot of it -- a lot of it's flat, but you know, to get back to the ridge tops where the goats maybe are or aren't without taking one illegally. And I'm just going to -- I don't like to increase an opportunity on something that's already in decline and is going to have other adverse impacts on.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Anybody else? Anymore discussion on the motion?

MR. BASNAR: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, opposed by the same sign.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we're going to have, I guess, show by raising your hand. All in favor again.

MR. OSKOLKOFF, MR. JOHN, MR. EWAN, VOTE IN FAVOR.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

MR. LOHSE, MR. HENRICHS, MR. ROMIG, MR. BASNAR VOTE IN OPPOSITION.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the motion does not pass.

MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman, the remaining proposals are in the eastern interior regions. All of them are ones that effect the southcentral region, but unlike those proposals from southeast, in this case we don't have the benefit of knowing what that council voted, because the eastern interior council won't meet until next week. So what would you like to do, would you like to hear what the proposals are and approve or adopt or

not adopt them?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: What's the wishes of the Council?

MR. JOHN: This had to do with Unit 12 and we -- to me, I think we should just, depending -- it does effect the people from our region and Copper Center and everything, it's way up in Unit 12. It's in the eastern interior region.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'd be willing to move to table until we hear their decision if that's possible, if that won't cause any major hardships.

MS. MASON: I don't think so. Then does this Council want to be consulted after.....

MS. EAKON: Wait, whoa, whoa.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead, Helga.

MS. EAKON: We have to abide by the Federal Advisory Committee Act requirements of public notice. And if you're going to convene you would have to do so telephonically and I think we're going to run into some time constraints too.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, in other words, you're saying that this has to be done before the season comes up then, in other words, we're in -- we're in a timelock here essentially?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, the situation is more in regard to the Board's decision making cycle, the staff committee will be meeting just two weeks after the Bristol Bay Council and then the Board meets two weeks later, so to convene another meeting of the Southcentral Council following Eastern Interior and before the staff committee would pose some logistics

problems -- scheduling and logistics problems.

Helga points out that it is possible to convene a teleconference meeting, but we still have to have public notice in the Federal Register. There really are serious constraints on trying to have another meeting of the Southcentral Council this time around, prior to the Board's actions.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I would like to hear, if there's no objection, go ahead and hear the proposal and .....

MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman, Proposals 56 and 57 were analyzed together and, in fact, we don't really have the benefit of a full -- a completed analysis. I faxed this material here and so this is a draft analysis, but I will present what has been submitted so far.

These two proposals were submitted by the Copper River Native Association and the Upper Tanana Forty-Mile Fish & Game Advisory Committee, respectively and they seek changes in the existing Unit 12 c&t determination for Nelchina caribou.

Proposal 56 asks that in addition to the communities of Northway and Tetlin that there be a positive c&t for residents of the communities of Chitna, Copper Center, Chistochina, Gakona, Gulkana, Mentasta and Tazlina. Pardon me for butchering these names, I'm not familiar with this area. Proposal 57 request a positive c&t determination for all residents of Unit 12 and 20(D) east of the Johnson River.

The Nelchina Caribou Herd occurs in Units 12, 13, 14(B) and 20(E). In Units 12 and 13 there are distinct Nelchina caribou determinations, seasons and bag limits. There are no Nelchina caribou c&t determinations in Unit 14(B) or 20(E). In Unit 12 there is a TBA or to be announced, winter hunt with a one caribou harvest limit. Customary and traditional use of the Nelchina Caribou Herd is restricted to the residents of Northway and Tetlin.

The Federal hunt is linked with the State's TBA Nelchina caribou hunt. And one way that that happens is that the Federal

season opens after the State's season closes and in 1995 the Federal season never opened because the hunters that were taking animals under State registration permits failed to reach the harvest guidelines in the period the animals were in the unit.

The other thing that you should know is that not all of the communities listed in two proposals have ever reported hunting caribou in Unit 12. For example, Chistochina, Tazlina and Gulkana under Proposal 56 and Nabesna and Cathedral Rapids under Proposal 57, those communities haven't reported caribou in Unit 12. But on the other hand, subsistence users from communities that were not identified in these proposals, but who do have a positive c&t for Nelchina caribou in Unit 13 have reported taking Nelchina animals in Unit 12 under the State registration hunt.

The preliminary conclusion is that given the status of Federal regulations pertaining to caribou in Unit 12 no action should be taken at this time to change the existing c&t determination for Nelchina caribou. The staff's suggestion was that the Council should direct the staff to undertake a review of the existing Unit 12 seasons, harvest limits and c&t determinations and have this for review at the fall Regional Advisory Council meeting. And while reviewing Unit 12 regulations staff consult existing and developing management plans and consider the modifications suggested for Proposals 56 and 57.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. What is the wishes of the Council? What do you want to do? Myself, I think there's good argument that people from these villages did use Unit 12 in the past. You heard a person, I think it was Phillip Sabon, there maybe two days ago, mentioned that he used to Nabesna Road, which means that one side is Unit 11, the other side is Unit 12, you know. Caribou cross, they hunt both sides, so we ought to take a look at it. I'm not saying do something on it today, but maybe -- I don't know what do you think, Fred? Fred is more affected, he's right up in that area there.

MR. JOHN: I just .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go along with the recommendation?

MR. JOHN: Yeah, I just .....

MS. MASON: The recommendation was essentially to table it until the next .....

MR. JOHN: Yeah, I'd like to go along with the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Do you want to make that a motions and we'll vote.

MR. JOHN: I'd like to make a motion we go with the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Fred moved the recommendation of tabling the proposal.

MR. LOHSE: I second it.

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

MR. LOHSE: I'd like to make sure we put the deadline on it they talked about, that they'll have information in the fall meeting.

MR. BRELSFORD: Excuse me, who the motion, please?

MS. EAKON: Ralph.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ready to vote?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question is called for. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion carries. Do we have another one?

MS. MASON: Yes, we do. Proposal 59 was submitted by the Healy Lake Village Council and it requests that the Federal Subsistence Board grant to the residents of Healy Like Village a positive customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Units 20(A), 20(C) and 20(D). It also asks that the Board recognize a positive customary and traditional use determination for moose in Unit 12.

The discussion was somewhat inconclusive. Healy Lake Village is a predominately Tanacross Athabaskan community. It has not been the focus of any ethnographic research or ADF&G Division of Subsistence studies. The majority of Healy Lake Village residents share a common heritage with other Tanacross Athabascans who live in neighboring communities and information about their customary and traditional practices has been recorded and can be assumed to be comparable in Healy Lake, but there is little known about Healy Lake itself.

The other Tanacross communities that are know from Division of Subsistence studies are Dot Lake and Tanacross. And Healy Lake is more remote than those two villages, it's not connected to a road system. And basically, the -- because of this lack of specific evidence there was nothing to suggest that Healy Lake should not have c&t for moose or caribou. Apparently a little bit more is known about moose than caribou, but it was essentially -- the conclusion were inconclusive for both.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Can we go forward and say that we have no recommendation on this, if nobody opposes -- I mean disagrees?

MR. JOHN: Yeah, that's what I was going to say. That's in our area.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there any objection that we say, no

recommendation? Hearing no objection that's how we'll do it.

MS. MASON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Next one.

MS. MASON: The last proposal that -- from the Eastern Interior is Number 61 and this was submitted by the Tetlin Village Council and it would change the moose season in the portion of Unit 12 that's known as Unit 12 remainder. And I won't get into the specifics of that, but those of you who are familiar with Unit 12 know that there is a very complex division in that and one portion of it is called the remainder of Unit 12.

The current State season for the area that's identified by the proposal is August 20th to 28th with one bull with spike-fork antlers or September 1st to 15th, one bull. The current Federal season for the area is September 1st to the 15th with one antlered bull.

The preliminary conclusion that was adopted -- that was brought forward by the staff was to adopt the proposal with the modification providing an August 20 to 31 season of one bull with spike-fork antlers, a moose season for all areas within Unit 12 while retaining all other existing season. And that was in order to align the State and Federal season open dates.

There was a suggested further modification to correct an error in the descriptions that are currently in the regulations because they presently do not form closed polygons. There was a suggestion of an area description that would for contiguous boundaries. The current area description reads Unit 12, that portion lying east of the Nabesna River and south of the Winter Trail, running southeast from Pickerel Lake to the Canadian boarder. It was suggested that it should be modified to read, Unit 12, that portion lying east of the Nabesna River, east of the Nabesna Glacier and south of the Winter Trial, running southeast from Pickerel Lake to the Canadian boarder.

That concludes the summary.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MR. JOHN: I'd like to say that Jay from up there told me -- told us .....

MR. LOHSE: Jay Wells?

MR. JOHN: Yeah, Jay Wells, that the Wrangell/St. Elias voted for this Proposal 61 and they accepted the recommendation of the staff.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Anyone want to make a motion?

MR. JOHN: I'd like to make a motion that we accept Proposal 61 with the recommendation of the staff.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You heard the motion and second. Further discussion on the motion? Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: Then, I take it, that's with the adopting the following modifications where it described the boundaries and changes the date right here.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are you prepared to vote? I just want you to know that, yeah, we did discuss this and the Wrangell/St. Elias SRC did pass this -- support this. I didn't hear any opposition to it from anybody.

MR. BASNAR: There was no problem with this spike-fork business?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, not to my knowledge. Prepared to vote?

MR. BASNAR: Question.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question is called for. All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. EWAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

MR. EWAN: Motion carries. Does that take care of all the proposals?

MS. MASON: Yes, it does.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. So what do we have left to deal with.

MS. EAKON: Members of the Council, Mr. Chair, we do have 20 minutes left in order to clear out this room .....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You want to prioritize what we have left on the agenda then?

MS. EAKON: The most important item on the remainder of the agenda is 8C, Revisiting Backlog of Customary and Traditional Use Determinations and Rachel Mason will present that. As I had told you, Item 8D, the Special Action Request was withdrawn and yesterday we received a fax -- a copy of a letter to that effect. Items E, F and G were put there just for your information. It's up to you, you could defer those until the fall, those are just informational items.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is it okay if we just go ahead with the backlog of customary and traditional use determination by Rachel and then see where we get after that?

MS. EAKON: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, Rachel.

MS. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I passed out to you was first of all a copy of the original backlog and then a piece of paper with a short list of all the proposals that are

currently active in that backlog. You did receive one in your binder but that was a different version, so I ask you to look at the one that I just handed out because that -- that one is more -- corresponds more to the sheet of paper. You originally had 66 in your backlog. The list of 18, which I have handed out is what we've boiled down to after all the c&t proposals that were considered this year and it also leaves out proposals that either deal with all species or they deal with fish or shellfish. So the proposals that are left have also been combined with each other. So I got 18. I've boiled it down to 18. I did not give the specifics of these proposals so that some of them are not for the whole units, they're just for certain communities within those units, for example, C052 for furbearers, that is for Cantwell, C066 for hare in Unit 15 and C069 for black bear, that's only for the community of Ninilchik.

The reason I gave out this list was just to give you guys a chance to -- to give us direction on what priority -- what priorities you have, whether it be a species priority or a regional priority or a priority for areas where there's currently a no subsistence determination. And unfortunately I did not put that information on here, but if that's what you would like to make as a priority, I can go down the list and tell you which ones are currently no determination and which ones are currently no subsistence. So I'll leave it back to you, Mr. Chairman, to get some guidance from the Council.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I really don't know, there isn't much information on these handouts.

MS. MASON: Right.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have questions about some of these.

MS. MASON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

MS. MASON: Well, one way that you could get more information would be to consult the larger version. This one has the fullest information we have.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Anybody have any recommendation how we go about these outstanding proposals?

MS. MASON: May I make one other.....

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do we have dates on when they were submitted?

MS. MASON: Yes, there is the date they were submitted, but that's in the big version here.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Well, maybe one way to go about them is those that were submitted first ought to be considered first and so on.

MS. MASON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That would be a good way.

MS. MASON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's one way to do it.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: It seems fair anyway.

MS. MASON: Yeah, some of them were submitted.....

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

MS. MASON: .....and then submitted again. And so -- but by going by the original submission date, then that would be the first -- first submitted, first considered.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's one way we could go about it. Any other suggestions? Are there some that we don't have enough information on or.....

MS. MASON: Not really. I think we have enough information and actually the direction to comit -- comit ourselves to looking at those that were submitted first, that

would probably be enough guidance for us.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MS. MASON: We have been directed -- the staff has been directed by the staff committee to start working on the backlog this summer so we need to get guidance from the councils on which ones to start working on. But if we know what you want, then we can start doing that.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yes, Roy, I see one in my area here that was submitted back in '91 by Mr. and Mrs. O'Conner, it's CO48 and CO49, I believe we have taken action at this meeting on those two items when we talked about the road corridor.

MS. MASON: Yeah. Those -- this list includes some that have already -- we've already taken action on.

MR. BASNAR: Okay, okay, good. So we wouldn't need to prioritize those?

MS. MASON: Yeah. There's 66 in here and 18 here, so only on the list, the shorter list are the ones that are still current.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Is that all that you need?

MS. MASON: If nobody else has any suggestions, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you. And now we'll go on to the next item then. We have about 15 minutes as I see it, Item D?

MR. LOHSE: D is canceled.

MR. JOHN: It's canceled.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, it's been canceled?

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MR. LOHSE: You said D was withdrawn?

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: D has been withdrawn is my understanding. Do you want to go to E and does anybody have a preference on which one they want to -- because of time, if not, we'll go ahead, let's do Item E then.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, my intention is to be very brief about it. John, did you want to describe any of the contents of this Ulmer initiative?

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game. Mr. Chairman, I can't add any more detail or explanation of what's already been written in Lieutenant Governor Ulmer's report. I would call your attention, however, to the bottom of Page 5 where it asks that reviewers send comments on the proposal to her. It gives addresses and phone numbers and E-mail and everything else. She had asked for comments to be sent to her by the 1st of March, but that deadline's already passed and I'm sure she would still be interested in getting the Council's opinion of the report, either as a group or as individually from the members. And I would recommend that if you haven't read it already and studied to do so and then send her whatever comment you have about it. That's all I can give you, thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's what I would recommend, to individually make comments if you feel like you want to do that. Myself, I feel that this effort is getting very complicated right now. I think we -- from my standpoint, we have to look at it from the Alaska Federation of Natives standpoint, and that's where we were studying this proposal, but that doesn't mean here -- we don't have to. I would like to see people, if you have the time, individually, to review this and to make comments.

Let's just leave it at that if there's no objection. We'll move on. Okay.

The next one would be then F, Level of Involvement of Local Fish, Game Advisory Committees with the Regional Advisory Council. Who's going to address that one?

MS. EAKON: Greg Boss, who is our liaison and works -- he's housed in the office of subsistence management had sent a draft paper on this -- I myself have not received anything from Mr. Boss, have you Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes.

MS. EAKON: You have.

MR. BRELSFORD: I have a briefing statement that was used in our preparation. I think there are basically two simple points. First of all, many of you come from the local advisory committee systems and the strength of the Federal regional council system is often a result of the experience and the overlap in leadership between the States local advisory committee and the Federal regional councils. We, therefore, need to strengthen the kind of interaction, exchange of information between the local advisory committee system and the regional council system by overlapping leadership by your familiarity with proposals in both systems by perhaps exchanging information openly on recommendations concerning proposals. And there's some idea of trying to adjust schedules in the local advisory committee systems to allow items to have recommendations from both systems going forward, kind of have closer coordination between the two. So the first point is we need to have as close as possible a common action on the basis of local knowledgeable people, whether that's in the local advisory committee system organized by the State or the Federal regional council system.

The second point is that there are limited funds to do things like joint meetings or travel other -- other kinds of arrangements that would involve new money -- would involve additional funds, there's some pretty serious limitations on how

we could address that. So our, basically, recommendation is to try and maximize the coordination between the local advisory committee system and the Federal councils within the existing frameworks through the overlaps that I've suggested. There may be an opportunity for additional review and some reconsideration on funding items at a later time. But under the current Federal budget we're -- we don't see a lot of new money available for enhanced budgets for the local advisory committee system.

So I think with that, I've offered the points that Greg had raised earlier.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I don't know how that will work, but if we can accomplish some kind of a cooperative effort, I'm for it. But I see some difficulty myself, I don't know, some of these advisory committees are made up of maybe non-subsistence type people. I know in the Glenallen area there's not too many on that that are subsistence minded. And it seems to me like that would be hard cooperating with those kind of people, but I'm willing to make the effort. Lee.

MR. BASNAR: Yeah. In my case, an example, I called my wife last night and the Denali -- or the Cantwell, officially, the Denali advisory committee met last night. They always call me and invite me to attend and I certainly would have done so had I not been here. And, of course, being in the Cantwell resident zone they qualify for subsistence use in Denali, so we have a pretty good relationship there.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess the point I'm trying to make is trying to -- sometimes talk about different things that don't interest us. Here we're mainly interested in subsistence, they're interested in other matters and will make cooperation a little bit difficult is the thing I was trying to point out. Ralph, do you have something?

MR. LOHSE: I was just wondering if the rest of the advisory committees operated on the same basis as ours does down here. Basically, once a year the advisory committee is an open meeting to anybody in the community and then everybody that's present on that night elects people that they want to serve on

the advisory committee for the year, so it's basically an open meeting, there's no restrictions, you don't have to be a member of the advisory committee or anything like that, but the whole community is invited. And whatever portion of the community comes, they all have one vote for electing who's going to be on the advisory committee. And so our advisory committee is a fairly wide cross section of the community. I mean it's -- being a commercial fishing town, we probably have a high percentage of people who do have commercial fishing interests on it, but they come from a wide variety of backgrounds. And I just wondered if that's how it's done in other places?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't know how, I've never been.....

MR. JOHN: Our area, nobody from any of the village are in the advisory committee. I don't know, it's -- we hardly ever see anybody participate in that except maybe the big -- big fish and game.

MR. BASNAR: We've got a cross section, we've got Natives and non-Natives. And we -- I think we authorize, let's say 11 seats and there's usually only six or seven of them filled, so it's kind of anybody that wants to be on the committee just show up and you're automatically on board.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, I think we have a fairly good participation. I think we have 15 seats and there's normally 15 people plus a couple of alternatives that are elected.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, in your case, you don't see no problem, that's what I'm saying.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

MR. BASNAR: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I welcome the opportunity. I can see some difficulties in maybe my region that -- but we can do it, I think we can do it. I'd like to go ahead and try to cooperate with the other advisory councils. Are we done with this then?

MR. LOHSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the next one will be Federal -- whatever DLP is policies -- okay.

MR. WILLIS: Defense of life and property.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

MR. WILLIS: I'll just briefly run through the points. You have there, it's a very short paper and it's in your book there and so -- we've had a number of proposals, not from this region, but from other regions -- well, I take that back, two from this region about shooting bears that were creating a nuisance for one reason or another under Federal subsistence regulations. And the Board had refused to accept those proposals because shooting nuisance animals was not considered to be a subsistence type of operation. Because we had several of those, they instructed staff to go take a look at what the regulations were, what the law said and what the practicality was of having a Federal defense of life and property regulation comparable to the State regulation on -- which is currently operated statewide.

In short, what our staff people found was that ANILCA is quite clear on what constitutes subsistence use. It says, the customary and traditional uses by rural residents of wild resources for direct personal or family consumption. And our regulations are written based on that statement in the law and so the Board's actions to state that shooting nuisance animals was not a subsistence operation or activity is supported by both law and regulations. We also found a number of practical reasons that would not be wise to create a Federal DLP policy. As far as black bears are concerned, in most areas there's a yearround season and a multiple animal limit and so there's really no reason to -- and no need -- and no reason -- no requirement to save the meat. So there's no reason really to have a DLP on black bears in most areas. Brown bears, a lot of areas on Federal lands don't have a subsistence for brown bear, it's not a subsistence species and so would not be covered under a Federal subsistence regulation. And those areas that do have

brown bears, most of the problems occur around fish camps and areas that are not normally on State land. So that would be another reason that it would -- from a practical standpoint, a Federal DLP policy would have little effect because the activities wouldn't be taking place on Federal lands.

And finally a Federal DLP regulation would probably have just about the same requirements that the State regulation does as far as some type of accountability, some type of reporting and submitting the hides and claws and so forth and collecting some biological data. This is one of the objections to the State policy was, that people who shoot a bear in defense of life and property have to salvage the hide and surrender it to the State along with the claws and the skull. But the Federal mandates for managing populations are very similar to the State mandates and there would have to be some type of reporting requirement under a Federal system like there is under the State system. And so the decision was that there was really no benefit in establishing a Federal DLP policy, but rather that the State policy should continue as is.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to add one additional point from the briefing statement that Dick Marshall prepared pretty near on his last day at work, so this is our memorial moment to Dick Marshall. The Board in discussing this on January 19th did recognize that there had been some burdens -- that the current system of reporting is perceived as not being user friendly in the communities and so they decided to informally approach the Alaska Department of Fish & Game and to explore whether those reporting requirements and kind of the -- whether there could be some streamlining so that they would be more user friendly to the communities and Greg Boss from our staff will be involved in those discussions with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. So, in effect, the Federal board is not going to act independently on this. They have conveyed some of the concerns that were raised through the regional councils forward to the State for consideration in the State DLP program.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I hope this included -- I like that idea, you know, being more user friendly. I hope part of that recommendation would include maybe a person that had to shoot a bear for defense of one's life or property be able to keep the hide or something like that in the future. Because it just seems like a burden that the person has to go through the skinning and then turn the hide and everything over to the State doesn't seem fair to me. Maybe that's one of the things that we could recommend and may -- it may be more acceptable, you know. Ralph.

MR. LOHSE: That's the main complaint that I hear about it. But at the same time, that's probably the main thing that's in there. I mean the main reason that that's in there is because it stops people from collecting a -- having an excuse to collect a hide. And I know why the -- I know why the law on the claws is in there, it's because the claws basically are the monetary value. And consequently -- consequently, if you eliminate those two things, you've basically given somebody an excuse to take their bear hides and their claws out of season, you know. I mean because we can all come up with -- I mean I can think of, just this last year, I could have claimed defense of life and property real fast. But the fact that I had to skin it out and give it to the State made me hesitate to shoot it and give it time to go away, you know.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just think back on some of what I said. I think the State does allow on a case by case basis. That happened in Glenallen, the last -- oh, two years ago, we killed a bear right by our office because it was breaking into our shed where we had some food, and -- and a person there in Glenallen, a Fish & Game person told me, do you want to give this skin to a, you know, somebody that wants it and they did allow the person to keep -- just to take the whole thing. But there had to be something -- I guess some kind of purpose to it like educational to teach somebody skinning or something like that, yeah. John, do you have a comment?

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Fish & Game Department. A new problem in this use of DLP to take bears is to get the gall bladders and sell them in addition to the possibility of selling

the hide or claws, there's a big market for any bear hide and especially polar bear hides in the Orient. And pretty well to-do Japanese and Korean people are willing to spend big bucks for those bear hides so that the requirement to turn those parts into the State is very important in preventing people from going out and deliberately killing bears for profit and acting like it was done in DLP. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I could see the reasoning. But I know in my case, like it was around my fishwheel a lot and tearing things up down in that area, I'd shoot him, I just don't have no motivation to skin the thing or anything for the State. It just seems unfair to have to go through all this labor and then to turn the hide over, you know.

MR. MORRISON: Well, it gives you practice.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right, we're done then.

MS. EAKON: Whoa. In appreciation for the breakfast, we do have a thank you card for Ralph. In appreciation for the potlatch, we do have a thank you card for Bob Henrichs. And then your last item there is going to be your next council meeting, please turn to Tab 10. You will notice that Kodiak Aleutians is going to meet October 1 and 2 and we don't want to conflict with Rachel and Robert because they're also staff for Kodiak Aleutians. We would prefer that you set a date and a location so that we could plan accordingly and make sure that there's no conflict with a meeting where I or Rachel or Robert have to attend.

MR. LOHSE: I would prefer that if we're going to do it in October we would do it at least after the first week in October. It's basically been a financial hardship to my family the last two years quitting when I've quit to come.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: How's the 7th, 8th, 9th, somewhere in that area.

MR. LOHSE: Sounds good.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: They're not for you, Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah.

MR. HENRICHS: I don't know, there's other things that are going to be planned like the corporation's annual meeting comes then, but I don't know when that stuff's going to be so I can't really say if that's good right now.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah, it's kind of the end and the beginning of the fiscal year, September/October for a lot of people. So I know September is very busy and if you combine that with a hunt and what not, so September is tough. I haven't really looked into October yet.

MR. BASNAR: That's best for me.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We'll look at those three days as a possibility right now then.

MS. EAKON: Tentatively. Okay, do you have a place you'd like to meet at?

MR. LOHSE: Could we meet in the Copper Center, Glenallen area?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: That's what we had suggested some time before and it sounds like a reasonable thing to do to me.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You have to know how to drive.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Love to drive, especially those bumpy roads.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'll tell you that most of the communities along the highway have a community hall that are available.

MR. JOHN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: We could also make our office conference

room available, which is kind of the center.

MR. BASNAR: Just a suggestion and I'm all in favor of going up there, but would be a little wiser to determine our agenda first and if it was, for example, some -- the preponderance of what we're going to discuss did not pertain to that area, we might be better off to meet in whatever area would be most impacted so that -- but if we do have a lot of issues that do pertain to that particular area, then that's where we should meet.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: I did suggest that area, but maybe we ought to have it.....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I can see where that's, you know, that's possible. I don't know if we have a grasp of the proposals and whatnot and I think it would be good to have, you know, kind of an idea, at least where to go. I know that before we had discussed, it's been several meetings now trying to get up to that area. And I'd just like to see a nice geographic distribution and I'd like to see the other areas, hear from the other people, they're on the road system. You know, it's not impossible for people to get -- but if it is a vast majority is from a different area, perhaps Mr. Basnar's correct, we should, you know, consider moving to that area if that's the case.

MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know exactly what it is, but I can assure the Council that if the c&t's are going to be examined in the order that they came in, there will be a geographic distribution that definitely includes the Glenallen area.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: That would be one of.....

MS. EAKON: The focal agenda item is going to be the proposals, and of course, the public forum -- call for proposals.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I don't know if we have consensus, but that's okay with me. Any opposition to considering Copper Center, Glenallen area as a possibility --

Glenallen is centrally located in the valley.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: You can look at some locations in Glenallen or you can go to Copper Center, which ever has a very large hall.

MR. BASNAR: What about hotel, motel facilities?

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Glenallen's the only ones -- there's Copper Center Roadhouse, which I don't know whether it's open this year or not.

MR. LOHSE: Even if we ended up using the hall in Copper Center, Glenallen's only 15 minutes away. You know, I mean we're not talking hundreds of miles.

MR. BASNAR: Is that it?

MS. EAKON: Yes.

MR. BASNAR: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion to adjourn, is there a second?

MR. JOHN: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

**(END OF PROCEEDINGS)**

**\* \* \* \* \***

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )

) ss.

STATE OF ALASKA )

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 33 through 197 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the **Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Subsistence Advisory Council** meeting taken electronically by me on the 6th day of March 1996, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at the Centennial Building Meeting Room, Cordova, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by myself and Meredith Downing 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 14th day of March, 1996.

---

Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 11/5/98